Accountability in Action Program

Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Mary McNeil, Andre Herzog, Sladjana Cosic, and PRISM Research

Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Mary McNeil
Andre Herzog
Sladjana Cosic
& PRISM Research

Accountability in Action Program

September 2009

Contents

Appendices

Acknowledgments

Abbreviations and Acronyms

BiH   Bosnia and Herzegovina
CDP   Community Development Project
CRC   citizen report card
CSC   community scorecard
CSO   civil society organization
FBiH   Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina
GTZ   Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit
      (German Agency for Technical Cooperation)
ICT   Information and Communications Technology
KfW   Reconstruction Credit Institute (Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau)
KM   Convertible Mark (konvertibilna marka)
MZ   neighborhood committee (mjesne zajednice)
NA   Not applicable
NGO   nongovernmental organization
OSCE   Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
RS   Republika Srpska
SDC   Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SIDA   Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
UNDP   United Nations Development Programme
USAID   United States Agency for International Development
VAT   value added tax
WBI   World Bank Institute

Executive Summary

In 2006, the World Bank Institute (WBI) and the Austrian Development Cooperation launched a three-year initiative, the Municipal Government Reform and Accountability Program, aimed at strengthening local governance and service delivery in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). The initiative focused on improving local government capacity to respond to citizens' demands for improved service delivery and local governance. An important component of this initiative was an in-depth analysis of citizen perceptions of municipal service delivery and performance—the Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The survey was designed to use both quantitative and qualitative information to capture citizen feedback on local government performance. The results were fed into a more comprehensive review of the municipal sector developed by the World Bank's Europe and Central Asia Region.[1]

The concept of "demand for good governance" underpins exercises such as the citizen review conducted in BiH. The World Bank's governance and anticorruption strategy, launched in March 2007, explicitly calls for strengthening demand-side approaches through improving the enabling environment for transparency and information disclosure, building civil society capacity, and using social accountability tools such as social audits.[2] While the supply side of governance focuses on formal public institutions responsible for public services, the demandside focuses on citizens' initiatives to hold government accountable and demand better services. Strong demand-side approaches are increasingly recognized as a critical part of improving service delivery, ensuring transparency in governance, and achieving long-term economic development.

Citizens and governments have launched demand-side, or social accountability, initiatives worldwide. Their experiences point to the growing effectiveness of citizen involvement in bringing

1. "From Stability to Performance: Local Governance and Service Delivery in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BH)." World Bank Sustainable Development Department, Europe and Central Asia Region. Washington: January 2009. Available at http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTBOSNIAHERZ/Resources/LocalGovernanceAndServiceDeliveryInBH.pdf
2. For more information on the World Bank Group's governance and anticorruption strategy, see: http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTGOVANTICORR/0,,contentMDK:21447906~pagePK:210058~piPK:210062~theSitePK:3035864,00.html

about improved government performance based on verifiable data and the use of rigorous survey techniques. Such techniques include participatory planning, participatory budgeting, independent budget analysis, participatory budget expenditure tracking, citizen advisory boards, and citizen and community scorecards, among others. Results often play a role in elections and can serve to supplement formal institutional checks and balances, especially when judicial enforcement is weak or unreliable.

BiH Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance

The objective of the citizen review in BiH was to engage citizens, service users, local governments, and service providers in a meaningful assessment and debate on the quality of services and governance at the local level. In particular, the assessment aimed to help answer the following questions:

- What are citizens' views of, and experiences with, service delivery and local governance?
- How does service delivery vary across municipalities?
- Are there any variations in delivery across different services? If so, why?
- What is the relationship between service user satisfaction and perceptions of local governance?
- What are possible measures to improve service delivery and local governance?

The project had two main components: a community scorecard and a citizen report card, which were followed by a dissemination workshop and a series of stakeholder feedback meetings (See Figure 1). First, a community scorecard was conducted in four municipalities to capture qualitative information through focus group discussions and in-depth interviews with a range of stakeholders. A different service was researched in each municipality: road construction and maintenance, preschool and elementary education, waste collection and removal, and local governance. The findings and lessons learned from the community scorecard process were built into the second phase of the citizen review, the design and implementation of a citizen report card.

The citizen report card—including a household survey and a series of stakeholder feedback meetings to discuss the results of the survey—was conducted in 20 municipalities. The survey asked 1,997 households about their perceptions of public service delivery and local governance, including government accountability, political stability, public security, government effectiveness, regulatory burden, rule of law, and corruption. The public services surveyed included local roads, waste removal, water supply, sewerage, heating, preschool and elementary education, and health care. Survey findings were presented at stakeholder feedback meetings in seven of the 20 municipalities covered by the survey. A key part of the research was participants' recommendations for improvements in service provision that might serve as a guideline for concrete policy action in each municipality.

Figure 1. Project Methodology

August–September 2006	December 2006–February 2007	March 2007	Mid-March 2007
Community Scorecard • Focus group discussions (104 participants, 4 municipalities) • In-depth interviews (18 participants)	**Citizen Report Card** • Household survey (n=1,997, 20 municipalities)	**Dissemination Workshop** • Intermediate findings presented to stakeholders (100 participants, 20 municipalities)	**Stakeholder Feedback Meetings** • In-depth discussions with diverse groups (39 participants, 7 municipalities)
Initial findings on road construction and maintenance, preschool and elementary education, waste collection and removal, and local governance	Refined and quantifiable findings on public services and local governance	Initial reactions to findings, clarifications, and preliminary dialogue among users, providers, and government	Opinions on underlying factors explaining research findings, recommendations for improvements

Source: Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2006–07.

Both citizens and local governments valued the exercise as a mechanism for improving interactions between citizens and local decision makers, and as a management tool for service providers to guide them in making improvements in service delivery. A benefit of the citizen review was that it gave citizens a rare opportunity to express their opinions about their local representatives and service providers. The exercise facilitated greater dialogue among stakeholders and was successful in identifying priority problem areas and potential solutions.

Key Findings

The citizen review uncovered the following key findings and potential solutions:

Citizen participation in local decision making and policy making is weak because of citizens' attitudes toward, and limited knowledge of, government. Even though a large number of citizens are not satisfied with their representation in municipal activities, only 20 percent are willing to participate in such activities. Their participation in local government is limited largely because citizens do not believe they can influence local decision making. Citizens believe decisions are ad hoc and made without requesting or responding to citizen input. Most citizens (70 percent of those surveyed) believe that local government decisions never or almost never reflect citizens' priorities. Two-thirds of respondents state that local government's decisions are driven by political party interests. As a result, citizen participation is more reactive than proactive. Citizens contact local officials only when they have a problem. Municipalities lack mechanisms for including citizens in consultations, obtaining feedback on their priorities, and including their input in decision making.

A majority of adults (75 percent) had not participated in or attended any meeting or activity organized by any local government actor (community council, municipal assembly, and so forth) in the past 12 months. More than half (58 percent) of respondents had not contacted a local government representative in the past 12 months.

Potential solutions:
- Municipalities could develop communication strategies to inform citizens about the policies, programs, services, and initiatives of the local government; listen to the public; and respond to citizens' needs.
- Mayors and municipal councilors could meet with citizens and visit communities more often.
- An audit mechanism could be established to evaluate government performance.
- Neighborhood committees (mjesne zajednice or MZs) could be used as the main mode of community organization at the local level and the main channel through which citizens could influence decision-making processes. They could also serve as the main source of information about municipal activities.

Women are particularly underrepresented in participatory processes in local governance. The citizen review shows that, in the aggregate, women have less knowledge of and interest in political procedures or their own rights. Men are more likely to represent households at public assemblies (42 percent had done so in the past year) than women, who had served as representatives only 4 percent of the time. More than half of the respondents (52 percent) believe men have a greater ability to influence local government decisions. Only 2 percent of respondents state that women have a greater ability than men to influence decisions.

Potential solutions:
- Local governments could use civic education to include more women in participatory processes at the municipal level.
- Cooperation with local women's NGOs could help build capacity among women and motivate them to voice their interests.

Citizens often do not exercise their client power due to the lack of grievance mechanisms for service delivery. Citizens rarely complain to providers when service problems arise. When they do complain, the service providers' response rate is extremely low. While service providers received relatively positive ratings for the reliability and quality of their services (between 59 and 93 percent across the different services and municipalities), they received strikingly low ratings on their responsiveness to customer complaints (only between 15 and 25 percent were positive). The most common reason citizens state for not filing a complaint is that they believe it would make no difference. Citizens also do not know to whom they should address their problems.

Potential solutions:

- Local governments could work with service providers to establish and promote grievance mechanisms with the aim of improving service delivery.
- If the problem cannot be solved immediately, the reasons should be explained to citizens.
- Introducing a participatory performance monitoring system that takes place on a regular basis (such as a social audit or citizen report card) could help identify and address service delivery problems.

Local governments lack managerial capacity, prioritization mechanisms, financial resources, and qualified personnel. Local governments attribute their inability to provide more and better services to a lack of resources. But even without additional resources, existing resources could be used more effectively through improved management and prioritization mechanisms. The biggest obstacles to improving life in their municipalities, according to respondents, are lack of resources (53 percent), corruption (36 percent), weak political leadership (35 percent), party politics (27 percent), lack of citizen participation (20 percent), and lack of skilled public servants (17 percent).

Potential solutions:

- Additional resources could come from citizens' financial participation, such as through voluntary contributions, private financing of projects, and higher taxes; new government investments; and greater financial commitments from higher levels of government.
- Government actors should focus more on the quality and reliability of services than on the quantity of infrastructure projects or people served.
- Municipal agencies should employ more qualified, professional staff.
- Local governments could adopt a code of conduct for civil servants.
- Transparency and citizen monitoring of service delivery could help prevent corruption.
- Local governments and service providers could hire more inspectors to contribute to higher-quality public services.

Local government work is often obstructed by a lack of clarity in legal frameworks, poor cooperation with utility companies, and internal political dynamics. Inadequate and often unclear division of responsibilities between local and other government levels result in inefficient service delivery. The constitutions and laws of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FBiH) and Republika Srpska (RS) on local self-government have resulted in the transfer of some functions that were previously the responsibility of the municipalities to entity (FBiH or RS) or cantonal levels, redistributing decision-making authority and financial and management responsibilities to higher levels of government. In reality, these responsibilities have not been redistributed to higher levels of government, as the actual implementation of policies and services is not occurring at the central government level. Rather, local governments still hold de facto authority for these responsibilities. In some municipalities, the responsibilities of utility companies are undefined, which in many cases leads to a troublesome relationship between municipal authorities and service providers.

Potential solution:
- Government actors could strengthen the decentralization process and synchronize municipal responsibilities and financial resources with the attendant workloads.

Dissemination and Follow-Up

Detailed findings of both the community scorecard and citizen report card surveys were presented to citizens and local government officials in the municipalities in which the citizen reviews were undertaken. As a result of the citizen review, WBI worked with local consultants to develop curriculum for delivery to municipal officials in three priority areas: communications, participatory budgeting, and mechanisms for citizen feedback on local government performance and delivery of public services. Initial training activities were undertaken in selected municipalities covered under the World Bank's Community Development Project (CDP), with plans for more in-depth training and technical assistance to be provided to local offices under the project.

The results of the Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina were fed into the broader economic and sector work of the World Bank, helping to guide World Bank lending in the country. Specifically, the findings on basic infrastructure and services were used as a basis for the preparation of the World Bank Municipal Development Project that supports municipal investments in the country.

1 Introduction to the Citizen Review

Overview and Context

Project Context

In 2006, the World Bank Institute and the Austrian Development Cooperation launched a three-year initiative, the Municipal Government Reform and Accountability Program, aimed at strengthening local governance and service delivery in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The initiative focused on improving local government capacity to respond to citizens' demands for improved local governance and service delivery, and followed up on the success of Bosnia and Herzegovina's Community Development Project (CDP) in building capacity for citizen involvement in the construction of small infrastructure projects in the poorest municipalities. Two seminars for CDP mayors on participatory municipal budgeting, held in February 2005, consolidated the demand for the World Bank Institute–Austrian Development Cooperation program and served as the impetus for taking a more programmatic approach to improving municipal-level capacity in this area.

An important component of this approach was an in-depth analysis of citizen perceptions of municipal service delivery and local government performance, the Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The survey tool was designed to use both quantitative and qualitative information to capture citizen feedback on local government performance. It was but one component of a larger picture of how to improve municipal capacity in BiH, and, provided input to a more comprehensive review of the municipal sector developed by the World Bank's Europe and Central Asia Region.[3] The review provided important inputs to that work by providing citizens' opinions on, and suggestions for improving, the performance of local services and governance.

---

3. "From Stability to Performance: Local Governance and Service Delivery in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BH)." World Bank Sustainable Development Department, Europe and Central Asia Region. Washington: January 2009. Available http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTBOSNIAHERZ/Resources/LocalGovernanceAndServiceDeliveryInBH.pdf. Local Governance and Service Delivery, World Bank, Washington, D.C., January 2009.

The concept of "demand for good governance" underpins exercises such as the citizen review conducted in BiH. The World Bank's governance and anticorruption strategy, launched in March 2007, explicitly calls for strengthening demand-side approaches through improving the enabling environment for transparency and information disclosure, building civil society capacity, and using social accountability tools such as the citizen review, community scorecard, citizen report card, and social audit. While the supply side of governance focuses on formal public institutions responsible for public services, the demand side focuses on citizens' initiatives to hold government accountable and demand better services. Strong demand-side approaches are increasingly recognized as a critical part of improving service delivery, ensuring transparency in governance, and achieving long-term economic development.

Strengthening the demand side of governance requires the implementation of a range of tools and methodologies that use analytically rigorous techniques to capture and quantify citizen demand. These tools and methodologies are clustered together under the term "social accountability." The World Bank has defined social accountability as "an approach toward building accountability that relies on civic engagement in which citizens and civil society organizations participate directly or indirectly in exacting accountability."[4] Social accountability mechanisms include (but are by no means limited to) participatory public policy making, participatory budgeting, independent budget analysis, participatory public expenditure tracking surveys, social audits, citizen advisory boards, community scorecards, and citizen report cards. Citizens and civil society organizations have launched such initiatives worldwide. Well-known examples include citizen report cards in India, participatory public expenditure tracking surveys in Uganda, and third-party monitoring of road construction in Peru. These examples point to the growing effectiveness of citizens' groups in pressuring government to improve its performance, in large part because they rely on verifiable data and the use of rigorous survey techniques. Information gathered in social accountability exercises is then widely disseminated through the media and used by advocacy groups in negotiations with government. Results often play a role in elections and can serve to supplement formal institutional checks and balances, especially when judicial enforcement is weak or unreliable.

At the local government level, such accountability is strengthened through decentralization efforts in which both political and fiscal resources are devolved to lower levels of government. In BiH, the state consists of a national government that represents the entire country, and beneath it are two entity governments: the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FBiH) and the Republika Srpska (RS). Because of different governance structures in each entity, the respective roles and responsibilities of local governments are quite complex. Furthermore, the country's recent conflict and a legacy from the former socialist regime has led citizens to view government officials more as remote power holders and less as delegated representatives accountable to the people. Local government accountability has been based on the conventional approach of local elections and traditional

---

4. Malena, C., R. Forster, and J. Singh. 2004. "Social Accountability: An Introduction to the Concept and Emerging Practice." Social Development Papers: Participation and Civic Engagement No. 76, World Bank, Washington, DC.

internal or so-called "horizontal" mechanisms, such as administrative or financial regulations, central government audits, and local legislative control over the executive branch.

The incomplete decentralization process in BiH has put local governments in a difficult position because of their limited autonomy and the centralization of responsibilities at the cantonal and entity levels. Discrepancies between responsibilities and the resources available to execute those responsibilities have contributed to citizens' negative perceptions toward their municipal governments. Local authorities are still viewed as closer to the people than federal or entity officials and are being given increasing autonomy and resources.

A number of development partners, including the World Bank, have recognized the importance of the municipal sector and have developed extensive programs to strengthen local government. Donors have been focusing on local economic development, modernization and professionalization of local development planning, cross-municipal cooperation, and improvements in customer service and administrative management. A significant number of initiatives, both by donors and civil society organizations, have sought to strengthen the links between citizens and municipalities by building capacity for participatory governance among both citizens and government actors.

Although these efforts are promising, citizen participation at the local level remains weak. Citizen partnerships with local governments and service providers are constrained, primarily because of underdeveloped mechanisms for citizens to participate in local planning and implementation and to hold local governments accountable. The lack of a systemic and coherent approach to capacity building at the municipal level—rooted in local institutions and arising from existing structures—presents an obstacle to achieving large-scale success.

One purpose of the citizen review, therefore, was to identify capacity-building needs based on an analytical survey of citizens' perceptions of what is lacking in local government performance, and what should be addressed, most particularly by BiH citizens themselves. It was hoped that from this effort a more targeted and appropriate capacity-building program could be developed.

Research Description

The objective of the citizen review was to engage citizens, service users, local government, and service providers in a meaningful assessment and debate on the quality of service and governance at the local level. In particular, the assessment aimed to help answer the following questions:

- What are citizens' views of, and experiences with, service delivery and governance?
- How does service delivery vary across municipalities?
- Are there any variations in delivery among different services? If so, why?
- What is the relationship between service user satisfaction and citizen perceptions of the quality of local governance?
- What are possible measures to improve service delivery and local governance?

The project began in early 2006 through a broad consultation with national and local governments, donors, and civil society organizations (see appendix 1 for a more detailed description of the methodology). Following this consultation process, PRISM Research, a local implementing partner, developed and conducted community scorecards in four municipalities (see appendix 2 for a description of the four municipalities). Information was collected from 104 participants in focus group discussions and 18 face-to-face in-depth interviews (see appendix 3 for a description of focus group participants and appendix 4 for a description of interviewees).

Three focus groups were organized in each municipality. The first focus group was composed of service providers, public officials, and local authorities. The second focus group included citizens, representatives of civil society organizations, and community representatives. The term "providers" will be used in the report when referring to the first group, and "users" for the second. The third focus group discussion, called an interface meeting, provided the most comprehensive and precise information about the service in question because all stakeholders were involved. As part of this third discussion, each stakeholder group also proposed specific actions to improve the quality of services.

Throughout the process, the aim was to ensure both active citizen input into the design of the survey methodology itself and the triangulation of survey data with feedback from stakeholder groups following the survey. A related supply-side assessment was initiated at the same time by PRISM Research to capture key financial data in each municipality, thus setting the survey within the context of resource constraints in each of the selected municipalities.

The findings and lessons learned from the community scorecard process were built into the second phase of the citizen review, the design and implementation of the citizen report card. The citizen report card included a household survey and a series of stakeholder feedback meetings to discuss survey results. The household survey was conducted from December 2006 to February 2007. First, PRISM developed and tested a public survey questionnaire divided into three sections covering the main public services devolved to local governments (123 questions); local governance issues of public participation, access to information, rule of law, and accountability (32 questions); and sociodemographic characteristics (16 questions). Then the questionnaire was used in 20 municipalities to cover a wide range of local governments with significant regional differences, as well as differences between urban and rural municipalities, and differences in population size and budgets per capita. About 100 households were interviewed in each of the 20 municipalities, for a total of 1,997 households. Each interview lasted 40 minutes on average.

The intermediate results of the citizen review were presented to stakeholders at a dissemination workshop in March 2007. The workshop brought together 100 participants from the municipalities covered by the survey, as well as donor, community, government, and civil society representatives. Following the dissemination workshop, stakeholder feedback meetings were organized in seven of

the 20 municipalities. The entire stakeholder feedback meeting process took two weeks, and 39 persons were interviewed. The findings presented for a municipality ranged from explanations of results to recommendations, risks, and the time line necessary for reform. During the interviews and focus groups, the project team asked for stakeholders' opinions about the underlying factors that might explain the preliminary research findings, and for their views on how to improve service delivery and local governance in their municipality. The results of these meetings are included in the chapter covering the survey and provide a second set of citizen perceptions on service delivery and local governance.

In order to ensure effective dissemination and leverage support for change, the initiative sought to engage the key stakeholders from the beginning to the end of the study. This includes government at the state, entity, canton, and municipal levels; associations of governments; think-tanks, civil society organizations, the World Bank country team, and other donors active in this area, including especially the Austrian Development Cooperation, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), the Swiss Development Corporation, the European Commission, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (Kfw) or Reconstruction Credit Institute, and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) or German Agency for Technical Cooperation. The key ministries identified as counterparts to the study are the Ministry of Finance on the RS side, and potentially the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Finance on the Federation side.

Structure of the Report

The first section of the report has introduced the context of the report and the methodology and sources of information. Section 2 reports on the findings of the community scorecard, including the focus group discussions, in-depth interviews, and feedback from the interface meetings. Section 3 presents the findings from the citizen report card, including the household survey and feedback from stakeholder meetings in 7 of the 20 municipalities. Section 4 provides the main conclusions and recommendations based on the findings. Section 5 is an epilogue that describes the impact of the citizen review and lessons learned on using this instrument.

Consolidated Findings

Table 1.1 presents consolidated findings from the exercise, combining data gathered through all phases of the initiative. The next two chapters present the detailed findings in each of the sectors under examination, divided into findings derived from each individual phase of the initiative.

Table 1.1. Consolidated Findings: Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in BiH
Stakeholder Feedback by Service Sector, 2006–07

Sector	Findings	Recommendations	Challenges
Road Construction and Maintenance	• Improvements in recent years, but some feel maintenance remains poor • Emphasis on quantity over quality • Urban/rural disparities • Limited local capacity for planning and inspection • Limited and ineffective complaint mechanisms	• Shift focus to quality over quantity • Asphalt rural roads for safety and access to city • Improve municipal administration capacity • Design programs for greater citizen involvement • Increase citizens' financial participation in sector and lobby for increased government resources	• Limited resources and local capacity • Difficulty in justifying rural investment on cost-efficiency basis • Irregular government follow-through on contractual obligations • Weak culture of participation
Preschool and Elementary Education	• Adequate facilities (with a few minor complaints) • High-quality child care and user satisfaction • Employees are not paid regularly; some lack requisite skills	• Employ an on-site doctor/nurse • Renovate facilities and improve accessibility • Expand services to make full use of existing capacity • Invest in professional development and effective incentive structures for employees • Local government should be more active in financing investment	• Irregular collection of local budgetary funds prevents regular staff payments • Late payments from parents, especially during certain seasons • Limited resources; lack of legal mandate for preschool education • Lack of coordination among involved institutions
Waste Collection and Removal	• Inadequate services—too few vehicles, containers, and personnel relative to population size and volume of waste • Urban/rural disparities; high/low-income household disparities • Frequent illegal dumping • Users lack information on billing calculations	• Citizen financial contributions for services • Place more containers in both urban and rural areas; establish collection points in rural areas, and increase collection frequency in both urban and rural areas • Increase citizen awareness and promote citizen engagement • Focus on improving efficiency of existing efforts	• Many outstanding payments from three years following war • Undefined responsibilities among government/service providers; unproductive incentive structures • Weak culture of participation; limited belief in effectiveness of grievance mechanisms • Municipalities lack adequate waste disposal sites

Table 1.1. Continued

Sector	Findings	Recommendations	Challenges
Local Governance	• Overall dissatisfaction with implementation, equity, transparency, accountability • Mistrust of local authorities; suspicion of political interests usurping citizen interests • Limited staff capacity and ineffective "holdover" employees • Productive relationship with local NGOs • Weak local council • Scepticism regarding participation • Ineffective grievance mechanisms • Limited knowledge of budgetary and decision-making processes	• Streamline processes in a "one-stop shop" for bureaucratic procedures • Encourage information seeking under existing Law on Free Access to Information • Improve municipal staffing through new hires, professionalization, training • Establish community assembly to increase citizen participation • Develop a multistakeholder effort to educate citizens about their rights	• Limited capacity of municipal authorities relative to higher levels of government • Limited resources • Outdated/inefficient administrative legacy practices and structures

Source: Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2006–07.

2

Findings from the Community Scorecard

This section presents the results of the focus group discussions and in-depth interviews in which 122 individuals participated. Community scorecards were used for the organization of the focus groups and interviews. Different focus group guides were developed for each service, but their structure was the same in order to allow for standardized information and reporting.

The qualitative assessment helped to generate indicators that were later incorporated into the citizen report card (CRC) exercise, as well as to begin giving feedback about the findings to participating local governments and communities to seek their views about the validity of the information. Four underdeveloped municipalities were chosen to participate in the scorecard, based on a number of attributes: less and more affected by the war, less and more developed, rural or urban, and with and without experience with nontransparent authority. Toward the conclusion of each focus group, participants were asked to suggest indicators that could be used to measure the quality of the service. The users scored indicators generated by providers. Once they had agreed on the significance of a specific indicator, group participants scored the current situation in their municipality on a scale from 1 to 5 for each indicator, in which 1 meant "poor quality" and 5 meant "very good quality." For more information on the community scorecard (CSC) methodology and implementation, see annex 1.

Each focus group discussion touched upon the following four thematic areas:

- Service characteristics and quality, as well as their usage and citizen access;
- Citizen participation in service design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of results;
- Budgetary expenditure, revenue generation, and public procurement; and
- Participant-generated indicators that would be used to measure service quality and performance, to grade the service using these indicators, and to provide recommendations for service improvement.

Each of these four thematic areas was examined for four different sectors: road construction and maintenance, preschool and elementary education, waste collection and removal, and local governance, with results summarized below.

Road Construction and Maintenance in Knezevo/Skender Vakuf

Knezevo, which is also called Skender Vakuf by some, is in Republika Srpska (RS), 50 kilometers southeast of Banja Luka. Its population of around 13,800 mainly inhabits the rural part of the municipality (75 percent). Livestock farming is its main economic activity. The urban population mainly works in local administration, public companies, and retail. Knezevo's geography and position as a border region during the war have isolated it from the rest of the country. Knezevo has problems with water supply, sewerage, waste disposal, and local road maintenance. The municipal budget has accumulated a large debt because there are no significant water wells, and all the water is pumped from the Cvrcka River, which requires much electricity. A large proportion (60 percent) of the water that is pumped is lost due to old infrastructure. The sewerage system is also old and is a threat to the environment. With respect to roads, the main problem confronting the community is that remote villages are difficult and expensive to reach.

Local Road Construction

Findings from Focus Group Discussions
Users believe local road construction and maintenance have greatly improved over the past two years, contributing to significantly greater satisfaction among citizens than before. This is primarily due to construction of new sections of asphalt roads that connect some of the most remote villages with the municipality. These investments partially resolved the problems of some of the most populated villages. Some roads are unusable in rain and snow. Providers state that connecting smaller villages with asphalt roads would require significantly more funding, as these roads currently are mainly dirt roads and pathways.

Users participating in the interface meeting were unanimous in their support for municipal authority decisions on recently constructed roads. However, despite this broad-based support, some users from urban areas complain that the local administration pays no attention to side roads and focuses only on the main road running through the city center. Distance and population size are the two primary criteria used by administrative bodies in deciding where to construct roads. Most roads connecting the outskirts with the city center are in very poor condition and almost impassable for motor vehicles.

One of the problems users mention is the absence of a city bypass, which causes all intercity traffic to pass through the city center. Many freight vehicles traveling through the city contribute to air pollution, dirty streets, and frequent traffic jams. The bypass road plan was developed more than 20 years ago, but providers state that the municipal budget is insufficient for its construction and that the project must be financed by a higher level of government.

Findings from In-depth Interviews

No roads were completely asphalted over the past two years. Mainly critical and unusable sections have been asphalted. While residents express satisfaction that something had been done, they believe the problem is not completely solved because the recently paved sections of roads are already becoming unusable and require repairs.

Residents mention cases in which villagers financed construction of roads from their own funds. In most cases, they financed construction of shorter sections and critical areas, which were built without professional assistance.

One nongovernmental organization (NGO) representative said there were problems with local roads that link villages in different municipalities. Such roads are almost never constructed or repaired due to jurisdictional problems and the lack of cooperation between municipalities in this region.

Local Road Maintenance

Findings from Focus Group Discussions

The wide dispersion of villages and rural communities complicates connecting them with the city and regional roads. Only 51 out of 104 roads are asphalted, which results in high costs to repair nonasphalted ones. Local roads, except in urban areas, do not have proper drainage, resulting in erosion and faster wear.

Local government has no plan for road maintenance. Instead, local community representatives submit requests to the local administration. After collecting a number of requests, the municipality provides and distributes sand for fill. Providers said there was no specific maintenance company responsible for road work, but that contracts for the maintenance work are awarded via ad hoc tenders. For less important roads, the municipality provides sand for fill, while local residents carry out the work.

Because the municipality's average altitude is 1,000 meters, it receives much snow, which is expensive to remove. No single company is responsible for winter road maintenance. The administration hires numerous individuals to clear less important roads in winter. The municipality covers the cost of fuel, while local residents provide workers and machinery. Tenders are used to hire companies and workers for maintenance of more important roads.

Findings from In-depth Interviews

A representative of a small company says there are well-known cases of political interference with winter road maintenance. Because unemployment rises during winter, there is significant competition for road maintenance work. Sometimes the most suitable vehicles are not used because their owners are not politically well-connected.

Local Road Inspection

Findings from Focus Group Discussions

There is a significant problem in staffing the inspection and urban planning agencies. Only two staff members have adequate qualifications. The head of the employers' association says political interests often prevent or complicate inspection work. A road inspector working for the community confirms that he faces lobbying pressure from units being inspected or their intermediaries.

Users claim that road inspectors working for the community have done nothing to issue sanctions against logging companies that violate the rules governing use of local roads, contributing to their greater wear and tear. In most cases this involves ignoring axle and total load limits for local roads. The head of the public works agency says new regulations for axle and total load limits have recently been adopted, and stricter enforcement has started.

Many tickets, fines, and other sanctions reported by communal inspectors are returned by courts due to procedural violations or incomplete reports. The head of the public works agency blames this on the inspector for public roads. However, the inspector does not directly supervise road construction. None of the providers are aware of any sanctions imposed for improper road construction. A small enterprise owner spoke about a case in which the mayor obstructed inspection work on behalf of private interests by issuing a direct order to the communal inspector to stop inspection activities.

Community and Provider Evaluation of Service Delivery

Users and providers rated road construction, maintenance, cleaning in winter, and inspection services using six indicators (See Table 2.1). Users always gave lower scores than providers, with the exception of the "maintenance" indicator, where providers and users agreed that it was poor (2). Excluding maintenance, provider scores ranged from 3.5 to 4, while user scores ranged from 1 to 3.

Indicator 1: The lower grade by users is because roads are asphalted only along critical sections because of the costs of maintaining those roads.

Indicator 2: Users believe construction quality is not very good. Providers give construction mixed grades. General administration representatives award higher grades than those directly responsible for the construction and supervision of local roads.

Table 2.1. Community Performance Scorecard and Provider Self-Evaluation Scorecard

No.	Indicator	Group Grade	
		Users	**Providers**
1	Kilometers of asphalt roads	3	4
2	Kilometers of asphalt roads not damaged	2	3.5
3	Kilometers of roads properly maintained	2	2
4	Number of days per year when roads are cut off due to rain or snow	3	4
5	Kilometers of roads with proper drainage	1	NA
6	Communal inspection services	1	4

Source: Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in BiH, 2006.
Note: Service performance indicators were rated on a scale of 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest).

Indicator 3: Both groups agree that the current rate of road repair is not satisfactory for the needs of the population. Providers claim that the budget for repairs is insufficient. Everyone agrees that the procedure for the rolling and spreading of sand for fill is inefficient. Users suggest that logging companies contribute to maintenance of the roads they are using.

Indicator 4: Despite heavy rain and snowfall, the local administration successfully organizes clearing of roads in winter so the roads in the most populated areas are usable. This is possible because a large number of local residents are hired.

Indicator 5: Users believe the newly constructed roads do not have proper drainage, which results in them wearing out more quickly.

Indicator 6: The very low rating by users reflects the failure of inspectors to file sanctions against logging companies that ignore the axle and total load limits for local roads and use snow chains when there is no snow. Users are unaware of stricter rules recently introduced by the local administration, while providers describe it as a significant achievement.

Recommendations

User Recommendations

It is necessary to construct better quality roads rather than more roads. Users believe that the money saved in constructing poor-quality roads is lost over a few years because such roads wear out faster. Random filling of roads should be replaced with systematic asphalting, which would be more cost-efficient over time.

Roads connecting the outskirts with the city center and with the main road must be asphalted, as they have become nearly unusable for motor vehicles. The construction of a bypass road would relieve congestion and contribute to better maintenance of city roads. Logging companies should

cover part of the construction and maintenance costs of roads because they are among the primary users. During the winter, snow should be cleared from the urban part of the municipality rather than waiting for it to melt.

Provider Recommendations

Municipal administration needs to improve staffing and planning. Municipal agencies should employ professional staff to supervise urban planning and communal inspection agencies, as well as train current employees. Tendering winter road maintenance for several years at a time would encourage companies to invest in equipment and provide better quality service. A capital investment strategy is needed to replace current short-term planning.

Municipal administration should design programs for greater involvement of citizens in approving construction of local roads and other municipal infrastructure. To ensure more transparent spending, it is important to present reports on public spending in every community at regular intervals (every three to six months). This would make it possible to identify shortcomings and increase citizen interest in participation, as well as to educate people about public finance.

Preschool and Elementary Education in Gorazde

Gorazde is a city and municipality in eastern Bosnia and Herzegovina on the Drina River. It is the administrative center of Podrnje canton, the smallest canton in the FBiH. There are about 25,000 citizens in Gorazde, of whom 70 percent live in rural areas.

Infrastructure

The Sunce Day-Care Center is run by the municipality in Gorazde and has a capacity of 100 children. Currently, only 60 children are enrolled, most of whom are in preschool. Some older school children take part in an after-school program. Although Sunce could enroll more children, this expansion would require other expenses (caregivers, furniture) that are not possible within the existing budget.

All the interface meeting participants agreed that Sunce offers adequate facilities for the good care of preschool children. Users say the playground is too small for the number of children, while providers say they do not have the funds to provide a larger playground. The most critical infrastructure problem is obsolete bathrooms. Bathrooms function, but the ceramic tiles and the water and sewerage lines are obsolete. Sunce's furniture was provided by international and local donors. It is not standardized or new, but is suitable for preschool children. Sunce has two televisions, a video recorder, a DVD player, and one computer that are used by school children.

SOS-Kinderdorf International, an umbrella organization for SOS Children's Villages, also provides day care in Gorazde. SOS Kindergarten Gorazde is part of a network of five SOS Kindergartens in BiH.[5] Its infrastructure is far better than Sunce's, but parents and providers agree that there are no differences between the quality of care and education the two centers provide. Parents primarily consider the distance of the day-care center from their home or work in deciding where to enroll their children.

When Sunce's central heating is on, it is very good. One heating plant provides heating to the day-care center, primary school, and municipal building. However, during the monthlong period in which the central heating has not yet been turned on as a cost-cutting measure, only one room is heated. As a result, participants are concerned that it is unhealthy for children to go from the heated room to the unheated bathroom, wardrobe, or dining room.

Personnel

Providers note the excellent relationship among employees and the good working atmosphere as important contributing factors to the provision of high-quality child care. The day-care center employs 13 staff, including five caregivers. The center's director, a psychologist, also works as a caregiver with the school children. Six caregivers take care of 60 children divided into three mixed-gender groups classified by age. The center's working hours are suited to the needs of school-age children and their parents. Users are satisfied because children can do their homework at the center.

The municipality's deputy mayor says SOS Kinderdorf caregivers have more opportunities for continuing education and training than those at Sunce. Sunce's director says the reason for poor education and training programs is an ineffective local training institute, and the Ministry of Education does not contribute to the development of preschool education.

Educational Program

Under the FBiH Law on Preschool Education, the maximum class size is 30 children. Before the law was adopted, Sunce's classes were much larger, complicating the work of caregivers and reducing the quality of care. The situation was much worse when there were about 40 children in a class. The new law also limits the number of hours per day each caregiver can spend working with children to six to ensure that children receive their full attention. Caregivers spend two hours a day keeping records on the progress of children. These progress records are compiled jointly with parents. Some parents were able to watch unnoticed as caregivers worked with children in the play area and were very satisfied with what they saw. Over the past 10 years there have been no serious problems with child safety.

---

5. For more information on SOS-Kinderdorf International and the SOS Kindergarten Gorazde, see http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org/pages/default.aspx and http://www.sos-ds.ba/index.php?lokacija=strane&otac=4&id=17&lan=en

Providers and users agree that overall, Sunce has a good educational program. Educational programs in Sunce and SOS Kinderdorf are of the same quality as they both operate under the same law on preschool education. The only difference is that the latter provides additional programs such as English lessons, meetings with children from other towns, and weekend play groups for children from rural areas. The municipality provides 5,000 convertible marks (konvertibilna marka or KM) in annual support for SOS Kinderdorf's weekend play groups. SOS Kinderdorf has much better and more varied teaching materials than Sunce, which encourages creativity and caregivers' imagination to work with modest materials (cardboard boxes, paper) to produce teaching tools. Sunce caregivers say making teaching materials consumes much of their time. Some parents say children should learn numbers and the alphabet in day care. Providers state that day-care centers do not have the responsibility to provide such training and that it would be bad to require preschool children to learn those skills at that age. Parents are satisfied with Sunce's educational program and do not believe that children would receive better care in another day-care center.

Health, Hygiene, and Nutrition

Users had no complaints on the nutritional content of food provided to children in Sunce. They describe it as well-balanced and meeting the needs of all children. Providers state that all federal food inspections (food quality, hygiene) have been positive.

Providers and users agree that hygiene in the day-care center is satisfactory. Employees carry out disease control once per year. Disinfection of the premises is conducted daily, while full disinfection is performed twice a year by the Institute for Public Health. Parents provide all materials for personal hygiene of children and for the cleaning and disinfection of the kitchen, bathrooms, and other rooms.

Sunce does not have a nurse or doctor on its staff. Previously, doctors visited the center once every 15 days, while dentists came occasionally. Currently the visits are not organized on a regular basis. An epidemiologist visits the center as part of a disease control program. Children have regular medical check-ups once a year, including all laboratory tests, and consequently all children at the day-care center have complete medical records. Also, the Institute of Public Health performs testing once a year, usually during winter when there is greater danger of viral diseases among children.

Finances

Funding for the day-care center has increased significantly over the past five or six years. The number of children has not increased during the same period, but the previous level of funding was insufficient to cover even basic needs. Therefore, the municipal council accepted the center's request to increase its funding. The only expense generated by the center is that to its workers. Sunce employees primarily complain about low salaries. Payment of salaries is two months late, the

employees' food allowance is paid irregularly and is often late, and bonuses are never awarded to employees.

The cost of child care at Sunce is 80 KM per month, whereas private child-care providers charge about 200 KM per month. The price of care in SOS Kinderdorf is also 80 KM. However, the Sunce center director argues that this price is unrealistic because it covers only the cost of food. The cost was set by the center's management and was calculated based on what parents could afford and was influenced by what SOS Kinderdorf charges. The director says her proposal to SOS Kinderdorf management to increase the price by 20 percent was rejected because SOS Kinderdorf is a humanitarian organization that aims to help parents and not to make a profit. In the director's opinion, most parents would send their children to SOS Kinderdorf if Sunce increased its price by 20 percent.

The director of Sunce says funding is insufficient. Insufficient funding has the greatest impact on the center's employees, who do not receive their pay regularly and are unable to collect fees to which they are entitled. The local government is the founder of the center and has a legal obligation to finance part of the operating costs. Despite an increase in local government funding to 80,000 KM per year, the local government fails to pay between 10 and 15 percent of that amount each year. The amount they pay is not based on the needs of the day-care center, and is contingent upon available funds in the municipal budget.

Local administration representatives are aware of this issue and say the shortfall is due to irregular collection of budgetary funds. A local community representative says the municipal budget increases each year, yet the full amount of budgetary support for the day-care center remains unpaid. Therefore, the failure to pay the full amount to the day-care center cannot be blamed on an irregular influx of budgetary funding, but rather is due to which budgetary requests receive priority. Users accuse day-care management of being too soft on the local administration and failing to secure legally guaranteed funding.

In addition to readjusting the budget, the deputy mayor has promised to further increase funding for the day-care center from 5,000 to 10,000 KM. The funds are expected to come from value added tax (VAT) revenues. According to the head of financial services for the municipality, when it was necessary to cut public spending in the past, the local administration would reduce funding for the day-care center, as it was not given high priority in budget allocation decisions. A great deal of lobbying was required to maintain the funding for the day-care center at the existing level. Furthermore, local authorities do not fulfill their legal obligation to finance 20 percent of capital investments for maintenance of the day-care center's facilities, which makes it impossible to carry out renovation work.

Some parents pay their day-care fees late. Fee collection declines by about 50 percent during the summer because many parents withdraw children from the center during summer holidays. About 75 percent of the parents whose children are enrolled in the day-care center have above-average incomes. These are households where both parents are employed. Parents with less income cannot afford day care at its current price. Local government has designed a welfare program for children of war invalids, under which these parents pay only half of the regular price. This program is the only available welfare program for day care, and only three children in the locality receive assistance from it.

Community and Provider Evaluation of Service Delivery

Caregivers, day-care center management, and parents assessed the work of the day-care center using eight indicators (See Table 2.2). Other focus group participants, municipal council members, and representatives of municipal agencies assessed only the first and the last indicators because they had no information about other indicators. Users and providers give the day-care center the highest possible scores on most indicators, with only medical service and heating receiving slightly lower scores.

Indicator 1: Both users and providers believe that primary school teachers can easily recognize the children who received preschool education because they are well-prepared for primary school. All of the focus group participants award the highest possible rating for this aspect of the day-care center's work and cite only positive examples.

Indicator 2: Parents are satisfied and providers say special attention is given to child safety.

Indicator 3: Users had no complaints on the quality of nutrition in Sunce, describing it as well-balanced and meeting the needs of children.

Indicator 4: Providers and users agree that the center ensures appropriate hygiene procedures. All participants give this indicator the highest possible rating.

Indicators 5 and 6: These indicators were rated only by parents, who awarded the highest possible ratings to these indicator categories.

Indicator 7: The failure to have a nurse or a doctor on staff is seen as a problem. Having a medical professional on staff would make parents feel more secure and would make it easier for them to deal with sick children. Additionally, it would ease the work of caregivers. The rating is for medical care provided by caregivers.

Table 2.2. Community Performance Scorecard and Provider Self-Evaluation Scorecard

No.	Indicator	Group Grade	
		Users	Providers
1	Opinion of primary school teachers about school readiness of children	5	5
2	Safety of children	5	5
3	Quality of nutrition	5	5
4	Quality of hygiene	5	5
5	Socialization and emotional development	5	NA
6	Physical development	5	NA
7	High quality medical service	4	4
8	Heating	3	4

Source: Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in BiH, 2006.
Note: Service performance indicators were rated on a scale of 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest).

Indicator 8: Users and providers both agree that heating in the day-care center is a problem.

Recommendations

User Recommendations

Users see the shortfall of promised municipal funds to the day-care center as the biggest constraint. Timely, regular, and legally enforced payments to the day-care center by the local administration are necessary so the center's management can plan its expenditures. The local administration must fulfill its legal obligation to cover 20 percent of capital investments for the day-care center's building in order to solve the problem of obsolete bathrooms. The center's management must take a firm stance with the local administration and ask it to respect the legal provisions regarding budget expenditures.

Users also have a number of safety concerns. They recommend employing a full-time medical professional to increase safety at the day-care center and ease the work of caregivers by reducing risk in the event of medical emergencies. Parents state that access to the center's entrance (where children are collected) is unsatisfactory and almost unusable for strollers. They feel strongly that a new access should be built. Caregivers should wear special uniforms when in contact with children instead of wearing their own clothes. The dining room needs better heating because of its tiled floor. Despite proper footwear, children are still cold in the dining room.

Provider Recommendations

Providers focus most on infrastructure. Renovating the bathrooms is the top priority for this stakeholder group. Ceramic tiles and water and sewerage lines should be replaced immediately.

Providers also make suggestions about expanding and improving services. The center should provide care for infants whose parents are in urgent need of this service. If at least one year of pre-school education was prescribed by law, it would largely solve the financial problems of preschool education institutions by providing them with secure funding. They want to develop a plan to use the center's excess capacity. This would help parents who are in need of day care, but cannot afford to pay the full price. A welfare program financed from the municipal budget could be a solution. The efficiency of the day-care center would be improved. The center should provide caregivers with continuing education and professional development through seminars and specialized training. Finally, providers feel that investments are needed in teaching materials to ease the work of caregivers and improve the quality of education.

Waste Collection and Removal in Derventa

Derventa is located in northern RS. To its north is the Sava River, which forms a 10-kilometerlong border with Croatia. Derventa has a total area of 517 square kilometers. Before the last war (1992–1995), the 57 villages and the city of Derventa had a population of 57,000, but today it is approximately 30,000. Direct attacks during the war damaged or destroyed most apartment buildings and houses, industrial equipment, processing facilities, the textile industry, and agricultural production. According to incomplete data, the material losses were estimated at more than US$500 million.

At the end of the war, sanitation of buildings and infrastructure that were most pertinent for reestablishing vital community services was restarted with modest local resources. With donor assistance, part of the piped water supply system, the electricity and telephone systems, school buildings, kindergartens, health clinics, and most local and intercity roads were repaired. Some industrial production was also restored. In Derventa, 60 percent of prewar industrial capacity and production was used for exports. Significant production, with good road connections and skilled human capital, provide the foundation of Derventa's renewal and development.

Service Quality

Findings from Focus Group Discussions
Providers and users state they are not satisfied with waste collection, mainly because of too few containers, vehicles, and personnel. The utility company has three used vehicles that were a post-war donation and 15 employees (mainly low-skilled workers). These numbers are insufficient for the provision of high-quality service in the small part of the municipality that is currently served, or the entire municipality. The service currently covers the town center and adjacent settlements (4,000 households and 300 businesses), while rural areas are not served at all. According to official estimates, about half the population is not provided with service.

There are no waste containers or designated places for solid waste disposal in rural settlements. Communal utility vehicles do not collect waste dumped on the side of the road. Rural residents who cannot throw their waste in containers in town are left to burn it, or they throw it next to the road or into a nearby waterway. Urban apartment buildings have too few containers. For example, a group of 120 apartments has only one container, which is emptied once a week.

Rural residents confirm that they are prepared to pay for waste collection because it is a very big problem for them. Providers state that rural parts of the municipality will be included in the waste collection plan for the regional solid waste dump site, and will be provided with central collection points throughout the entire municipality. Providers also say that community council representatives can submit requests for their settlements to receive service. The municipal administration, after receipt of the request, can agree to a contract with the utility company to provide waste collection services. However, users are skeptical, saying the utility company does not have the capacity to expand its service given its limited equipment and manpower.

Findings from In-depth Interviews

Citizens can influence the waste removal services only through their neighborhood committees (MZs). The MZ serves as the primary focus for community organization and participation in decision making. MZs submit their requests to the local administration, which in turn conducts negotiations with the utility company. MZ requests are considered in the budget preparation process when service provision is discussed.

Frequency of Solid Waste Removal

Findings from Focus Group Discussions

Waste is collected once a week from residences, and every other day from businesses. For the size of the population and the volume of waste, users consider this insufficient. The result is overflowing containers surrounded by waste and unpleasant odors. While the current frequency of waste collection is unsatisfactory to users, they confirm that service providers follow the timetable for waste collection.

The head of the communal police agrees that current services are unsatisfactory. She also thinks the frequency of waste collection in urban areas is insufficient, as containers are often overflowing, and there is a lot of rubbish around the containers. She also considers the large waste items residents leave next to containers to be a serious problem. The director of the utility company notes that his company does not charge for the removal of these large items, but believes a charge should be levied. Large waste items are removed after submission of an order from municipal agencies and sometimes are collected when there is not too much normal waste. Another problem is the presence of too few waste containers in public areas—primarily at schools, markets, shopping centers, and cafes.

Illegal Dumping

Findings from Focus Group Discussions

The precise number of illegal dump sites in the municipality is unknown, but numbers in the dozens. Most participants mention there are illegal dump sites close to their apartment buildings or houses. The number and size of illegal dump sites has slightly decreased with some commercial businesses starting to buy waste metal. Now the illegal dumps mainly contain plastic, glass, and organic waste.

Findings from In-depth Interviews

Because there is no publicly provided town heating service in Derventa, residents mainly use solid fuel for heating. Residents who dump hot coals into containers can cause a serious problem if the coals ignite fires. Participants describe cases after the war where people would dump leftover ammunition and unexploded ordnance. This created a serious risk from occasional explosions.

The head of the municipal Communal Services Department is required to seek approval from the MZ regarding the location of dump sites for solid waste. The municipal assembly makes this decision. This enables MZ representatives to set conditions on dumping and dump site maintenance as a prerequisite for approval. Another problem is the large number of destroyed houses that are frequently used for solid waste disposal, even though they are located within villages.

Financing Solid Waste Collection

Findings from Focus Group Discussions

The charge for solid waste collection and removal is based on the size of the dwelling. However, given that in Derventa there is no separation of charges for municipal waste collection and water supply services, citizens receive joint bills based on the number of household members. Users did not know how much they were paying for solid waste collection nor how their bill was calculated. About 70 percent of those who receive a bill pay it, which providers consider fairly good given the difficult economic situation.

Findings from In-depth Interviews

The existing debts of most users are from the three years immediately following the war. Most users understand that service cannot be improved or expanded if payments are not collected regularly. Discussants state that residents would be willing to pay somewhat more for efficient collection and quality disposal of solid waste.

The communal inspector stresses that the municipal supervisory body, sends reports to the utility company when it finds waste removal problems. The utility company sends bills to the local administration for the service provided. The relatively low price charged for waste collection and incomplete household payments do not encourage better quality service or a market orientation by the utility company.

Community and Provider Evaluation of Service Delivery

Users and providers rated the frequency of waste collection, number of collection points and containers, and the cleanliness of collection locations using six indicators (See Table 2.3). Users and providers both give low scores on all indicators.

Indicator 1: Users feel that the current frequency of waste collection does not meet their needs. The municipal police officer also considers the frequency of waste collection insufficient. Utility company representatives are aware of the situation, but claim that it is the best they can do given their budget.

Indicators 2 and 3: Users say the number of containers, cans, and rural waste collection points does not meet their needs, while providers again cite budgetary and financial constraints as the reason for inadequate service.

Indicator 4: Users state that the area around the containers is not cleaned and that some rubbish always remains. The communal police representative emphasizes that citizens who leave large waste items next to the containers are at fault, and the removal of such items should be paid for separately. The problem is also caused by carelessness of citizens when throwing rubbish into the containers.

Indicator 5: The municipal inspectorate does not have sufficient staff to cover the entire municipality (currently there is one inspector and one communal environmental policeman). In addition, given that courts are overburdened, processing complaints can take up to two years. Users do not have enough information to score this indicator, but they believe that the practice of avoiding fines through corrupt methods (contacts, party and political affiliation, "service for service" trades, bribes, and so forth) is common.

Indicator 6: When citizens talk about the negative impacts of solid waste disposal, it is evident that they are aware of the increased risk of infection of people and animals through polluted water, air pollution from burning waste, and detrimental effects on flora and fauna. However, due primarily to economic challenges, citizens frequently ignore the detrimental effects of inadequate solid waste disposal. Both users and providers consider increasing environmental awareness as essential for resolving the problem of illegal dumping, incorrect waste disposal, and the overall cleanliness of the town. All participants give the current situation low marks.

Table 2.3 Community Performance Scorecard and Provider Self-Evaluation Scorecard

No.	Indicator	Group Grade	
		Users	Providers
1	Frequency of solid waste collection	2.5	3
2	Number of local collection points for solid waste disposal	2	3
3	Number of containers for waste disposal	1	1
4	Cleanliness of waste collection locations	2	3
5	Number of reports resolved and fines collected	NA	2
6	Citizen awareness of environmental protection and cleanliness	2	1.5

Source: Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in BiH, 2006.
Note: Service performance indicators were rated on a scale of 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest).

Recommendations

User Recommendations

Recommendations focus on strategies for providing sufficient service. One suggestion from users is to place a larger number of containers and bins for waste disposal in urban and suburban areas, and to establish collection points where rural residents could dispose of solid waste. The utility company should pay particular attention to public areas, especially schools, and increase the frequency of waste collection from those locations. Waste collection workers should clean the area around containers after each collection.

Several user recommendations concern improving citizen awareness and behavior. Both providers and users stress the need for a comprehensive citizen awareness campaign (through the media, schools, and NGOs) that would promote citizen engagement in environmental protection. To raise citizen awareness, service users think youth need to play a key role. A young participant says that young people in Derventa have grown accustomed to the poor appearance of the town and accept it as normal. He considers it necessary to show how Derventa looked before the war in order for young people to become significantly more active on this issue and to mobilize them to participate. The municipality should employ more people to work as communal police so that they can monitor the situation and make recommendations.

Provider Recommendations

Providers focus on making waste collection more efficient. Providers state that the waste collection company needs 50 percent more workers and transport vehicles in order to provide sufficient service and respond to user demands. Because vehicles used for waste collection cannot reach some locations due to traffic congestion and lack of parking space, some waste collection should be conducted late at night or early in the morning. Charges for waste removal should be calculated on the basis of the amount of waste produced and not on the size of the residential unit.

Local Governance in Donji Vakuf

Donji Vakuf is located on the road that links large trading zones in central Bosnia (the Vitez municipality) with the Bosanska Krajina region and Croatia. This regional road passes through the center of the urban zone of the municipality. The budget of Donji Vakuf in 2005 totaled about 1.7 million KM (information from focus group participants) or 130 KM per capita based on the approximate population of 13,000.

The local government is investing a lot into Ajvatovica, a traditional pilgrimage site for many Bosnian Muslims. Traditional religious gatherings in Donji Vakuf serve as opportunities to attract votes for parties that seek citizen loyalty through religious affiliation and ethnic identity. Finally, the focus of the local administration on the parts of the municipality where this event takes place is at the expense of other areas. This creates a sense of rivalry among citizens and damages social cohesion.

Satisfaction with Local Government

Findings from Focus Group Discussions

Many users express dissatisfaction with local authorities and municipal agencies. Reasons include: failure to implement municipal council decisions and the council's failure to do anything about it; poor treatment of councilors by the municipal administration; unequal treatment of communities in prioritizing public needs; lack of knowledge about the situation of the people; disregard of the code of conduct adopted by the council; loss of accountability in local governance; and unclear responsibility for services among various levels of government.

Citizens have a wide range of reasons for their dissatisfaction with the work of municipal agencies. These include: incompetence in developing programs and projects and in applying for donor funding and funding from higher levels of government; conflict of interest and nepotism; lack of professionalism and objectivity; the unacceptable amount of time it takes to issue administrative orders, certificates, and licenses; aging public servants and their failure to adapt to new public administration procedures; too few employees (one for every 300 residents); lack of disciplinary measures; failure to implement decisions by the mayor; and disregard of the rules on work hours and working fewer hours than expected. This type of poor treatment of clients by some civil servants alienates citizens, prevents their access to information, and contributes to the negative perception of the local administration.

Local authorities and municipal agencies are well-aware of citizen dissatisfaction. They list the following reasons for not being able to better satisfy citizens: the relatively poor competence of municipal authorities compared to higher levels of government; lack of funds; outdated and ineffective administrative practices inherited from the socialist system; and the lack of a "one-stop shop"

for government services. In the meeting with local administration representatives, users agree that councilors are accessible, but also state that council members' openness does not contribute to the fulfillment of citizens' needs and increased participation.

Findings from In-depth Interviews

NGO representatives say they are satisfied with the work of municipal agencies and how they treat NGOs. Their reasons include being provided space for their work and their productive relationship with the mayor.

Several interviewees have the same complaints that users reported in the focus group discussions. An MZ representative stated the reasons for his dissatisfaction, which include: (i) lack of creativity, (ii) poor education and lack of professionalism among civil servants, (iii) ineffective workplace habits inherited from the socialist system, (iv) lack of interest in resolving urgent problems, (v) entrenched indifference to community infrastructure problems, and (vi) the transfer of responsibility from one municipal agency to the other. The MZ representative says that he communicates directly with the mayor rather than municipal agencies in order to resolve problems more efficiently.

A representative from the small business community mentions poor organization of agencies and poor allocation of officials within the municipal agencies. Other complaints include the unhelpfulness of some officials, their poor relationships with clients, and excessive bureaucratic procedures in issuing routine documents such as birth and citizenship certificates.

A community representative says the council never complains when its decisions are not implemented by the executive authorities. Rather, the council simply ignores the situation. The representative says that only about one-third of council decisions are ever implemented. A citizen says it is primarily the responsibility of the president of the assembly, who appears less motivated to resolve existing problems, to implement council decisions. Another local community representative says municipal agencies are preventing the strengthening and development of community councils. Despite a decision by the municipal council to provide 60KM each month to presidents of community councils, payment of this compensation was eight months late at the time of the discussion.

Transparency

Findings from Focus Group Discussions

Some users complain that decisions about the design and implementation of public infrastructure works are greatly lacking in transparency. Disagreement about municipal government responsibilities leads to a lack of understanding and to arguments between service providers and users. Users claim that local authorities are able to limit transparency due to uncertainty about the division

of responsibilities between municipal and cantonal authorities. Municipal council representatives believe that the board, composed of political party members, is a highly useful mechanism that improves the work of the council, while users believe it jeopardizes transparency of decision making by the municipal council and significantly limits the participation of citizens and civil society. Hierarchy is often ignored in local decision making, which also prevents transparency and identification of responsible parties.

Findings from In-depth Interviews

The head of the community council says municipal agencies lack accountability. Internal agreements by the heads of political parties are an obstacle to transparency and citizen participation in decision making. Local authorities rejected the request by users that all council decisions be displayed on village and community bulletin boards because of the complexity of such procedures, related costs, and the fact that council decisions are already announced on local radio.

Participation in Decision Making

Findings from Focus Group Discussions

Citizens accept community councils as a channel for influencing decision making at the local level, but strongly doubt that their requests will be fulfilled. A significant number of settlements and villages are not organized and have not elected community councils because too few citizens participate in the process. In the communities that have councils, there are no specific meeting dates or funds for the councils' work. Providers believe it would be unrealistic to expect the local administration to secure regular financing for community council chairmen and that doing so would enlarge an already-bloated bureaucracy.

User and provider opinions differ about the lack of citizen interest in taking part in decision making. Citizen participation in municipal council meetings and public hearings on the budget is insignificant. Providers claim that lack of interest is the primary reason for low citizen participation in decision making. They also state that the primary reason for lack of interest is citizens' beliefs that local authorities cannot achieve anything. On the other hand, users claim that the lack of interest is due to the absence of mechanisms that would allow citizens to influence decision making. The same reasons were given for low election turnout. In 2006, the council sent written requests for budget proposals to communities. In 2007, only one public hearing was organized and no invitations were sent to communities. The initial budget was adopted as originally proposed, failing to take into account any modifications suggested by citizens.

Users and providers also disagree on how decisions are made. Local administration representatives say work is carried out in accordance with the law. However, citizens have no knowledge of the work of supervisory boards or the legal requirements regulating their work. Users say the prioritization of needs that require municipal funding is not based on a broad-based community

assessment and citizens' suggestions, but rather on the interests of a narrow circle within political parties. However, providers refute this claim and state that the initiative for infrastructure development comes from communities. After an invitation is extended by municipal agencies, communities develop project proposals, which they submit to the municipality. The municipal council has created a commission that sets priorities. The community liaison officer is the principal link between the commission, citizens, and communities. The president of the municipal assembly says he fully trusts his councilors and their professionalism. He believes they are well-informed about the municipality and are capable of making good decisions that reflect community-wide needs and priorities.

Since 2006, community representatives have had the right to propose suggestions and amendments to the budget. Despite this legal right, all users agreed that their attempts to do so were unsuccessful. Councilors claim that only one community leader uses this right regularly. They are unaware of any proposed amendment that has been accepted and included in the budget. Problems arise when proposals fail to secure the support of council members from other political parties. A small number of community councils meet to discuss the municipal budget and draft proposals. Community council presidents state that citizen turnout for these meetings is very low because citizens do not believe they can influence decisions about the municipal budget.

Findings from In-depth Interviews

A business sector representative agrees that political motivations outweigh the interests of citizens in many instances. For example, political parties can respond to citizen requests and make proposals in the interest of the entire community. However, these proposals often fail to secure the backing of other political parties, which fear that by supporting the proposal they would help their political rivals score points with citizens.

A business sector representative claims that the poor economic situation has discouraged a large number of citizens from joining organizations. He believes there is strong skepticism among citizens that common interests can be achieved through joint action. The president of the community council claims that he has problems in achieving high levels of community participation in community meetings and almost never succeeds in bringing together the required number of people to make decisions.

Responsiveness of the Local Government

Findings from Focus Group Discussions

Often none of the three ways in which to submit complaints about the poor quality of public services is effective. The three avenues for grievance redress are lodging formal complaints with the municipality, contacting the communal inspector, or contacting the mayor. Furthermore, the

municipality has only one communal inspector for supervising communal services. Beyond complaint submission, all the respondents agree that there is no mechanism enabling citizens to assess the quality of public services provided at the local level.

Users claim that local administration representatives do not work in the field and are uninformed about municipal problems and citizen needs. Numerous examples were cited where citizens were unsuccessful in getting the responsible administration representative to make field visits and collect information. Examples were mentioned in which the communal inspector witnessed improper use of public infrastructure and did nothing to sanction those responsible. Some respondents believe municipal councilors are incompetent and fail to recognize the needs of the population and find proper solutions.

Findings from In-depth Interviews

Every Thursday the mayor meets with citizens who have submitted formal requests for a meeting. Respondents believe this is a convenient way to reach the mayor and talk to him. After listening to citizens' requests, the mayor can direct them to the appropriate municipal agency or agencies.

An NGO representative believes that the local administration is open to cooperation with NGOs. The NGO regularly informs the administration about its activities and the municipality agrees to cooperate on specific projects in which it is interested. A business sector representative claims that it is possible to reach every councilor and talk to him or her because they live in a small municipality.

Citizen Knowledge

Findings from Focus Group Discussions

All participants agree that citizen knowledge about the work and decision-making processes of public administration is very limited. The unemployment rate is very high and, consequently, citizens spend much of their time in search of work. They usually do not have enough free time to gather information about the local administration and public services. They rely on information from other people.

Information usually comes from secondary sources. This information is often incomplete or not received in a timely manner. Users believe that the current mode of dissemination of information, via radio, is not suitable because they cannot balance their personal obligations and work hours with when information is broadcast. Almost all respondents are aware that the local radio station broadcasts information about municipal council decisions. Local radio is the primary source of information about public debates, council decisions, public procurement, and technical information on the work of the local administration. The radio signal cannot be received in all parts of the

municipality. The administration also informs citizens about new regulations, tenders, scholarships, and activities through the bulletin board in the municipal building.

Providers say that creating a "one-stop shop" to streamline government services would facilitate citizen access to information. Currently, citizens have to spend a great deal of time attempting to reach officials responsible for the dissemination of information. Citizens suggest that the most efficient way to provide public information would be to send written information to local community representatives.

Findings from In-depth Interviews

An NGO representative states that citizens do not exercise their rights under the Law on Free Access to Information, which aims to allow citizens to freely and easily access public information. She believes that it is because they do not know about the law and seek information at only one location. A community council president confirms this. Only four official requests for information have been submitted by citizens over the past five years. He believes that this is because citizens are not politically knowledgeable enough to exercise their rights, especially when it comes to obtaining information.

The community council president, who attends all of the municipal council sessions, says municipal agencies are somewhat negligent even when it comes to informing councilors about policy changes, changes in budget allocation, and other government information. Municipal agencies often fail to provide information to councilors even when they request it. Working materials of municipal council sessions have long been unavailable to citizens. At the initiative of a community council president, they are now sent to the liaison officer for communities, where citizens can access and analyze them. However, citizens are still unable to widely access this information.

The municipality publishes an official gazette. However, it is quite difficult to obtain a copy of the official gazette. Some respondents only half-jokingly argue that it is easier to obtain a copy of the official gazette in France than in Donji Vakuf. Even the majority of municipal agencies do not have their own copy.

Public Finance

Findings from Focus Group Discussions

Providers say the local administration did not start publishing information about public hearings on the budget until very recently. Even when public budget hearings are publicized, very few citizens participate. The secretary of the municipal council explains:

> "This year we wanted it to be the budget of the citizens, so we presented the draft budget to the citizens. However, citizens have more needs than we can realistically satisfy. It turns out that the debate does not

make much sense and is not justified because people discuss it, but when it comes to deciding, we have to do what we have to do. Priorities must be covered. It is good that citizens tell us what they think about the budget, but realistically, they do not have much influence. We can shout slogans and tell stories, but citizens do not have much influence on the budget. The budget is limited by available funds and priorities. When those are satisfied, little remains to be influenced by the citizens."

The president of the municipal assembly says not much can be achieved through public debate. He explains:

"Municipal agencies are the priority; we must finance them because we need them. Infrastructure problems are our next priority in developing the budget, and then support for associations and organizations. We would like the citizens to create the budget in all of its segments. That is truly impossible. But we respond to the needs of local communities to the extent possible. All suggestions, complaints, and proposals are taken under consideration and we accept them as much as possible in devising the budget."

If a community needs to finance infrastructure construction, it can secure the funding from the municipal budget. Local authorities are ready to provide an amount equal to that gathered by the citizens. This policy is known as "mark for mark." These are mainly projects to resolve urgent problems and are limited to 50,000 KM. Community councils appoint people to manage the projects.

Respondents believe this type of public finance policy is not as transparent as it should be. Because it is difficult for citizens to assess the real value of infrastructure projects, it is done by municipal agencies or companies selected by the municipality. This creates the potential for misconduct and corruption. One user says that a project with a value of 10,000 KM can be assessed by agencies to cost 20,000 KM, or double its true amount, with the extra money going into private pockets.

Another problem with the locality's infrastructure finance policy is that it is practically impossible for some communities to collect funds for public infrastructure. Providers claim that local authorities finance capital works, but that it often takes more time than necessary because of budgetary constraints. Users believe the local administration does not have clearly defined priorities for such cases.

Users have very limited knowledge about public procurement, while public officials claim that it is regulated by law. Users say there is a great deal of corruption in this area, yet they lack sufficient evidence to support this claim. When asked about corruption, providers say it is impossible because of existing legislation.

Users say problems arise because funds are spent for purposes other than those for which they have been allocated. To bolster this claim, discussion participants cite the example of funds for winter road maintenance, which are spent for other purposes. Participants in both groups are unable to

list a single mechanism by which citizens can evaluate the impact of public investment. The council receives reports on the use of funds, but there is no standard reporting procedure. This complicates the assessment of the quality of project implementation and the control of expenditures. Individuals cite cases that they knew of in which there was a large discrepancy between the quality of work and the money spent, but there were no formal investigations. These cases included funding to improve local roads and to control flooding.

Findings from In-depth Interviews

A businessman believes that the "mark-for-mark" policy of matching citizen contributions with public funds puts an extra burden on citizens. Capital investments must not be conditioned on the ability of communities to provide funds for such purposes. He also believes that budget spending must not be dependent on ad hoc requirements, but rather that the budget plan must be respected. Some citizens sent a proposal to the council to reconsider its decision to finance public infrastructure projects on the basis of "mark for mark" because they believe there are no legal grounds for its application. The council was required to respond within a month, but after two months no answer was received.

The same businessman believes such practices cause the spillover of public funding from one budget item to another. The president of a community council also claims there are cases of spillover of budget funds, and current expenditures of the municipal administration are biased toward public services and infrastructure at the expense of social services and other expenditure categories. The same respondent complains that funds from privatization are spent on current expenditures rather than capital investments.

An NGO representative states that NGO projects sent to the council are never fully funded. The council decides on the total amount of funds for NGOs, and that amount is divided equally among NGOs that submit funding requests. The respondent believes this is not a good practice because funding is not based on the results achieved through working with the community.

Community and Provider Evaluation of Service Delivery

Users and providers rated their satisfaction with local government, citizen, and community participation; citizen awareness and requests for information; and location of municipal council member residences, as locations near council members residences' might receive better service delivery than other areas. (See Table 2.4). Users always gave equal or lower scores than providers, and on four indicators gave much lower scores. On the other three indictors, both users and providers gave low scores.

Table 2.4. Community Performance Scorecard and Provider Self-Evaluation Scorecard

No.	Indicator	Group Grade	
		Users	Providers
1	Satisfaction with local authorities and municipal agencies	2	5
2	Community representatives' engagement of the municipal council	1	2
3	Citizen participation in MZ sessions	2	2
4	Citizen participation in NGOs	2	4
5	Dispersion of municipal council member residences in the municipality	2	5
6	Proportion of citizens who receive and are aware of information	2	5
7	Number of formal requests for information	1	1

Source: Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in BiH, 2006.
Note: Service performance indicators were rated on a scale of 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest).

Indicator 1: The difference in the scores between the two groups can be explained by the fact that the providers assess the efficiency of the municipal council and municipal agencies from a pro-cedural point of view, while users assess the impact of their work.

Indicator 2: This indicator measures how well the interests of communities are served by com-munity representatives working with the municipal council. Users believe that engagement by community representatives has not paid off so far, but expect the situation to change. They believe that community representatives have the best information about their needs. Providers claim that the engagement of community representatives is very low, and they could be more effective if they were more proactive.

Indicator 3: This indicator measures citizen participation in decision making at the community level, as well as community cohesion in relation to public needs. Both groups agree that citizen participation in community meetings should increase, as this is the best way to define community needs.

Indicator 4: An interview with an NGO representative indicates that NGO participation leads to more significant social engagement and greater impact on the community. Providers believe NGOs are an important mechanism for citizen participation and are well-developed in Donji Vakuf.

Indicator 5: Users claim that the distribution of funds by communities depends on where council members live. Some community representatives complain that their budget proposals are neglected because no councilors live in their area. Providers disagree and deny that this is an issue.

Indicator 6: In the debate about this indicator, users criticize community members for not hav-ing a differentiated approach to different population groups (youth, returnees, farmers).

Indicator 7: Both groups say citizens almost never use the Law on Free Access to Information.

Recommendations for Improving Performance

User Recommendations

Improve municipal staffing. To improve performance, users recommend several major changes take place with respect to the staff members of the municipality. First, users recommend employing young people in municipal agencies to increase efficiency, access, and openness. They also want to increase the number of municipal administration employees by one-third and want to employ more inspectors to ensure higher-quality public services. Users also recommend the professionalization of the function of the president of the municipal assembly to improve the work of the assembly, supervision of implementation of council decisions, and better participation of citizens in decision making.

Empower community councils. Users recommend establishing a community assembly to increase citizen participation in decision making, especially in allocating public funds. Community representatives should join council members in making decisions on important issues and should have the right to vote. The appointment of municipal councilors should be done at the community level. Moreover, users wish municipal councilors to reside in the community they represent. Finally, users recommend ensuring ongoing funding for the work of community councils as a way to improve performance.

Increase citizen information. Users feel the timely and systematic distribution of working materials of the municipal assembly to all those who attend council sessions would enable better citizen participation and increase their knowledge about the work of the assembly. A specific recommendation generated by the users is to provide a copy of the official gazette and minutes of the council sessions to each community council. Similarly, users demand that written materials be sent to community councils and that information bulletins be printed as standard procedure for reporting on the work of the municipality and its decisions, rules, and budget, rather than relying on the use of radio, as is currently done.

Provider Recommendations

Local authorities need to work more on educating citizens about their rights. At least one community representative should be required to attend assembly sessions in order to increase citizen awareness and participation in decision making. As described earlier, providers feel that the creation of a "one-stop shop" could shorten the time required for bureaucratic procedures, provide easier access for citizens to municipal agencies, and increase their knowledge about the work of municipal authorities. Providers recommend the adoption of a code of conduct for civil servants.

Municipal hiring decisions should take place at the mayoral level only. Providers believe that hiring young workers, as per users' recommendations, would only serve to further increase the size of the administration, which is already larger than prescribed by law. Providers believe that it is not necessary because the administration's work is already debated and discussed by the council, which is responsible for managing the hiring of staff, deciding on the number of employees needed, and similar tasks. However, creating the position of head of the mayor's cabinet would ease the mayor's workload and enable increased supervision of the implementation of decisions.

3

Findings from the Citizen Report Card

This section presents the findings of the citizen report card. The citizen report card (CRC) consisted of a household survey and a subsequent series of stakeholder feedback meetings. The survey was conducted from December 2006 to February 2007. First, drawing on the results of the community scorecard exercise, the project team developed and tested a public survey questionnaire covering the main services devolved to local government, as well as issues of public participation, access to information, rule of law, and accountability.

For service provision, the CRC focused on access/usage, quality/reliability, incidence of problems, responsiveness of service providers, and citizens' suggestions for improvements. On local governance, it covered citizen voice, accountability, political stability, public security, government effectiveness, regulatory burden, rule of law, and corruption. (For more information on the CRC, sampling methodology, respondent characteristics, and the final questionnaire, please see appendices 2 and 5).

Upon completion of the household survey, the findings, together with ratings of services and governance, were summarized in an intermediate report. By presenting the aggregate results for all 20 municipalities, the intermediate report provided an analysis of the citizens' general feedback on local governance and social delivery.

The household survey addressed seven areas: six public services, listed below, and local governance.

- local road building and maintenance,
- waste removal,
- water supply, sewerage,
- heating,
- preschool and elementary education facilities, and
- health-care facilities.

The household survey also addressed local governance issues, including:

- access to information;
- citizen interaction with local government representatives;
- citizen participation in local governance;
- political stability and public safety;
- local government effectiveness;
- regulatory burden;
- rule of law; and
- corruption.

The goal of the household survey was to understand characteristics of service usage and provision, citizen satisfaction with provided services, and problems citizens face. The results are categorized according to four areas of service delivery: (i) accessibility, (ii) reliability, (iii) quality, and (iv) responsiveness, and are drawn from objective and measurable indicators such as proximity of services, presence of facilities, number of complaints and providers' responses, and frequency of repair and maintenance. The sections on overall citizen satisfaction are subjective and shaped by citizen perceptions for each issue. The definitions of each of these indicators for service delivery are as follows.

- Accessibility measures the extent to which citizens enjoy access to a certain service.
- Reliability measures the extent to which users believe they could rely on a certain service, as opposed to looking for alternative solutions.
- Quality measures how well the service provider meets the needs of its customers (frequency of service provision, incidence of problems, repair and maintenance, and so forth).
- Responsiveness measures the percentage of all respondents who have had problems with a certain service and who have filed a complaint to the service provider because of the problem.
- Satisfaction represents citizens' overall satisfaction levels with the particular service in question.

The first part of this section presents the findings on the six public services under examination: local road building and maintenance, waste removal, water supply/sewerage, heating, preschool and elementary education facilities, and health-care facilities. Within each service, the findings of the survey are presented first, and evaluated using the five indicators of accessibility, reliability, quality, responsiveness, and satisfaction. Then the findings and recommendations from the stakeholder feedback are presented. The findings are mainly from meetings in the seven municipalities, but also from the dissemination workshop. The second section of this chapter covers local governance, first presenting findings from the survey and then from the stakeholder feedback meetings.

Findings on Public Services

Key Findings: Performance across Sectors

Although performance indicators such as access, reliability, quality, responsiveness, and overall satisfaction across sectors and not fully comparable, they do provide a useful general overview of user perceptions regarding service delivery and allow for valuable cross-sector comparisons (See Tables 3.1 and 3.2).

Survey questions for each sector had common questions measuring the following elements:

- whether a household had access to a service;
- service reliability;
- service quality;
- whether the household had complained about the service;
- whether the provider responded to the complaint; and
- overall satisfaction with the service.

Across the board, services are of relatively high quality, with a positive rating of 81 percent. However, services rank very poorly when evaluated on the responsiveness of providers to user grievances.

Key finding: Education is rated best overall by users across the municipalities surveyed, with a rating of 85. However, when excluding sectors for which "responsiveness" was not measured, all services are rated to be more or less equal in quality, with overall ratings ranging from 55 to 58.

Access is highest for health care and education, with more than 90 percent of respondents reporting having access to these services. As long as people live within a reasonable distance of a school or clinic, they have access to these services. Access is next highest for roads, water, and waste collection, all with access rates of approximately 65 percent. Households have the poorest access to sewerage services and heating. Central public heating is available only in urban areas. Urban areas have much greater access to all services than rural areas, and the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FBiH) has significantly greater access than the Republika Srpska (RS). Larger and higher-revenue municipalities also tend to have slightly greater access to all services.

Reliability is inversely proportional to access. Heating is the service to which the smallest percentage of respondents have access (9 percent). However, respondents rate this service as the most reliable, with 91 percent rating heating as reliable. Similarly, sewerage is the service with the second-lowest access rate (42 percent), yet it has the second-highest reliability rating (72 percent).

TABLE 3.1. Service Characteristic Ratings across Sectors
Service Sector Ratings for Five Performance Indicators, 2006–7

Performance Indicator	Key Findings	Average Positive Rating	Range
Access	• Highest access for health care and education • Poorest access for sewerage and heating services • Access is significantly greater in urban areas	62	Low: 9 (heating) High: 99 (education)
Reliability	• Inversely proportional to access • Urban areas have more reliable services • No correlation with municipality size	69	Low: 59 (local roads and sewerage) High: 99 (heating) *Missing data for health care and education
Quality	• Cross-sector comparison difficult due to measurement differences • Urban areas have higher-quality services	81	Low: 57 (water supply) High: 93 (local roads) *Missing data for health care
Responsiveness	• Poor responsiveness is offset by high service quality and reliability—only 10–12 percent had problems with services	19	Low: 15 (local roads) High: 25 (sewerage) *Missing data for health care, education, and heating
Overall Satisfaction	• No correlation with other indicators • Urban respondents more satisfied with all services except education (equal satisfaction)	64	Low: 53 (sewerage) High: 80 (education)

Source: Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2006–07.
Note: Performance indicator definitions—Access: receive service. Reliability: do not need repairs. Quality: do not have problems with service. Responsiveness: reported a problem to authorities; Satisfaction: are satisfied with service. Respondents were asked to evaluate each of the service sectors using the five performance indicators listed above, rating each indicator as either positive or negative. "Average Rating" refers to the average positive rating for an indicator across the four service sectors. Ratings range from 0 (lowest) to 100 (highest). A rating of 100 in the "access" category, for example, would signify that 100% of respondents gave the "access" category a positive rating in all of the service sectors.

Local roads, water supply, and waste removal all have similar levels of access (ranging from 64 percent to 66 percent) and reliability (59 percent to 65 percent). Health care and education are not rated for reliability, as the characteristics of these services are such that they do not suffer interruption as other services do. Those in urban and wealthier municipalities also have better reliability of services. Urban areas and the FBiH have more reliable services. Reliability is not significantly correlated with municipal size or revenue.

The high degree of variation in the various measures of quality of service makes cross-sector comparison difficult. In certain cases, quality and reliability are interconnected, such as when quality is measured by the frequency of service or service interruption. This makes it difficult to

TABLE 3.2. Service Sector Ratings and Performance Comparison
Percentage of Respondents Awarding "Positive" Ratings by Performance Indicator

Sector	Access	Reliability	Quality	Responsiveness	Satisfaction	Overall Rating
Local Roads	64	59	93	15	50	56
Waste Collection	65	59	92	18	56	58
Water Supply	66	65	57	19	72	56
Sewerage	42	72	84	25	53	55
Heating	9	91	83	NA	74	64
Health Care	90	NA	NA	NA	63	77
Education	99	NA	76	NA	80	85

Source: Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2006–07.
Note: Performance indicator definitions—Access: receive service. Reliability: do not need repairs. Quality: do not have problems with service. Responsiveness: reported a problem to authorities. Satisfaction: are satisfied with service. Overall rating refers to the average positive rating across each of the five performance indicators. Ratings range from 0 (lowest) to 100 (highest).

compare quality of service among demographic groups, although urban areas tend to have fewer problems with service. Local roads rank the highest in terms of quality, receiving positive ratings of 93 percent, but quality is equated with whether the entire length of the road is asphalted. Waste collection ranks second at 92 percent, but it is measured by whether collection is once a week or more often. Water supply ranks lowest at 57 percent and quality is measured by whether a household has problems with water supply, which could be considered reliability. All other services are rated positively on quality by at least 76 percent of respondents.

Respondents are usually disappointed with the responsiveness of service providers to their complaints when they face problems with the service. Most people (81 percent on average) do not report a problem, and the vast majority of the time (90 percent to 99 percent), reporting the problem did not lead to a solution. Fortunately, only 10 percent to 12 percent of respondents have problems with services (with the exception of heating, at 2 percent), so poor responsiveness rates do not affect service reliability and quality much.

Overall satisfaction with each service does not correlate with any of the other indicators. Satisfaction rates for education (80 percent), heating (74 percent), and water supply (72 percent) are high, while roads (50 percent), sewerage (53 percent), waste collection (56 percent), and health care (63 percent) have lower satisfaction rates. Urban areas are more satisfied with services than rural areas, with the exception of education, with which they are equally satisfied. There is no trend in satisfaction in the FBiH compared to the RS, or among municipalities of different sizes or per-capita revenue levels.

Local Road Building and Maintenance

Findings from the Household Survey

Local Road Building and Maintenance services were the worst-rated services among those examined in this study. As seen in Table 3.3, Local Road Building and Maintenance services received an overall positive rating of 56 out of 100, with individual indicator ratings ranging from 15 (responsiveness) to 93 (quality). Rural areas have less access to roads, especially asphalt roads, than urban areas. Urban areas are better off, with 83 percent of households being connected by asphalt roads. Rural areas lag, with only 62 percent of households having access to asphalt roads. Nearly three-quarters of respondents (73 percent) say there is an asphalt road that connects their household with other parts of the village. In rural areas, the nearest road is 1,000 meters away, on average. In urban areas, the average is less than 300 meters. Almost all respondents (93 percent) whose household is connected by an asphalt road say the road was entirely asphalted. While 12 percent of respondents from rural areas have a road that is not asphalted for its entire length, only 4 percent of respondents living in urban areas state the same.

Table 3.3. Local Road Building and Maintenance

Sector	Access	Reliability	Quality	Responsiveness	Satisfaction	Overall Rating
Local Roads	64	59	93	15	50	56

Source: Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2006–07.

Poor maintenance and cleaning of local roads is a problem. Almost half of respondents report repair of old roads taking place in their neighborhood over the past year, and 23 percent report construction of new roads. There is significantly more road construction and repair in urban areas and in less-populated municipalities. However, 40 percent of respondents report that the roads in their neighborhood are never cleaned. This is more often the case in rural areas (52 percent) than in urban areas (29 percent). When citizens are responsible, the roads are cleaned infrequently. The survey results show that 59 percent of respondents report that the winter cleaning of local roads is done when needed. Private companies do a better cleaning job than the government and are more responsive.

Poor road maintenance causes serious problems for citizens during winter. Roughly one-fourth of all respondents (27 percent) living in areas with irregular winter road cleaning report that their village or settlement was cut off because of snow last year. This was the case more often in rural areas and less-populated municipalities than in urban areas and more inhabited municipalities. Because of insufficient road clearing in wintertime, 30 percent of respondents have transportation difficulties. They also suffer from less accessibility to food (22 percent) and medical treatment (17 percent). Low-income families in rural areas are most affected.

Experience shows that complaint mechanisms have not been very effective. Fifteen percent of all respondents who had problems with local roads reported that despite lodging a complaint, the problem was not resolved in 90 percent of these cases. Citizens in rural areas and the RS report problems significantly more often than those in urban areas or the FBiH. Half the respondents who have not lodged a complaint say they did not do so because nothing could have been done to solve it.

Respondents are moderately satisfied with the road situation. Satisfaction rates are worse in rural and poor municipalities. Almost half of the respondents report being "satisfied" with local roads, but only 3 percent report being "very satisfied." About the same proportion say they were dissatisfied with the road situation. Citizens are most satisfied with "care and action taken during winter time" and most dissatisfied with "care and action taken during water logging and other problems" and with "local government responsiveness to complaints."

Community involvement in this service area mainly takes the form of financial support (70 percent) or manual work (55 percent). Financial support is the dominant form of participation in urban areas and the FBiH, but manual work is equally important in rural areas and the RS. This is because in half of the rural settlements visited as part of this exercise, there is no company that is responsible for road maintenance, making citizens' manual work crucial for road building and maintenance. This could also explain the fact that the streets are never cleared in 50 percent of rural settlements that were visited.

Among respondents, 17 percent say asphalting and repairing old roads should be the top priority, followed by regular maintenance (12 percent), and better cleaning (6 percent). Because local governments have limited funding, they build roads that respondents deem to be of poorer quality. However, this is an ineffective strategy for operating in a challenging fiscal environment, as the funds potentially "saved" by constructing poor-quality roads are lost over a few years because such roads wear out faster.

Comments from the Stakeholder Feedback Meetings

All settlements cannot be provided with the same quality of service because of the lack of funds. When choosing how to allocate funds, priority is given to the length of the road to be asphalted, not to its quality. Some municipalities must cope with a poor-quality road network that does not meet technical standards. Many villages are abandoned or populated mainly by elderly residents. The rural population density is very low. Therefore, in the eyes of government stakeholders, there is no economic activity that would justify investments in improved roads in those areas.

Shortcomings in maintenance are a major source of dissatisfaction. Some cantonal authorities in the FBiH do not fulfill their responsibilities with respect to this service area. For example, only regional roads are maintained. Furthermore, stakeholders cite the example of contracts with communities for road maintenance not being strict enough and the fact that neighborhood committee

(mjesne zajednice—MZs) do not always deliver on their contractual and legal obligations. Utility companies clean roads only in urban areas, but people in villages are unfairly charged for this service.

Stakeholders' main recommendations relate to lack of resources, greater citizen participation, and greater involvement on the part of higher levels of government. Principal recommendations include the following:

- To increase funds, citizens suggest encouraging citizens' financial participation through private voluntary contributions, taxes, and so on; new government investments; and more substantial financial commitments from higher levels of government.
- To improve citizen participation, citizens suggest that MZ representatives should be present while work is being carried out. MZ representatives should audit all public works projects.
- Strong citizen control and oversight are needed when implementing road work.
- There should be a plan for ongoing maintenance and cleaning during winter.

Waste Removal

Findings from the Household Survey

As seen in Table 3.4, Waste Removal services received an overall positive rating of 58 out of 100, with individual indicator ratings ranging from 18 (responsiveness) to 92 (quality). Lack of waste removal services is mainly a problem in rural and poor municipalities. This service covers only 54 percent and 59 percent of respondents in rural and poor municipalities, respectively. In urban municipalities, waste removal is well-organized and the health and environmental consequences of lack of waste removal are minimized. In municipalities with large rural areas, which comprise one-third of all surveyed areas, the service is often not provided and environmental and social costs are significant. Overall, most respondents have either a dumpster (39 percent) or have service provided by a garbage truck (31 percent), but 30 percent of respondents do not have any form of waste collection service at their disposal. This situation is more critical in the RS, where 40 percent of households lack waste disposal, compared to 24 percent in the FBiH. Those who do not use garbage collection services usually burn their household garbage (78 percent) or dump it on an empty plot of land, or in a water body or garden (31 percent). Only 16 percent of those who do not have access to or do not use waste removal service bury or dispose of the garbage in a municipal dump.

Table. 3.4. Waste Removal

Sector	Access	Reliability	Quality	Responsiveness	Satisfaction	Overall Rating
Waste Collection	65	59	92	18	56	58

Source: Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2006–07.

Waste removal service is fairly regular and reliable. Among all respondents, garbage is most often collected once a week (52 percent), and 40 percent have more frequent collection. This frequency meets the needs of the majority of households (79 percent). Garbage is mostly collected regularly (70 percent), but in some areas there is intermittent interruption to service (16 percent), and 7 percent report irregular service. Many (40 percent) of those households that do not have waste removal service believe it is due to the lack of concern by local government officials. Irregular waste collection is the most serious problem (27 percent), followed by insufficient containers (16 percent), overloading of containers (9 percent), and poor location and maintenance (6 percent). Rural residents are more likely to say garbage collection vehicles cannot reach their areas than residents of other types of municipalities. Residents of more populated municipalities (more than 25,000) are more likely to say that proper care is taken in their neighborhoods.

Most respondents (67 percent) who face problems do not make formal complaints because they believe providers will not respond. An additional 15 percent do not make complaints because they do not know where to send their complaint. For the 18 percent of respondents who filed a complaint, only 5 percent had their problem solved. More people from rural areas and the FBiH do not know whom to contact to make complaints than from urban areas and the RS.

Respondents are moderately satisfied (54 percent) with waste removal service. However, residents from wealthier municipalities and urban areas were more satisfied. Respondents say they are significantly dissatisfied (30 percent) or very dissatisfied (11 percent) with citizens' disposal of garbage in inappropriate places, followed by the sanitation of public garbage dumpsters (30 percent dissatisfied, 5 percent very dissatisfied). The highest rate of citizen dissatisfaction is in the poorest municipalities.

Citizens believe that waste removal service could be improved significantly. The most common suggestions are to increase the number of dumpsters (12 percent), place new dumpsters in areas without waste removal (8 percent), and increase the frequency of waste collection (7 percent). Urban residents more frequently propose an increase in the number of containers, while rural residents more often propose the introduction of containers.

Comments from the Stakeholder Feedback Meetings

The main obstacles to improving waste removal are lack of resources, cooperation among municipalities, support from cantonal authorities, and political will. Utility companies often do not have enough garbage collection trucks, dumpsters, and other proper equipment. In some cases, the existing equipment is several decades old. Municipal councils keep the price of waste removal service below the market price. However, most municipalities still face problems collecting user fees. Like the survey respondents, stakeholders involved in meetings during this exercise report that rural areas suffer because of the poor road network and low population density, which makes waste collection service in these areas challenging from an economic perspective.

Many municipalities lack adequate waste disposal sites. According to stakeholder feedback, there is a serious problem of illegal waste disposal sites and low awareness about related environmental risks. Local government officials claim citizens lack the initiative to change the situation in their neighborhoods and are ill-equipped to help to organize themselves and demand better service.

Stakeholder recommendations focus on lack of resources, equipment, and dump sites. They also focus on the need for increased citizen environmental awareness, financing, management of, and support of the service. Principal recommendations to improve service quality are as follows:

- Municipalities need to invest in new vehicles, equipment, road infrastructure, and waste removal facilities.
- Municipalities without a proper dump site should attempt to find one that meets environmental standards.
- In rural areas, citizens should take the initiative to invest their own funds in the purchase of bins and dumpsters.
- Local governments should educate citizens about environmental issues and proper waste removal.
- Municipal authorities should introduce inspections and penalties for illegally dumping waste.
- The price of the waste removal service should be determined by the market and not subsidized by government.
- The government should provide assistance to citizens who cannot afford the service.
- The utility companies should have more control over service charges.
- The internal organization of the utility companies needs to be improved.

Water Supply

Findings from the Household Survey
As seen in Table 3.5, Water Supply services received an overall positive rating of 56 out of 100, with individual indicator ratings ranging from 19 (responsiveness) to 72 (satisfaction). The majority of households (66 percent) are connected to the public water supply system. One-fifth use water from rivers, streams, springs, or wells, 11 percent use water piped from the local water supply, and 4 percent use other sources. FBiH residents, urban neighborhoods, and wealthier municipalities more often have public water supply connections, while others more frequently use water from rivers, streams, springs, wells, or a local piped water supply. The most frequently cited reasons for which respondents stated they do not use the town water supply were because service is not available to them (53 percent, most frequently in the RS and rural areas) or they do not need it (more fre-quently in the FBiH and in urban areas. Six percent of respondents state they cannot afford to use the public water supply.

The vast majority of households, or 75 percent, say they have a water supply system that does not require servicing or repair. More than three-quarters (77 percent) of households had water sup-

Table 3.5. Water Supply

Sector	Access	Reliability	Quality	Responsiveness	Satisfaction	Overall Rating
Water Supply	66	65	57	19	72	56

Source: Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2006–07.

plied to their residences for more than 21 hours per day during the past month, but 10 percent had water for only 11 to 20 hours, and 11 percent had it for fewer than 10 hours per day. Residents of more than half of the households that have access to a public water system (57 percent) state they do not have a problem with water supply, but 26 percent complain about poor quality, 19 percent about unexpected interruptions, and 8 percent about pipe problems. Poor water quality is notably higher in the FBiH (33 percent), poorer municipalities (40 percent), and among apartment dwellers (30 percent), than in RS (13 percent), richer municipalities (24 percent), and among homeowners (25 percent).

The responsiveness of water suppliers to users' complaints is among the worst of all service providers. Similar to waste removal and local roads, the percentage of citizens who file a complaint when facing a problem with water supply is quite low. While 11 percent of respondents had problems with water supply, nearly 20 percent of those lodged a complaint. However, only 3 percent say the water problem had been resolved. Two-thirds did not make a complaint because they believe it would not have been effective in solving their problem.

Overall satisfaction with water supply is greater than respondents' satisfaction with roads and waste removal services. Almost three-fourths (72 percent) of respondents say they are satisfied with water supply services. Despite this relatively high level of satisfaction, it is important to recognize that satisfaction levels are uneven across households. Low-income municipalities have a higher percentage of households that are dissatisfied (18 percent) or very dissatisfied (9 percent). Rural municipalities also have more households that are dissatisfied (20 percent) and very dissatisfied (6 percent).

Comments from the Stakeholder Feedback Meetings

Stakeholders mention numerous problems despite their overall high level of satisfaction with water supply. One such problem is the destruction of roads while replacing old pipes. In addition, stakeholders mention that large quantities of water are lost in the secondary network because of its deterioration and fragmentation. Additional problems are irresponsible consumption of water, lack of citizen cooperation (in cases where there is a spring on private property), below-market prices charged by the utility company, political disagreements at the local level that stall project implementation, and lack of cooperation among water utility companies and local governments.

Rural municipalities generally suffer more problems with public infrastructure than urban municipalities. As is the case with other services, low population density in rural areas makes it less

economically justifiable to connect remote areas to the public water network. Public officials also are less motivated to provide access to the public water supply to these communities due to their perception that many such citizens have their own springs and some villages have built their own water supply systems.

Stakeholder recommendations focus on greater citizen participation and on renovation, expansion, and funding of the water supply network. Principal recommendations include the following:

- Most municipal water supply networks need to be renovated and expanded, especially in order to cover rural settlements.
- Water fees need to be based on consumption rather than imposing a flat rate.
- It is crucial that other levels of government contribute to the financing of the basic utility network.
- The reconstruction of the network should be financed through investments and citizen participation at the local level.
- The new network should incorporate proper rainwater harvesting, better control over water usage (require water meters), and the connection of additional springs to the network.
- To stimulate citizen participation in improving water management, local governments should organize public discussions on water consumption.
- A commission should be established that would investigate network problems and propose technical solutions.

Sewerage

Findings from the Household Survey

As seen in Table 3.6, Sewerage services received an overall positive rating of 55 out of 100, with individual indicator ratings ranging from 25 (responsiveness) to 84 (quality). Urban residents more often have sewerage service. The majority of households have a connection to the public sewerage network (42 percent) or have a septic tank (44 percent). A relatively small number of respondents (9 percent), mainly in RS and rural areas, use an outdoor toilet. While all respondents living in apartment buildings have a connection to the public sewerage network, significantly fewer of those who live in private houses (31 percent), in the RS (31 percent), and in rural areas and the smallest municipalities (19 percent) have a connection.

Table 3.6. Sewerage

Sector	Access	Reliability	Quality	Responsiveness	Satisfaction	Overall Rating
Sewerage	42	72	84	25	53	55

Source: Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2006–07.

The majority of households (84 percent) do not have sewerage-related problems. Sewerage repair is not needed in 72 percent of the households. Only 5 percent of households require urgent repair of the sewerage network, 14 percent require repair or service, and 7 percent think some servicing is required. The need for repair is higher in rural settlements of the FBiH. Households that have a septic tank need maintenance twice as often as those with a connection to the public sewerage network (18 percent compared to 9 percent). The most common issues are unpleasant odors (57 percent), frequent obstruction (26 percent), and the poor condition of pipes (20 percent).

Compared to other services examined in this exercise, the number of those who make a complaint about sewerage is relatively high. For those 29 percent of respondents who filed a complaint, only 6 percent had their problem solved. Additionally, two-thirds of citizens with complaints did not formally lodge a complaint to the responsible authorities, as they believe such action would not be effective in resolving their problems. Households with septic tanks report lower rates of satisfaction than those using the public network.

Comments from the Stakeholder Feedback Meetings

The main obstacles to improving sewerage services are lack of resources, weak or unclear property rights, citizen indifference to the current state of services, and (in one municipality) internal organization of the utility company. Meetings revealed that many sewerage systems are old and in poor condition. However, the reconstruction of the sewerage network would entail huge costs and most municipalities could not afford it. Rural areas are even worse off because of a lack of resources for investment. Citizens are not interested in cofinancing projects because they use septic tanks or find solutions on their own, usually with no oversight by authorities. Additional problems include large financial losses to the utility due to illegal connections to the network.

Recommendations focus on maintenance, rehabilitation, and increasing support for service delivery improvements and network maintenance from higher levels of government. Principal recommendations are as follows:

- Some existing sewerage networks need new collectors, repair, better maintenance, and replacement of old pipes.
- Municipalities without building and maintenance plans need to prepare plans for the installation and maintenance of sewerage lines.
- Higher levels of government should get involved in supporting the development of basic utility infrastructure and raising funds for investments in less developed areas.

Heating

Findings from the Household Survey

As seen in Table 3.7, Heating services received an overall positive rating of 64 out of 100, with individual indicator ratings ranging from 9 (access) to 91 (reliability). Most households (77 percent) use their own heating system, not public central heating. Public central heating is available mainly in urban areas, municipalities with more than 25,000 people, richer municipalities, and apartment buildings. Seven percent of households have individual central heating, with these being fairly evenly distributed throughout the different demographic categories.

Table 3.7. Heating

Sector	Access	Reliability	Quality	Responsiveness	Satisfaction	Overall Rating
Heating	9	91	83	NA	74	64

Source: Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2006–07

Most households (82 percent) do not have problems with their heating system. In those households that need heating system repairs, the need is mainly for servicing (16 percent) rather than for more serious repairs (2 percent). The majority of households (91 percent) that use public central heating say the service is dependable in the winter, 6 percent say the service is irregular, and 3 percent say it is so irregular that they practically do not have heating.

Compared to other services, relatively few users filed a complaint about heating. However, it is difficult to draw conclusions as to why users did not file complaints due to the small number of users who did so (29 out of 1,997). Seventy-four percent of households with public heating are satisfied with the service, with 15 percent saying they are dissatisfied.

Health Care

Findings from the Household Survey

As seen in Table 3.8, Health Care services received an overall positive rating of 77 out of 100. However, it is important to note that only two indicators were used for this service: access, which received a rating of 90, and satisfaction, which received a rating of 63. It is important to note that the section of the survey measuring health-care facilities is structured differently than the survey questions for other services. Access and usage are the predominant issues. Overall satisfaction was measured by one standard question. Too few citizens made complaints to draw any conclusions.

Table 3.8. Health Care

Sector	Access	Reliability	Quality	Responsiveness	Satisfaction	Overall Rating
Health Care	90	NA	NA	NA	63	77

Source: Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2006–07.

Ninety percent of interviewed households have access to a health-care center and pharmacy. The most common health-care institutions are pharmacies (92 percent of respondents say they exist locally) health-care centers (89 percent), clinics (66 percent), private doctors (60 percent), and hospitals (42 percent). Unlike results for other service areas there are only minor differences between access in rural and urban areas. The most significant difference is that in poor municipalities, only 53 percent of respondents have access to ambulances, while in rich municipalities, 76 percent have access. All forms of health-care institutions are more prevalent in urban areas, and in richer and more highly populated municipalities. All types of health-care institutions, with the exception of hospitals, are more prevalent in the FBiH.

Pharmacies and health-care centers are the most frequently used health-care institutions. These are used by 91 percent and 84 percent of households, respectively. Over half of respondents (54 percent) report using affiliated local clinics, 44 percent use hospital services, and 32 percent use private doctors. The main reasons for which respondents do not use private doctors are they do not need services (36 percent) and the high cost of services (34 percent). All types of health-care institutions are used more often in the FBiH and in more populated municipalities.

Two-thirds of citizens are satisfied with public health-care facilities. The satisfaction level varies slightly across all population groups—from 57 percent in rural areas to 66 in urban areas, from 57 percent in the FBiH to 68 percent in the RS. Satisfaction decreases when municipal population increases and municipal revenue decreases.

Comments from the Stakeholder Feedback Meetings

The main obstacle to improving health-care services is the lack of resources. Most stakeholders think the current law on health care is inadequate overall and this service should be the responsibility of state authorities. In FBiH, cantonal finances are insufficient to fund health-care services. Across all localities, respondents feel the administration of the health-care system does not function properly. A large number of citizens have no health insurance, and health-care services are prohibitively expensive for many people. As is the case with other service areas, health-care service coverage is lower in rural areas because marginal costs are much higher than in urban areas. Similarly, because of the low population density in rural areas, pharmacy coverage is inadequate.

Recommendations for improving health care services primarily focus on expanding service coverage. Principal recommendations are as follows:

- The state government should invest in small local health centers.
- More professionals should be employed in health-care centers.
- It would be highly beneficial for health-care providers to offer household visits to remote areas.
- Ambulance services and pharmacies should be available throughout the municipality.
- Local ambulances should be better equipped to provide pharmacy services.

Elementary Education

Findings from the Household Survey

As seen in Table 3.9, Elementary Education services received an overall positive rating of 85 out of 100, the highest rating for any of the services studied in the Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance. However, it is important to note that only three indicators were used for this service: access, which received a rating of 99, quality, which received a rating of 76, and satisfaction, which received a rating of 80. The elementary school enrollment rate for children from the survey households is 99 percent. All children are enrolled in public schools rather than private schools. In urban areas, 87 percent of children walk to school, while in rural areas 65 percent do so. More children walk "often" to school in the FBiH (83 percent) than in the RS (67 percent). While 22 percent of children in urban areas use public transportation, only 5 percent in rural areas do so. There is very little difference in commuting time across the two types of localities.

Table 3.9 Elementary Education

Sector	Access	Reliability	Quality	Responsiveness	Satisfaction	Overall Rating
Education	99	NA	76	NA	80	85

Source: Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2006–07

Respondents do not emphasize any particular shortcomings in the physical condition of schools. Eighty percent of respondents say they are satisfied with this aspect of the service area. Overall satisfaction with elementary education is somewhat higher than satisfaction for the physical condition of schools. Two-thirds of respondents with children in elementary education say local public schools need to be improved. The most cited aspect in need of improvement is the general quality of education (26 percent), which was mentioned more often in the RS (35 percent) and in municipalities with higher populations (38 percent) and higher per-capita revenues (32 percent).

Comments from the Stakeholder Feedback Meetings

The main obstacles to improving education are lack of coordination among responsible institutions, lack of resources, and lack of qualified staff. The education system in FBiH is complex and inefficient, with coordination between the federal and cantonal ministries much in need of improvement. Ministries do not invest enough in schools in rural areas. This is especially true in returnees' villages. In many schools, classrooms for information and communications technology (ICT) education do not have basic equipment. ICT facilities for classrooms are not financed in remote areas where there are fewer than 25 pupils. Problems with physical aspects of education (out-of-date libraries, insufficient numbers of classrooms, lack of facilities for physical education, lack of proper transportation of pupils, lack of equipment, and so forth) are related to a lack of financial resources. School principals mention the lack of qualified staff as a concern, particularly the shortage of younger teachers.

Most recommendations concern local government becoming more active and supportive. Principal recommendations are as follows:

- Both local governments and school management should be more active in ensuring adequate equipment, transportation services, and construction and maintenance of school buildings.
- Higher levels of government should get more involved and invest more in education.
- Local governments should find ways to stimulate young professionals to work in schools, especially in rural areas.
- Local governments should be more active in providing scholarships for excellent pupils, promoting the establishment of parents' and children's councils, and investing in schools in rural areas.

Findings on Local Governance

Key Findings: Local Governance

Figure 3.1 summarizes findings in this domain, representing the percentage of positive responses for each of the measured dimensions of local government performance.

The three indicators dealing with low levels of corruption have the highest response rates. Lack of experience with corruption has the highest ranking among all local governance indicators: 99 percent of respondents have never experienced corruption at the local level. The next two highest indicators of local government performance also relate to corruption: The vast majority of respondents have no knowledge (91 percent) or perception (76 percent) of corruption.

Government efficiency indicators tend to cluster in the middle. Most respondents feel local government is effective (71 percent), that the regulatory burden is low (67 percent), and that the relatively large size of the informal sector is due to the regulatory burden (46 percent).

Figure 3.1. Local Government Performance Indicators (household survey)

Indicator	Value
No experience with corruption	99
No knowledge of corruption	91
No perception of corruption	76
Government effectiveness	71
Low regulatory burden	67
Access to local government representatives	48
Informal sector due to regulatory burden	46
Access to information	43
Participation in elections and public meetings	37
Rule of law is applied	36
Political stability	35
Public safety	32
Satisfaction with local government	
Good quality of local court decisions	15
Accountability of local government	2

Source: Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2006–07.

Access to government is more problematic. Fewer than half of respondents say they have access to local government representatives (48 percent), access to information (43 percent), or participated in elections and public meetings (37 percent). Rule of law (36 percent), political stability (35 percent), and public safety (32 percent) rate poorly relative to other indicators measured.

Local government accountability indicators have the lowest scores among all indicators. Only 2 percent of respondents report that local government decisions reflect their priorities. The quality of court decisions was rated the second lowest among all indicators (15 percent). Finally, overall satisfaction with local government also rated quite low (21 percent).

Access to Information

Findings from the Household Survey

Almost half (40 percent to 43 percent) of the respondents could not judge to what degree specific types of information about the work of local government are useful for them. Among those who did make a judgment, more consider the information useful (37 percent to 47 percent, depending on the type of information) than not useful (11 percent to 16 percent); 47 percent report they have no experience requesting and accessing information from local government or do not have an

opinion about its usefulness. Respondents with higher levels of education judge the information as more useful than those with lower levels of education.

The most appreciated information relates to planning for municipal development and public works (47 percent). Information on public procurement is considered the least useful (16 percent). Local radio is the most useful source of information (58 percent), followed by the notice board in the municipal building (46 percent), the service desk in the municipal building (42 percent), the local MZ representative (41 percent), the notice board at the MZ (38 percent), and the municipal bulletin (26 percent).

Comments from the Stakeholder Feedback Meetings

Local government representatives believe citizens are not interested in becoming informed. For example, citizens who compete for tenders are interested in procurement information, but in general, citizens know little about procurement law. Citizens are interested in concise and concrete information that relates to their personal interests. Their concerns revolve around solving their problems relating to service delivery, completing administrative procedures, and material and financial support. Local officials believe citizens expect government to do everything in terms of public service provision. They suggest educating citizens about the advantages of being informed about the work of local government, and stimulating them to participate in decision-making processes through lectures and seminars on sustainable development and the importance of citizen participation.

There is a shortage of adequate communication channels. Some smaller municipalities have no local radio station, although such stations are often the best means for information dissemination. Municipalities with no local radio station should create one. Municipal bulletins are the least useful means of disseminating information, especially when an insufficient number of copies are printed.

Citizens have the following suggestions on how local government could improve access to information and how MZs should play a larger role:

- Local governments should publish information more frequently and regularly about projects, procurement, and other activities of local government.
- Local government representatives should spend more time in the field meeting with citizens and participating in MZ meetings.
- Local government officials should brief the local media on a more regular basis.
- Municipal councilors should be more proactive in informing citizens about their work.
- The work of the municipal council should be wholly transparent and more inclusive.
- Strengthening MZs would improve relations between government and citizens.
- MZs should be better trained to provide information about local governance issues to citizens.
- Notice boards in MZs should be standardized across municipalities.
- A list of sources of information should be developed and modernized.

Citizen Interaction with Local Government Representatives

Findings from the Household Survey

More than half (58 percent) of the respondents have not contacted a local government representative in the past 12 months. Men make contact slightly more often (by 9 percentage points) than women. Interaction between citizens and local governments takes place mainly through MZ council members. Direct contact with the mayor and municipal council members is less frequent. The majority of respondents rarely contact municipal administration representatives, and when they do, they most frequently contact municipal services (33 percent) or MZ council members (22 percent), and least often the mayor and municipal council members (13 percent).

Citizens contact different officials for different kinds of information. A mayor is contacted in order to improve local services, civil servants to obtain licenses or documents, councilors to obtain information, and MZ representatives for financial support. Citizens in the FBiH request information more often than those in the RS. Citizens are most satisfied with their interactions with civil servants (55 percent) and least satisfied with municipal councilors (41 percent). Those living in the FBiH are more satisfied with their interactions (except with civil servants) than those in the RS.

Comments from the Stakeholder Feedback Meetings

Citizens preferr to contact MZs rather than local government. MZs play an important role as a mediator between citizens and local governments, helping to prioritize work and ensure that work is implemented. MZs are perceived as closer to the people and more attuned to their needs.

Citizens are least likely to contact mayors because mayors are the least accessible of government officials. In addition, there is no proper mechanism for cooperation between municipal councilors and citizens. Some local governments have insufficient means of communication with citizens. Citizens do not contact local representatives because they do not understand decision-making processes and the division of responsibilities in government.

The main recommendations produced by stakeholders at feedback meetings concern the improvement of communication channels, citizen education, and education for civil servants who work directly with citizens. Principal recommendations were as follows:

- Councilors and other local government representatives should spend more time in the field and in meetings with citizens.
- A separate office for council members should be created where citizens could come and meet them.
- The law on local elections should be changed to offer only open lists of candidates.

Citizen Participation in Local Governance

Findings from the Household Survey

Citizen participation in local governance is quite minimal. Citizens participate at the local level through indirect mechanisms (61 percent), such as representative politics, more often than through direct mechanisms (26 percent), such as local elections, referendums, and petitions. More than one-third of adults (37 percent) have never had any direct or indirect participation in governance at the local level. Almost half (48 percent) have never participated in municipal council elections, and 43 percent have never participated in mayoral elections. Even more (88 percent) have never participated in public discussions about the municipal budget, petitions at the municipal level (83 percent), municipal referendums (78 percent), and MZ council elections (68 percent). The majority (75 percent) have not attended any meetings or activities organized at the local level (by the community council, non-governmental organizations [NGOs], or municipal assembly) in the past 12 months. Those who have participated most frequently attended public meetings on municipal budgets (20 percent) and least frequently attended municipal council sessions (5 percent). Those who attended activities consider the experience to be very useful or somewhat useful (70 percent to 81 percent, depending on the type of meeting). Older citizens and those with higher education participate more often.

Citizens believe (at least to some extent) that government decisions are the result of political party interests and not a result of the interests of citizens (67 percent). Only 1 percent of citizens surveyed believe local decisions attempt to improve the lives of the poor. The majority (80 percent) believe their local governments perform very poorly in terms of being open to citizens' opinions on priorities, promotion of citizens' needs, and undertaking measures to assist the poor. Citizens view local religious organizations most positively in terms of reliability and fairness, followed by the local police and the local media. Local NGOs, municipal assemblies, and local courts are considered the least reliable and fair. MZs are considered the most useful form of public meetings and activities at the local level (80 percent agree), while NGO activities are considered least useful (68 percent).

Comments from the Stakeholder Feedback Meetings

Citizens believe they cannot influence decision-making processes through participatory mechanisms. Their main, and often only, form of citizen participation is through elections. Citizen initiatives are often politicized, and as a result, individuals lose confidence in the process. Many do not believe government decisions reflect their priorities. Local officials state that citizens do not believe decisions of those in power reflect citizens' priorities because citizens have greater expectations, government cannot respond to all citizens' requests and needs, there is insufficient financial and political support from cantonal or entity authorities, and there are political instability and other obstructions to participation. Low citizen participation in local decision making reflects their limited awareness of democratic principles and the limited belief in the importance of civic engagement at the local level. However, despite lack of active participation in governance on the part of citizens, they assign responsibility for all aspects of public life, especially employment, to the government.

Citizens mainly use MZ meetings to express their needs. Everything that is discussed and decided at MZ meetings is expected to find its way to decision makers. Citizens rely least on local petitions or public hearings to make their needs and opinions known to local government. Local government representatives, especially in MZs, have a strong incentive to work for the prosperity of their communities because of the social status such work gives them. Some municipal governments recognize the importance of MZs and invest in enhancing their capacity.

Stakeholders have the following recommendations for strengthening citizen voice and participation:

- Citizens should regularly discuss community issues at MZ meetings.
- Municipal council members should visit MZs.
- Municipal councilors should discuss the municipal budget with MZ representatives.
- Information about budgets and public expenditures should be presented via the media through-out the year. This would educate people and make them more interested and active.
- Local government needs to find ways to stimulate citizen participation in its work through public education of citizens, public hearings, and the establishment of an information desk at a central location providing public information on budgets, laws, and so forth.
- Local government should design development programs that promote community engagement. This would reduce stereotypes about government's lack of openness to citizen participation.

Political Stability and Public Safety

Findings from the Household Survey

Public safety is low as measured by local government's orientation to protecting the vulnerable and poor, its disaster preparedness, citizen perceptions of safety, and citizen tolerance of diversity. More people feel safe in their municipality (62 percent) and think their municipality has tolerance for diversity (45 percent) than think their municipality is prepared for disaster (15 percent) or that the vulnerable and poor are protected (7 percent). Citizens living in the FBiH have stronger doubts about public safety than those in the RS.

Citizens are less concerned about political stability. They are most positive about local elections being free and fair (45 percent agree versus 15 percent who disagree). Citizens are also more posi-tive than negative about people feeling free to express their opinions in public (40 percent versus 23 percent) and that civil society organizations (CSOs) are independent (29 percent versus 17 percent). The one measure of political stability rated rather negatively is citizen awareness regarding participation, with only 24 percent of citizens agreeing that they can participate in local govern-ment (versus 35 percent who disagree). Similar to public safety, citizens living in the FBiH feel slightly less confident about political stability than those in the RS.

Comments from the Stakeholder Feedback Meetings

The main obstacles to improving political stability and public safety are crime, lack of resources, and the unwillingness of political factions to cooperate. Social assistance programs do not exist at local or state levels because of the lack of resources. Social work centers do not have enough resources to assist all those in need. Citizens do not feel safe because of economic worries and high unemployment. Power struggles among political parties at the local level strongly affect public security. While tenuous perceptions of public safety could be partially alleviated by involvement and monitoring initiated by civil society organizations, CSOs are currently underdeveloped and not truly independent. Specifically, there are few NGOs dealing with governance issues in smaller municipalities.

The main recommendations for improving political stability and public safety revolve around more proactive government efforts to reduce unemployment, increase spending on social assistance, and strengthen local self-governance. Principal recommendations are as follows:

- Local governments should introduce active labor market programs.
- Social work centers should be financed by providing help to the Red Cross and similar institutions.
- Government should develop a database categorizing citizens in need of public assistance.
- Public spending on social assistance programs should increase.
- Stakeholders should foster cooperation between social assistance centers and the municipality.

Local Government Effectiveness

Findings from the Household Survey

More citizens are dissatisfied than satisfied with government effectiveness. Respondents consider lack of resources to be the biggest obstacle to improving life in their municipality (53 percent), followed by corruption (36 percent), weak political leadership (35 percent), party politics (27 percent), lack of citizen participation (20 percent), and a lack of skilled public servants (17 percent). Only 15 percent of citizens are very satisfied with local government decisions and administration. Citizens are most satisfied with the issuance of permits and other documents (31 percent satisfied versus 36 percent dissatisfied) and most dissatisfied with decisions that relate to local development plans (21 percent satisfied and 42 percent dissatisfied). More than half of all respondents consider high municipal taxes, corruption of local officials, local crime, and municipal bureaucracy as obstacles to local business development and job creation (55 percent to 57 percent). Only 2 percent to 3 percent did not consider these factors to be an obstacle.

Comments from the Stakeholder Feedback Meetings

The main obstacles preventing the improvement of local government effectiveness are lack of resources, corruption, insufficient support from higher tiers of government, and excessive bureaucracy. Some municipalities have no development, operational, and strategic plans because they lack the human resource capacity to prepare them. Lack of resources is the main problem, in large part due to insufficient funding from higher levels of government. Bureaucratic procedures in some municipalities are complicated because of the old administrative system, which is heavily burdensome and slow. However, in some municipalities, tutorials are printed for all administrative procedures, and fees are reduced to a minimum. In these more efficient municipalities, the majority of documents and licenses can be obtained in one day.

Government needs to modernize its IT. Local governments should provide online application, and request forms, and should allow citizens to use an online system to schedule meetings with municipal service employees in service departments. More information and government procedures should be put online. There should be a modern, multifunctional "one-stop shop" with modern IT.

Civil service reform is necessary. Government should pay more attention to the qualifications and skills of civil servants, perhaps by setting up a merit-based pay system. Young, more adaptable, and more qualified staff should be employed in the administration. Government should design social programs for elderly civil servants if they are not old enough to retire, but they need to be replaced by younger personnel with greater capacity and more relevant skill sets.

Local government needs to be more inclusive. Local government should define concrete and realistic development plans and discuss these with all who are interested (for example, business, agriculture, and youth). Local governments and CSOs should make efforts to educate civil servants and reorganize municipal departments, as well as apply new approaches to relations between civil servants and citizens. When the government plans to take out a loan, each MZ should be consulted and asked about its priorities. Conclusions from public hearings should be respected. MZ representatives should be present at all discussions related to the municipal budget. In addition, representatives of different municipal departments and services should present planned activities in each MZ and specifically address citizens' needs in those MZs.

Local governments should be more transparent and responsive to citizens' demands. An office for citizens' complaints should be established, and the time required for responding to citizens' requests should be reduced. Corruption should be publicly debated and discussed. There should be transparency in revenue collection and expenditures. Internet presentations of the government's activities should be available. A system for citizens to evaluate the work of local government should be initiated. There should be external, independent auditing of local government activities.

Several laws need to be changed in order to lay the foundation for greater political stability. The law on elections should be modified, with fund-raising ceilings for independent candidates being

decreased. The law on financing political parties should also be modified to allow for a more level playing field among all candidates. The law on administrative service should be applied to depoliticize municipal services. On the other hand, the law on the distribution of public revenue should not be subject to constant change, as such unpredictability of available resources obstructs local governments' work.

Regulatory Burden

Findings from the Household Survey

Citizens feel that government regulations are unnecessarily burdensome. One-third (33 percent) of respondents feel that local government regulations impose a large or moderate burden on them. Respondents see obtaining building permits as posing the greatest bureaucratic burdens (51 percent), followed by land registration (37 percent), and commercial licenses (33 percent). Household registration is seen as the least burdensome documentation to obtain from the government (21 percent). All procedures are seen as more complicated by respondents in the FBiH than in the RS.

Citizens believe crime (59 percent) is the biggest factor contributing to the existence of the informal economy. Five other factors are almost equally important: lack of employment inspection, low employee awareness of their rights, high taxes, regulatory burden for businesses, and labor laws that are expensive to comply with (ranging from 53 percent to 57 percent). Rural respondents have a slightly greater tendency to believe that the regulatory burden contributes to the existence of the informal economy.

Comments from the Stakeholder Feedback Meetings

The main obstacles to reducing the regulatory burden are the attitudes of civil servants, a lack of funds, and a lack of political will. Citizens are dissatisfied with the complexity of administrative procedures, the obsolete administrative system, poorly organized databases, and high taxes.

Rule of Law

Findings from the Household Survey

Citizens' opinions on the upholding of the rule of law is strikingly divided, as almost equal numbers of respondents feel the rule of law is always or often applied in their municipality (36 percent) as believe it is rarely or never applied (33 percent). Respondents state that property rights are more often respected (42 percent said always or often) than administrative decisions (39 percent) or tendering and procurement for public works, services, or goods (29 percent). Between 26 percent and 35 percent of respondents did not state an opinion on these three questions.

Courts have a poor reputation. About 80 percent of respondents state they have not had direct experience with local courts, and are not able to evaluate the decisions of the court. Of those who have experience with local courts, 85 percent do not think the decisions of the court were just, fair, consistent, enforceable, and affordable.

Corruption

Findings from the Household Survey

Less than a quarter of respondents feel that corruption is a very serious or serious problem in their municipality. Only 9 percent say they know of a case in which an individual or organization had to give a bribe. Less than 1 percent of respondents had been asked for bribes by local officials. Experience with corruption among local civil servants is quite rare (2 percent), and even less among municipal councilors (1 percent) and mayors (1 percent). Respondents have the least experience with corruption among community councilors.

Respondents perceive more corruption among civil servants (28 percent) than among councilors (25 percent), mayors (22 percent), and MZ representatives (20 percent). Community councils are perceived as the least corrupt of government officials under consideration (6 percent). Over half of all respondents, however, state that they did not know whether corruption is a problem among each of the four groups of officials. Similarly, about half the respondents did not express their levels of satisfaction with government efforts to decrease or suppress corruption in their municipality in the past 12 months. More respondents in the RS and urban areas consider corruption to be a serious problem.

Comments from the Stakeholder Feedback Meetings

There is disagreement about whether corruption is a problem. Stakeholders say the low percentage of citizens who have experience with corruption underscores the fact that there are not many possibilities for corruption at the local level. Stakeholders argue that citizens are the ones who initiate corruption and municipal councilors are most corrupt. In addition, there are many incompetent civil servants working in administration. Some stakeholders say corruption is just a stereotype, and concrete examples are lacking.

Recommendations focus on what government can do to fight corruption.

- A code of conduct for civil servants should be adopted.
- Local governments should set up an office for citizen complaints on corruption, introduce internal and external auditing of local government operations, and employ competent personnel.

4

Conclusions and Recommendations from the Citizen Review

Both citizens and local governments valued the citizen review as an important mechanism for improving interactions between citizens and local decision makers. They also recognized the potential of the exercise to serve as an effective management tool for service providers in guiding them toward making much-needed service delivery improvements. BiH citizens are at an early stage in recognizing their rights to demand such improvements. One benefit of the project was that it gave citizens an opportunity to express their opinions about their local representatives and service providers. Indeed, a main conclusion of the pilot was that the methodology employed in this exercise was highly successful in eliciting and identifying problem areas, facilitating greater dialogue among stakeholders, and proposing solutions.

The citizen review clearly showed that while citizens perceive some areas of local service provision and governance to be performing reasonably well, important aspects are perceived to have moderate to strong problems. The stakeholder meetings were the primary source of conclusions and recommendations. During these meetings, stakeholders met with local government representatives and service providers to discuss possible solutions, expected risks or barriers to these solutions, and the time line for implementing the measures. Although the exercise yielded many additional conclusions and recommendations, stakeholders focused primarily on the following:

Citizen participation in local decision making and policy making is weak because of citizens' skeptical attitudes about the effectiveness of participation and their limited knowledge of government processes. Even though a large number of citizens are not satisfied with their representation in municipal activities, only 20 percent are actually willing to participate in local government. Their participation is limited largely because they feel that this participation would ultimately be ineffective in helping them influence local decision making. The surveys and focus group discussions revealed that many citizens believe local government decisions are ad hoc and made without requesting or responding to citizens' input. Most citizens (70 percent) believe local government decisions never or almost never reflect their priorities. Two-thirds of respondents state local government's decisions are driven by political party interests.

As a result, citizen participation is more reactive than proactive. Citizens contact local officials only when they have a problem. Municipalities lack mechanisms for including citizens in consultations, obtaining feedback on their priorities, and feeding such priorities into decision making. A majority of adults (75 percent) have not participated in or attended any meetings or activities organized by local actors, such as the community council or municipal assembly, in the past 12 months. Almost half of respondents state that they have never participated in municipal council elections (48 percent), and 43 percent have never participated in mayoral elections. More than half (58 percent) have not contacted a local government representative in the past 12 months.

Recommendations:

There were a range of recommendations for ways in which citizens' voice could be strengthened and citizen participation could be increased in all phases of the policy cycle.

- Municipalities could develop communication strategies and iterative processes to: (i) inform citizens about local government policies, programs, services, and initiatives; (ii) more effectively listen to the public; and (iii) respond to citizens' needs and incorporate their opinions into local government actions.
- Municipal authorities, and in particular municipal councilors, could find ways to educate citizens on local governance issues and to better motivate them to participate in the work of local government.
- Mayors and municipal councilors need to hold meetings with citizens and pay field visits to communities more frequently and on a more regular basis. These meetings need to be productive, and citizens need feedback to motivate their participation.
- There should be an institutionalized audit mechanism to evaluate government performance and the quality of public service provision.
- The role of MZs should be expanded, and their proximity to community members should be leveraged and used in reinventing local governance in BiH. MZs should be used as the main mode of community organization at the local level, as well as the main channel through which citizens can influence decision-making processes. MZs could also serve as the main source of information about municipal activities.

While overall citizen participation is low, women are particularly underrepresented in participatory processes in local governance. The review shows that many women have less knowledge of, and interest in, political procedures, rules, or their rights. While 42 percent of men have represented their households at public assemblies, only 4 percent of women surveyed had done so. More than half of the respondents (52 percent) believe that men have a greater ability than women to influence local government decisions, with only 2 percent stating that women have a greater ability than men to do so.

Recommendations:

- Local governments could use civic education to include more women in participatory processes at the municipal level.
- Cooperation with local women's NGOs may help build capacity among women and motivate them to voice their interests.

Citizens often do not exercise their client power due to the lack of grievance mechanisms for service delivery. The exercise revealed that citizens rarely complain to service providers when service problems arise. When they do complain, the service providers' response rate is extremely low. While service providers received relatively positive ratings (59 percent to 93 percent positive) for the reliability and quality of their services, they received strikingly low ratings on their responsiveness to customer complaints (only 15 percent to 25 percent positive). There is an obvious disconnect between service providers and clients. The most common reason citizens offer for not filing a complaint is that they believe it would make no difference and would not solve their problem. The second most cited reason for failing to lodge a complaint is that citizens say they do not know to whom they should address their complaint.

Recommendations:

- Local governments could work in partnership with service providers to establish and promote grievance mechanisms with the aim of improving service delivery at the local level.
- If the problem cannot be solved immediately, this information should be communicated to citizens.
- Introducing a participatory performance monitoring system on a regular basis (such as the social audit or citizen report cards) could help to identify service delivery problems and could help to empower citizens to actively participate in and improve local service delivery.

Local governments lack managerial capacity, prioritization mechanisms, financial resources, and qualified personnel. The citizen review revealed that public services in all municipalities require more resources and citizen contributions. Local government attributes its inability to provide more and better services to a lack of financial resources. But, according to stakeholders, such lack of resources is only part of the problem. Even in the absence of additional resources, existing resources could be used more effectively through improved management and prioritization mechanisms. Respondents consider the biggest obstacle to improving life in their municipalities to be the lack of resources (53 percent), followed by corruption (36 percent), weak political leadership (35 percent), party politics (27 percent), lack of citizen participation (20 percent), and a lack of skilled public servants (17 percent).

Recommendations:

- There are several potential sources for raising additional needed resources: citizens' financial participation, new government investments, or a greater financial commitment from higher levels of government.

- For a more long-term, cost-effective orientation, government could focus more on the quality and reliability of services rather than the quantity of infrastructure projects or number of people served.

- Municipal agencies need to employ more qualified, professional staff. Also with respect to staffing, municipal agencies should employ an increased number of young people, a change that survey respondents feel would increase efficiency and promote more client-oriented attitudes and behavior among municipal agencies. In addition, to achieve this goal and improve staff performance, municipal agencies could adopt a code of conduct for civil servants.

- Increased transparency and community-based citizen monitoring of local service delivery could help prevent corruption.

- Local governments should hire more inspectors to improve the quality of public services.

Local governments' work is often obstructed by a lack of clarity in legal frameworks, weak cooperation with utility companies, and problematic internal political dynamics. Inadequate and often unclear division of responsibilities between local government and other levels of government frequently results in inefficient service delivery. In the FBiH, service delivery frequently suffers due to an unclear division of responsibilities between local and cantonal authorities, particularly in the health and education sectors. Entity constitutions and laws on local self-government have transferred responsibility for some municipal services to entity or cantonal levels, redistributing decision-making authority and financial and management responsibilities to higher levels of government. In reality, these responsibilities have merely been deconcentrated, as actual implementation is still being done by local branches of central government. In some municipalities, the rights of utility companies are undefined, which in many cases leads to a troublesome relationship between municipal authorities and service providers.

Recommendation:

- One possible solution could be to strengthen the decentralization process and synchronize municipal responsibilities and financial resources with actual workloads. However, the modification of the current legal framework for local self-governance is beyond the scope of this exercise and remains up for debate and modification by local government and community actors.

5

Project Follow-up and Process Findings

While this report focused on stakeholder findings, lessons, and recommendations regarding service delivery and local governance, the entire exercise also lent itself to several important lessons and recommendations about the citizen review process itself. In order to carefully distinguish process findings from content findings, process findings are included in this chapter.

The report attempted to clearly delineate among the various instruments used (community scorecard, citizen report card, stakeholder feedback meetings during the dissemination process) and findings from each type of instrument. In this way, the report underscores the different types of information yielded by the different instruments used throughout this exercise. For example, the community scorecard yielded mainly qualitative information that helped identify broad-based key issues in service delivery. In contrast, the citizen report card, especially the household survey, generated mainly quantitative information that helped to bring specific, analytic, and quantifiable rigor to the various findings, such as illustrating how widespread or severe a problem might be and comparing performance across services. The stakeholder feedback meetings were especially useful in analyzing the causes of problems, brainstorming possible solutions, and identifying potential obstacles to implementing those solutions.

Follow-up to the Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance

As follow-up, recommendations resulting from the citizen review were discussed with municipalities covered by the citizen report card in a dissemination workshop in February 2007. As a result of the findings, a capacity-building program was designed by WBI in consultation with local organizations in three priority areas: communications, feedback/performance monitoring systems, and participatory budgeting.

In an effort to build upon local expertise, the World Bank Institute (WBI) published a call for proposals to local institutions that could design the capacity-building program. The organizations that were selected through a competitive process included Boram[6] (communications), Media Center[7] (communications), Center for Civic Initiatives[8] (participatory budgeting), and Eda[9] (feedback/performance monitoring systems). These organizations participated in a training-of-trainers workshop in BiH in June 2008, during which a curriculum for each of these topics was developed. Pilots testing the curriculum were delivered in September 2008 in nine municipalities under the Community Development Program (CDP). Further scaling up of the capacity-building program is expected under the extension of the CDP.

Results were also fed into economic and sector work prepared by the World Bank's Europe and Central Asia region. The report, "From Stability to Performance: Local Governance and Service Delivery in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BH)," outlined a series of policy recommendations to the Bosnian government on how to improve municipal performance.[10]

At present, capacity-building programs on participatory performance monitoring systems and participatory budgeting are planned for nine municipalities under Bosnia's CDP and in partnership with local non-governmental organizations (NGOs). In July 2009, EDA began this program with training sessions to mayors and their staff in three municipalities on COMPASS, or the Client-Oriented Municipal Public and Administrative Services Survey methodology. Representatives from BiH municipalities that have already implemented this methodology attended and shared experiences with the training session participants.[11] Communications training is also slated for a slightly lower number of municipalities as a result of limited funds in this initial phase.

Lessons Learned

Implementation and Analysis of Results

There were several key factors that contributed to the project's successful implementation. First, with respect to sampling, the selection of the target population was felt to be statistically rigorous and highly representative. However, project managers felt that the number of municipality representatives in the sample could be reduced, especially in the smaller municipalities, without sacrific-

6. http://boram.ba/indexENG.html
7. http://www.media.ba/mediacentar/compiled/p882.htm
8. http://www.ccibh.org/main.php?lang=ENG
9. http://www.edabl.org/en-UK/Default.aspx
10. This report is available online at http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTBOSNIAHERZ/Resources/LocalGovernanceAndServiceDeliveryInBH.pdf
11. For more information, see EDA's Web site at http://www.edabl.org/en-UK/Vijesti/PrikaziVijest.aspx?ID=367&CatID=14

ing information. However, representatives of the departments responsible for the utilities need to also be consulted.

Next, all survey issues were discussed with the most relevant person or people in charge of the service.

In retrospect, instruments (questionnaires, guides for discussion, sampling) should have been shared with stakeholders at the local level prior to implementation. In this way, stakeholders would have been able to provide input into instruments' relevance and improve their quality. Also, the inclusion of local stakeholders in survey design would serve to increase ownership of findings and recommendations.

Considering the significant variations among municipalities in terms of economic development, urbanization, public infrastructure development and revenues, and other characteristics, the citizen review revealed that the most plausible way to make comparisons among municipalities is to limit cross-municipality comparisons to those municipalities with similar characteristics. This type of comparison allows stakeholders to have a clearer picture about possible solutions, provides them with benchmarks for comparison, and identifies potential partners in identifying effective policy and programs.

Finally, the methodology used to gather information proved highly effective. Using results from the community scorecard focus group discussions to inform the questionnaire undoubtedly created a survey instrument that was more reflective of key issues confronting the municipalities with respect to service delivery. While the multistep process was more time and resource intensive than simpler methods of soliciting community feedback, it was effective in generating focused and relevant data upon which local stakeholders could take immediate action. As such, the time invested in the process was highly worthwhile.

Dissemination Process

The dissemination process targeted all of the disparate stakeholder groups that provided input into the citizen review process. Mayors were informed about the dissemination strategy and asked to participate. The information conveyed during the dissemination process ostensibly accurately reflected respondents' opinions, as throughout the process respondents did not dispute the survey results or publicly contradict them.

Apart from the presentation of main findings and action areas in meetings as part of the dissemination process, it also would have been helpful to include questions that asked for an explanation of the results. While such questions would naturally be slightly different in each municipality and would follow the natural flow of discussion, they should be standardized to the extent possible in order to allow for comparison. However, not all the questions should be predetermined. Rather,

public meetings to discuss findings should allow ample space for respondents to express themselves, articulate their areas of interest, and fully react to the information presented. It is of note that none of the 39 respondents mentioned the Association of Cities and Municipalities as a potential forum for sharing experiences and replicating good practices.

Appendix 1: Methodology

The Citizen Review of Service Delivery and Local Governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina was conducted from August 2006 to February 2007 by a local research firm, PRISM Research, with assistance from the World Bank. The methodology combined the use of community scorecards (CSCs) with a citizen report card (CRC). CSCs capture qualitative information through focus group discussions with a range of stakeholders. In contrast, CRCs capture quantitative information through household surveys built around specific indicators. In this exercise, qualitative findings from the CSC exercise were fed into the design of the CRC, which took the form of a household survey questionnaire. The findings of the CRC were then discussed with four stakeholder groups in representative municipalities in which the CRC was implemented. The aim throughout the process was to ensure both active citizen input into the design of the survey methodology itself and the triangulation of survey data with feedback from stakeholder groups following the survey. A related supply-side assessment was initiated at the same time by PRISM Research to capture key financial data for each municipality surveyed, thus setting the survey within the context of the broader resource constraints faced by each of the selected municipalities. The sections below give more detail on the component parts of the project methodology.

Step 1: Qualitative Research Using Community Scorecards

The project team developed and conducted the CSCs in four municipalities during August and September 2006. Information was collected from citizens, civil society organizations, local government, community representatives, and local service providers using focus group discussions, complemented by face-to-face, in-depth interviews in which 122 individuals participated. The qualitative assessment helped to generate indicators that were later incorporated into the CRC exercise, as well as to begin feeding back the findings of the exercise to participating local governments and communities to seek their views about the validity of the information.

A sample of four underdeveloped municipalities was chosen to participate in the scorecard based on a number of attributes: less and more affected by the war, less and more developed, rural or urban, and with and without experience with nontransparent authority. The scope of the CSC was limited to local roads, day-care centers, waste collection, and local governance (satisfaction with local governance, transparency, voice in decision making, responsiveness, and access to information). One specific service was chosen per municipality. Each service was financed by the municipal government.

A set of criteria was used to allow equal representation of urban and rural areas, genders, age groups, and education. Private sector representatives were included in each user group (except in Gorazde where the issue addressed was a day-care center). The main criterion for selecting participants for the service provider focus groups was their role in service provision. For each service, it was important to include local government representatives (legislative and executive) as well as direct service providers.

Three focus groups were organized in each municipality. The first group was comprised of participants representing the following stakeholder groups: service providers, public officials, and local authorities. The second group included citizens, civil society organizations, and community representatives. The term "providers" was used in the report when referring to the first population, and "users" for the second. The third group, called an "interface meeting," provided the most comprehensive and precise information about the service because all stakeholders were involved in the discussion.

Four municipalities and services were selected: Donji Vakuf—public administration, Knezevo/Skender Vakuf—road construction and maintenance, Derventa—waste collection and removal, and Gorazde—preschool education/kindergarten. Each municipality used a different guide for the focus group discussion, but they were structured similarly to provide a consistent format for collecting information. The guide for the two groups (users and providers) in each municipality was the same in structure and included the same questions to investigate the perceptions of both groups.

Toward the conclusion of each focus group, participants were asked to suggest indicators that could be used to measure the quality of the service. The users scored indicators generated by providers. Once they had agreed on the significance of a specific indicator, group participants scored the current situation in their municipality on a scale from 1 to 5 for each indicator, in which 1 meant "poor quality" and 5 meant "very good quality." Throughout the exercise, it became evident that participants tended to think first about the features of a service that were in need of most improvement.

During the research, citizens expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to participate in the discussions. For example, in Knezevo, both providers and users came to an agreement that this approach might be applied when making decisions about municipal budget priorities. In Gorazde, parents and kindergarten workers agreed to make a joint request to the local authority for increased resources for the kindergarten.

A total of 18 in-depth interviews were used to obtain additional information about the services. Interviews were also used when a person who had pertinent information about the service could not participate in the group discussion. In some municipalities, the issue was well-investigated in the focus groups, and that information was simply confirmed by the in-depth interviews.

During the research, the team faced the challenge of a very broad spectrum of information given by participants. This was mainly the result of the size of the unit of research: a municipality. This means that the causes of problems related to services often vary considerably in different parts of any one municipality, as well as in terms of service delivery outcomes.

Another factor that affected the implementation of the research was timing. The research was conducted during the general election campaign for the higher levels of government in BiH (cantonal, entity, and state). Participants frequently pointed out problems unrelated to the municipal level of government or local service provision. The election campaign apparently stimulated participants to think about general issues and problems that are not under municipal jurisdiction. Both providers and users recognized that much of the cause for local problems lies in the functioning of the higher levels of government (cantonal in FBiH, entity, and [to a lesser degree] state). This was a common theme throughout the implementation of the CSC because citizens perceive municipalities as the closest power level to them and tend to convey their dissatisfaction to local representatives on issues that municipalities cannot influence.

The findings and lessons learned from the CSC process were built into the design of the CRC. The citizens' qualitative knowledge expressed in focus groups served as the basis for the development of indicators used in the CRC survey. Each indicator reflected those aspects of service most relevant to citizens. For example, citizens suggested that the question as to whether there was an asphalt road in their town would not be sufficient. A better question would be: "How many kilometers of asphalt roads are there in your town?" The questionnaire was revised accordingly and set the stage for the next step in the project methodology.

Step 2: Quantitative Research Using Citizen Report Cards

The CRC comprised a household survey and a subsequent series of stakeholder feedback meetings. The survey was implemented from December 2006 to February 2007. First, drawing on the results of the community scorecard exercise, the team developed and tested a public survey questionnaire covering the main services devolved to local government, as well as issues of public participation, access to information, rule of law, and accountability.

For service provision, the CRC focused on access/usage, quality/reliability, incidence of problems, responsiveness of service providers, and citizens' suggestions for improvements. On local governance, it covered voice, accountability, political stability, public security, government effectiveness, regulatory burden, rule of law, and corruption (see the final questionnaire in appendix 5).

The survey was conducted in 20 municipalities throughout BiH that were identified as representing a broad variation in service delivery and local governance across both entities, as well as urban and rural areas. The first 15 municipalities were selected in two components (9 + 6) randomly across three per-capita municipal revenue strata in 2005 within FBiH and RS, respectively. The strata measures served as a proxy for fiscal capacity and expenditure levels.[12] In addition, two municipalities were selected within Sarajevo and Eastern Sarajevo. Finally, the study also selected the municipalities associated with three of the largest cities outside of Sarajevo: Banja Luka, Mostar, and Tuzla.

About 100 households were interviewed in each of the 20 municipalities, for a total of 1,997 households. Appendix table 1.1 shows the distribution of these 1,997 households among the municipality characteristics (rural versus urban, revenue level, and population).

Intramunicipality sampling was based on settlement clusters. In each of the 20 municipalities, settlements were selected through random-number generation. On average, 17 settlements were selected per municipality for inclusion in the sample. On average, six interviews were conducted in each settlement, for a total of 343 settlements and 1,997 interviews. Data collection used face-to-face interviews in the respondents' household. Households were selected using a random walk technique to ensure equal representation of all types of households.

Two criteria were used for respondent selection. First, the person in the household that provided information was the head of household, spouse, or other person who takes care of the household

---

12. The samples for FBiH (n=9) and RS (n=6) were chosen according to each entity's approximate population shares of the country's population, while allowing an integer number of municipalities to be selected per income strata. The sample did not include any of the 12 municipalities out of the 142 total municipalities in the country that have fewer than 2,500 inhabitants.

Appendix Table 1.1. Distribution of Citizen Report Card Survey Respondents

	Total n	Total %	FBiH n	RS n
Type of settlement				
Rural	972	49	552	420
Urban	1,025	51	646	379
Per-capita municipal revenue in 2005				
100–200 KM	499	25	299	200
201–300 KM	600	30	300	300
301 KM and greater	898	45	599	299
Municipal population				
2,500–12,500	600	30	200	400
12,501–25,000	599	30	399	200
25,001 and greater	798	40	599	199

Source: PRISM Research.
Note: KM = Convertible mark (konvertibilna marka).

or represents the household in public. The second criterion was "familiarity with the issue." At the beginning of each topic, interviewers asked to speak with the person who was best informed about that topic. About two-thirds (67 percent) of citizens who were contacted agreed to participate in the survey. Each interview lasted 40 minutes on average. Appendix table 1.2 shows the distribution of the 1,997 households in terms of household size and income, and respondent gender and age.

Appendix Table 1.2. Citizen Report Card Survey Household and Respondent Characteristics

	Total n	Total %
Size of Household		
1–2	773	38
3–4	870	44
>4	354	18
Monthly Household Income		
< 300 KM	693	35
301–700 KM	520	26
> 700 KM	395	20
NA	389	19
Respondent Gender		
Female	893	45
Male	1,104	55
Respondent Age		
< 30	313	16
31–45	481	24
46–60	624	31
> 60	579	29

Source: PRISM Research.
Note: KM = Convertible mark (konvertibilna marka). NA = Not applicable.

The survey instrument was mainly designed in the form of a close-ended questionnaire, with some open-ended questions. The questionnaire was divided into three sections: (i) public services (123 questions), (ii) local governance (32 questions), and (iii) sociodemographic characteristics (16 questions). The first section covered services that are entirely or partially assigned to and provided by local government. The second section dealt with citizens' participation in, and perceptions of, local governance. The first section is drawn from very objective and measurable indicators (i.e. distance, presence of facilities, and so on). The second section, in contrast, is more subjective and based on citizen perceptions.

Data analysis was based on a few analytical assumptions. The main survey hypotheses were based on assumptions that the type of settlement, entity, population size, and municipal per-capita revenue would influence variation in the quality of service delivery and local governance across municipalities. In addition, respondent gender, age, and education were seen as important predictors when it came to variations in perception of, and participation in, local governance. Statistical significance and strength of relationships between variables were tested using (i) Pearson's chi-square test, (ii) correlation coefficients, and (iii) standardized regression coefficients.

Upon completion of the household survey, the findings, together with ratings of services and governance, were summarized in an intermediate report. By presenting the aggregate results for all 20 municipalities and no municipality-specific data, the intermediate report provided an analysis of the citizens' general feedback on local governance and social delivery.

Step 3: Feedback Meetings with Stakeholders

The final phase of the CRC aimed at supporting dialogue and responses from the key local actors on the findings of the public survey in order to jointly identify underlying factors related to how citizens perceive key performance indicators of local governance and service delivery. It also aimed to generate mutually agreed upon strategies and actions to improve those indicators.

The intermediate report was presented to stakeholders at a dissemination workshop held in Sarajevo in March 2007. The objective of this workshop was to gather initial feedback on the citizen review from local officials. The workshop brought together 100 participants: 20 were local officials from the municipalities that were surveyed in the report, and 59 were mayors of the poorest municipalities in BiH, which are included in the Bank's Community Development Project in BiH. The remaining 21 participants were representatives of the donor community, entity and national governments, civil society, and the World Bank. The feedback from local officials was the first step in the dialogue.

Following the dissemination workshop, individual meetings with stakeholders were organized in selected municipalities. The municipality-specific findings were disseminated to local government

Appendix Table 1.3. Sample Municipalities for Stakeholder Feedback

Population	Annual municipal per capita revenue		
	KM 100–KM 199	KM 200–KM 299	KM 300 and more
2,500–15,000	Ribnik (RS)	Ljubinje (RS)	
15,000–25,000	Buzim (FBiH)	Breza (FBiH)	Visegrad (RS)
> 25,000		Zvornik (RS)	Ilidza (FBiH)

Source: PRISM Research.
Note: RS = Republika Srpska. FBiH = Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

representatives and service providers, enabling them to focus on their respective areas of responsibility and anticipate issues prior to face-to-face meetings with the project team. The team developed guidelines for stakeholder meetings, which explained the intention to seek stakeholders' opinions about recommendations for possible improvements in local governance and provision of public services. The results were presented in a way to allow comparison of the respondent's municipality to other BiH municipalities and the average of all 20 municipalities in which the CRC was implemented. The entire process took two weeks, with a total of 39 individuals being interviewed.

The findings presented for a municipality ranged from explanations of results to recommendations, risks, and the time line necessary for reform. The team piloted the dissemination process in the municipality of Ilidza. The dissemination process was then revised. The team contacted the key local stakeholders to discuss their availability to participate in interviews and focus group discussions. During the interviews and focus groups, the project team asked for stakeholders' opinions about the underlying factors that might explain the preliminary research findings and for their ideas on how to improve service delivery and local governance in their municipality.

The detailed municipal findings were presented in stakeholder meetings in seven of 20 municipalities. These municipalities represented different sample clusters defined using two variables: population size and municipal per-capita revenue. Balance between the two entities, as well as between poorest and richest municipalities, were also taken into account. When there was more than one municipality in a cluster, random numbers were used to select the municipality. Annex table 1.3 lists the municipalities selected for stakeholder feedback meetings and compares their population sizes and per-capita revenue levels.

The target audience for the stakeholders' meetings comprised different service providers and local government representatives such as the municipal council president, councilors, representatives of MZs, and the heads of the following departments: finance and economy, development and investments, communal and housing, urban planning, and public affairs. For the sake of respondents' confidentiality, neither the list of people interviewed in each municipality nor their specific functions are provided.

Appendix 2: Municipalities in the CSC

Donji Vakuf (local governance)

Donji Vakuf is located on the road that links large trading zones in central Bosnia (the Vitez municipality) with the Bosanska Krajina region and Croatia. This regional road passes through the center of the urban zone of the municipality. Although there is a lot of transport and passenger vehicle traffic through the town, few vehicles stop in town given its appearance

Despite the fact that one of the loveliest rivers in BiH flows through the center of town, due to lack of maintenance and tourism facilities, Donji Vakuf does not add anything to its gross domestic product through tourism. The local government is investing a lot into Ajvatovica, a traditional pilgrimage site for many Bosnian Muslims. Ignoring Donji Vakuf's natural beauty as a potential basis for tourism in favor of religious tourism that lasts only a few days a year is typical of the short-range planning at the local level. Traditional religious gatherings in Donji Vakuf serve as opportunities to attract votes for parties that seek citizen loyalty through religious affiliation and ethnic identity. Finally, the focus of the local administration on the parts of the municipality where this event takes place is at the expense of other areas. This creates a sense of rivalry among citizens and damages social cohesion despite the fact that they are predominantly members of the same religious and ethnic group.

Besides the events related to Ajvatovica that last only a few days a year, Donji Vakuf is rarely mentioned in the national media. For the past year the main news from Donji Vakuf has been about the poorly conducted process of privatizing state companies that did not provide any development or employment. Little remains of the strong prewar logging industry that could have led to prosperity and new jobs.

The budget of Donji Vakuf in 2005 totaled about 1.7 million KM (information from focus group participants) or 130 KM per capita based on the approximate population of 13,000.

Knezevo (local roads)

Knezevo[13] is in RS, 50 kilometers southeast of Banja Luka. At an elevation of about 900 meters (Vlasic mountain hillside), it is covered with deciduous and coniferous trees. Its population of around 13,800 mainly inhabits the rural part of the municipality (75 percent). Livestock farming is its main economic activity. The urban population mainly works in local administration, public companies, and retail. Before the war, there were 60,000 sheep in the municipality. In the last 15 years, the number has decreased to 8,000. Milk production is an important source of income. Income from cheese production is stagnant because of nonstandardized production. Oat cultivation had accounted for a big portion of the municipality's output before the war, but no longer exists. Knezevo has significant potential for winter tourism because of its high altitude. It might have become the place where Banja Luka's residents could escape to enjoy the countryside, as respondents emphasized during the focus group discussions. Currently, there is no organized tourism in Knezevo.

Knezevo's geography and position as a border region during the war have isolated it from the rest of the country. Discussants emphasized this as one of main reasons for the entity politicians' policy of extracting resources, including timber. This tension is reflected by the administration and citizens when they say: "We must go to them (to Banja Luka), and they do not have to come here."

Knezevo has huge problems with water supply, sewerage, waste disposal, and local road maintenance. The municipal budget has accumulated a huge debt because there are no significant water wells; all the water is pumped from the Cvrcka River, which requires a good deal of electricity. A big proportion (60 percent) of the water that is pumped is lost due to old infrastructure. The sewerage system is also old and is a threat to the environment. Local roads are an issue because remote villages are difficult and expensive to reach.

Derventa (waste collection)

Derventa is located in northern RS. To its north is the Sava River that forms a 10-kilometer-long border with Croatia. Derventa has a total area of 517 square kilometers. Before the last war (1992–1995), the 57 villages and the city of Derventa had a population of 57,000, but today it is approximately 30,000.

Most of the municipality was affected by the war and there were many victims and extreme physical devastation. Direct attacks damaged or destroyed most apartment buildings and houses,

---

13. Skender Vakuf is another name for the municipality mainly used by Bosniaks. This report uses Knezevo because the majority of the population uses this name.

industrial equipment, processing facilities, the textile industry and agricultural production. According to incomplete data, the material losses were estimated at more than $500 million.

At the end of the war, sanitation of buildings and infrastructure that were most pertinent to reestablishing vital community services was restarted with modest local resources. With donor assistance, part of the piped water supply system, the electricity and telephone systems, school buildings, kindergartens, health clinics, and most local and intercity roads were repaired. Some industrial production was also restored.

In Derventa, 60 percent of prewar industrial capacity and production was used for exports. Significant production, with good road and communication infrastructure and skilled human capital provide the foundation of Derventa's renewal and development. Private and state agriculture also represents a vital foundation for economic development. Additional investment in crop production, stock feed production, seed processing, livestock, milk processing, and meat production and processing could significantly increase the level of production as the preconditions exist and the market is assured. Derventa's location and natural features provide significant potential for the development of hunting and rural tourism. The entire territory is rich in lowland game, while the area of Motajice is well-known for its deer. The clear and unpolluted Ukrina River that flows through Derventa is rich in fish and is a popular picnic spot.

Gorazde (day-care centers)

Gorazde is a city and municipality in eastern Bosnia and Herzegovina on the Drina River. It is the administrative center of Podrnje canton, the smallest canton in the FBiH. There are about 25,000 citizens in Gorazde, of which 70 percent live in rural areas. Having determined that development of a modern local administration is one of its priorities, there have been a number of improvements in the work of public officials and local authorities. This was confirmed by both citizens and government officials.

Appendix 3:
Focus Group Participants

Municipality	Providers	Users	Interface Meeting
Donji Vakuf (local governance)	• President of the municipal assembly • Councilor • Head of the department for communal services • Two MZ council presidents • Head of the social activities department • Secretary of the municipal assembly	• NGO representative • Small enterprise owner • President of the parents' council in the elementary school • Five citizens	• Small enterprise owner • President of the parents' council in the elementary school • Three citizens • Secretary of the municipal assembly • Head of the social activities department • Two MZ council presidents
Knezevo (local roads)	• Director of the communal utility company • Communal inspector • Head of the department for finances • Head of the department for communal services • Urban officer • MZ council president • Councilor • Secretary of the municipal assembly	• Two NGO representatives • President of the employers' association • Medium-size enterprise owner • Director of the elementary school • Two citizens	• Councilor • Head of the department for communal services • Director of the communal utility company • NGO representative • Medium-size enterprise owner • Director of the elementary school • Citizen
Derventa (trash collection)	• Head of the waste removal unit in the communal utility company • Head of the department for communal services • Head of the inspection department • Communal services officer • MZ council president • Councilor • Director of the communal utility company	• Two NGO representatives • Director of the secondary school • Small enterprise owner • Four citizens	• Head of the inspection department • Director of the communal utility company • Communal services officer • MZ council president • NGO representative • Small enterprise owner • Two citizens

(continued)

Municipality	Providers	Users	Interface Meeting
Gorazde (day-care centers)	• Director of the day-care center • Two caregivers • Deputy mayor • Head of the department for finances and economy • Two councilors • MZ council president	• Five parents • NGO representative	• Three parents • MZ council president • Director of the day-care center • Two caregivers • Councilor • Deputy mayor

Note: MZ = nongovernmental organization. NGO = neighborhood committee (mjesne zajednice).

Appendix 4: In-depth Interview Participants

Groups	Municipality				
	Donji Vakuf	Derventa	Knezevo	Gorazde	Total
Citizens	1	3	2	0	6
Citizens associations, NGOs	2	1	1	0	4
Neighborhood Councils	1	0	1	0	2
Small and medium enterprises	2	0	1	0	3
Municipality representatives	0	1	1	0	2
Director of SOS Kinderdorf	0	0	0	1	1
Total	6	5	6	1	18

Appendix 5: Household Survey Questionnaire

Prism Research/Social Audit of Local Governance/ Final Questionnaire/Dec. 7, 2006

INTERVIEW ID				

INTERVIEW DATE				

INTERVIEWER CODE				

SUPERVISOR CODE				

REGION	

SETTLEMENT TYPE (1—URBAN 2—RURAL)	

ENTITY	
MUNICIPALITY	
STREET, NUMBER	
CONTACT LIST CODE	

FIELDWORK CONTROL	
CONSISTENCY CONTROL	
CODING	
DATA ENTRY	
DATA ENTRY INTERVIEW CODE	
CONTROL OF OPERATORS	

(continued)

Type	Consistency control	Operator's note
# of questions missing the answer		
# of inappropriate filters		
# of questions with incorrectly written answers		
# of questions missing the answer under "Other" where it was appropriate		

READ ALOUD: Good day/evening. My name is _____ **(state your full name)** and I am working as an interviewer for Prism Research. We are currently conducting a large survey about local government and public services in cooperation with the World Bank. The survey will provide information about the work of local government, its relationship with citizens, as well as the quality of public services in you municipality. The survey findings will be used for the improvement of the relationship between the local government and citizens and public services as well.

May I speak with the person who is the head of the household?

Prism Research, in accordance with ESOMAR and AAPOR rules and regulations is obliged to protect your anonymity. All questions that contain any type of information about the identity of respondents are removed from the report and the final database. This means that the answers given by you are physically separate to data that relate to your identity.

I have to let you know that our conversation might last for about 40 minutes. If you feel that you cannot answer some questions for any reason, let me know directly. If I talk too fast or too slow, or if you do not understand a question, stop me and ask me to explain.

Do you have any questions at this point?

A1. Number of persons who refused to participate in the survey between the last completed interview and this one:	

TIME STARTED		
	H	M

HOUSEHOLD DEMOGRAPHY

To begin with, I would like to ask some general questions about you and your household.

TABLE H1. Please enumerate all people, ages 16 and older, who are members of your household (that is, who currently live in the house-hold). For each of them state age, gender, education, and employment status.

No.	Name	Age	Gender	Relation to the head of the household	Brings income	Highest level of education completed	Current employment status	Only if employed: Is she or he registered for social security?
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
7		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
8		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
9		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
10		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
		Completed years	1–Male 2–Female	1–Head of household 2–Spouse 3–Son/Daughter 4–Mother/Father 5–Son-in-law, brother-in-law/ daughter-in-law, sister-in-law 6–Grandson/ Granddaughter 7–Relative 8–Other 9–No answer	1–Yes 2–No 9–No answer	1–No education 2–Elementary 3–Secondary, 3 grades 4–Secondary, 4 grades 5–Tertiary education, 2 years 6–University degree, 4–6 years 7–Master's/PhD 9–No answer	1–Self employed in farming—livestock and agriculture 2–Self employed in own business or professional activity unrelated to farming 3–Intermittently employed or works from time to time 4–Permanently employed—state or public sector 5–Permanently employed—private sector 6–Unemployed—seeking employment in the past month 7–Unemployed—not seeking employment in the past month 8–Pensioner 9–Student 10–Unfit or of limited fitness for work 11–Other 99–No answer, refused	1–Yes 2–No 9–No answer

IF RESPONDENT IS EMPLOYED:

V1. Where is your workplace located?

1 In my municipality
2 In other municipality; specify:

V2. What is your average commuting time to work?

Write down number of minutes:

The following questions are related to your experience of public service usage. We will begin with the topic of housing conditions followed by local roads, solid waste removal, education, and a number of other issues.

HOUSING CONDITIONS

V3. What is the main construction type of the dwelling?
(to be filled by interviewer based on own observation)

1 Multifamily residential building 1
2 Individual house 2
3 Prefabricated building 3
4 Other 4

V4. How long have you been living in this house/apartment?

Write down number of years:

V5. In case you have changed your place of living, what was the reason you moved to your current place?

1 War 1
2 Property occupied 2
3 Property devastated 3
4 Security 4
5 Better living conditions 5
6 Family reasons 6
7 Job 7
8 Other 8
97 Have not moved 97
99 No answer 99

V6. Which one of the listed statuses best describes your current status in your current house/apartment?

1 Permanent residence with no moving during war 1
2 Permanent residence, displaced person 2
3 Permanent residence, refugee/returnee 3
4 Temporary residence, displaced person 4
5 Temporary residence, refugee/returnee 5
6 Temporary residence, other 6
9 No answer 9

V7. What is the legal status of use of this building?

1 Own 1
2 State or municipality rented 2
3 Private person rented 3
4 Temporary user/Emergency shelter 4
5 Other 5

V8. Does any member of the household have a title or other legal document showing ownership of this dwelling?

1 Yes 1
2 No 2
9 No answer 9

V9. What is the area of this dwelling in square meters?

Write down number of sqm:

LOCAL ROADS

May I speak with the person who has the most information about local roads? Are you that person?

Before I start the section about local roads, I would like to give you the definition of local roads that we want you to have in mind: Local roads are all those roads in your neighborhood that your household uses.

V10. Please write down the code number of household member *who has the most information* about local roads.

Household member code (TABLE H1, column 1):

V11. Please write down the code number of household member *who will provide information* about local roads.

Household member code (TABLE H1, column 1):

V12. What is the type of the road that connects your household with other parts of the village/city?

1 Asphalt ▶ V14 1
2 Brick 2
3 Cement 3
4 Stone/Slab 4
5 Clay 5

V13. What is the distance of the nearest asphalted road from your house?

Write down the number of meters: ▶ V15

V14. What portion of the road that connects your household with the main road is asphalted?

1 100 percent 1
2 Two-thirds 2
3 One-half 3
4 One-third 4
5 Less than one-third 5

V15. Has there been any construction of new roads in your neighborhood during the past year?

1 Yes 1
2 No 2

V16. Has there been any repair of old roads in your neighborhood during the past year?

1 Yes 1
2 No 2

V17. Has there been any involvement of the community in your neighborhood in the construction or maintenance of local roads?

1 Yes 1
2 No ▶ V19 2
8 Don't know ▶ V19 8

V18. What is the type of involvement of the community?
(multiple responses possible)

a.	
b.	
c.	

(continued)

V19. Who maintains the roads in your neighborhood/community?
(multiple responses possible)

1	Public utility company	1
2	Citizens	2
3	Specialized private company	3
4	Nonspecialized private company	4
5	None	5
8	Don't know	8

V20. Is there incidence of water logging or deterioration of the local roads during heavy rains?

1	Yes	1
2	No	2

V21. What is the frequency of the cleaning of roads in your neighborhood?

1	Daily	1
2	Weekly	2
3	Bimonthly	3
4	Once a month	4
5	Less than once a month	5
6	Never cleaned	6
8	Don't know	8

V22. How regular is the winter cleaning of roads?

1	Always when needed ▶V25	1
2	Less regularly than it is needed	2
3	Totally irregular	3
8	Don't know	8

V23. What consequences do you face when the roads are not cleared during winter? **(multiple responses possible)**

1	Cannot go to work	1
2	Children cannot go to school	2
3	Do not get proper foodstuffs	3
4	Do not get any medical treatment if necessary	4
5	Does not affect life	5
6	Other:	6

V24. Please tell me how many days your village/settlement was cut off due to snowfalls last year?

Write down number of days: ☐

V25. Who does the winter maintenance of the roads?
(multiple responses possible)

1	Public utility company	1
2	Citizens	2
3	Specialized private company	3
4	Nonspecialized private company	4
5	None	5
8	Don't know	8

V26. Are you (1) very unsatisfied, (2) unsatisfied, (3) satisfied, or (4) very satisfied with the following aspects of the services related to local roads?

INTERVIEWER: HELP RESPONDENTS. EXPLAIN HOW TO USE THE SCALE!

		Very unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Don't know/ Without experience
a	Road fixing	1	2	3	4	8
b	Cleanliness of roads in your neighborhood	1	2	3	4	8
c	Care and action taken during water logging and other problems	1	2	3	4	8
d	Local government responsiveness to complaints	1	2	3	4	8
e	Care and action taken during winter	1	2	3	4	8

V27. What suggestions do you have for improving the quality of service provided by the municipality/corporation in local roads?
(multiple responses possible)

a.	
b.	
c.	

V28. What has been the biggest problem regarding the local roads in your neighborhood in the past year? (Single response)

97	No problem	97
99	No answer	99

TRANSPORT

V29. What means of transport do you or your family members use at least once a week? **(multiple responses possible)**

1	Private vehicle	1
2	Public transport (for example, bus, minibus)	2
3	Bus/Minibus (privately organized)	3
4	Bicycle	4
5	Motorcycle	5
6	Taxi	6
7	Other:	7

99	No answer	99

V30. Are there any obstacles to using public transport (for example, bus) for you or other household members?

1	Yes	▶V31	1
2	No	▶V32	2
3	We don't need the service	▶V33	3

(continued)

V31. What type of problems do you incur?
(multiple responses possible)

1	Service not provided	**1**
2	Distance to stop	**2**
3	Cost/not affordable	**3**
4	Infrequent service	**4**
5	Route does not go where we need to go	**5**
6	Other	**6**

8	Don't know	**7**

V32. How long does it take you to reach the nearest public transport?

Write down number of minutes: [   ]

WASTE REMOVAL

I will ask you now some questions about waste removal in your community. May I speak with the person who has the most information about waste collection in your neighborhood? Are you that person?

V33. Please write down the code number of household member who has the most information about the service.

Household member code (TABLE H1, column 1): [   ]

V34. Please write down the code number of household member *who will provide information* about the service.

Household member code (TABLE H1, column 1): [   ]

V35. Which of the following waste collection services do citizens from your neighborhood have access to?
(Read aloud; multiple responses possible)

1	Garbage cart picks up garbage (including disposal to street and garbage cart collection afterward)		**1**
2	Garbage dumpster near home		**2**
3	Garbage dumpster far from home		**3**
4	Garbage dumpster for selective waste disposable		**4**
5	None of these	▶ V37	**5**

V36. Which of the following waste collection services does *your household use?* **(multiple responses possible)**

1	Garbage cart picks up garbage (including disposal to street and garbage cart collection afterward)	▶ V38	**1**
2	Garbage dumpster near home	▶ V38	**2**
3	Garbage dumpster far from home	▶ V38	**3**
4	Garbage dumpster for selective waste disposable	▶ V38	**4**
5	None of these	▶ V38	**5**
9	No answer	▶ V38	**9**

V37. What are your current methods of household garbage disposal?
(Read aloud; multiple responses possible)

1	Burn	▶ V46	**1**
2	Bury	▶ V46	**2**
3	Dump in water body (pond, river, canal)	▶ V46	**3**
4	Dump in street	▶ V46	**4**
5	Dump in garden	▶ V46	**5**
6	Dump in empty plot of land	▶ V46	**6**
7	Municipality dump	▶ V46	**7**
8	Other	8	

	▶ V46	

V38. How far is it from your house to garbage dumpster/cart?

Write number of meters: [   ]

V39. Who does waste collection in your neighborhood?
(multiple responses possible)

1	Public utility company	**1**
2	Citizens	**2**
3	Specialized private company	**3**
4	Nonspecialized private company	**4**
5	None	**5**
8	Don't know	**8**

V40. How is the garbage collection schedule?

1	2 or more times per day	**1**
2	One time per day	**2**
3	Once every 2–3 days	**3**
4	Once a week	**4**
5	Once in two weeks	**5**
6	Once a month	**6**
7	Less frequently than that	**7**
8	Don't know	**8**

V41. Does this schedule respond to your family's needs?

1	Yes	**1**
2	No	**2**

V42. Does the garbage collection accord with the schedule?

1	Regular	**1**
2	Sometimes interrupted	**2**
3	Not at all	**3**
8	Don't know	**8**

(continued)

V43. Are you (1) very unsatisfied, (2) unsatisfied, (3) satisfied, or (4) very satisfied in respect of the following aspects of household garbage collection service?

		Very unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Don't know/ No experience
a	Distance from home to collection site	1	2	3	4	8
b	Number of garbage dumpsters	1	2	3	4	8
c	Sanitary condition of public garbage dumpsters	1	2	3	4	8
d	Regularity of dumping public garbage dumpsters	1	2	3	4	8
e	Neatness	1	2	3	4	8
f	Location where garbage is collected from garbage carts/dumpsters? (for example, too close to house, smells bad, and so on)	1	2	3	4	8
g	Citizens' behavior	1	2	3	4	8

V44. What actions do you feel need to be taken to improve garbage collection service? **(multiple responses possible)**

a.	
b.	
c.	

998   Don't know   **998**

V45. What has been the biggest problem regarding the waste removal in your neighborhood in the past year?
(Single response)
AFTER THIS QUESTION GO TO ▶ V49.

97   No problem   ▶ V49   **97**
98   No answer   ▶ V49   **98**

V46. Have you, or has someone within your household, made a request to have garbage collection services in your neighborhood?

1   Yes   ▶ V47   **1**
2   No   ▶ V48   **2**
8   Don't know   ▶ V48   **8**

V47. To whom?

1   Relevant service provider   **1**
2   Municipality agencies   **2**
3   MZ council   **3**
4   Municipal assembly   **4**
5   Someone else: **5**

8   Don't know   **98**

V48. Why have you still not gotten garbage collection services in your area? **(Read aloud; multiple responses possible)**

1   Alley inaccessible for garbage carts   **1**
2   Requested and waiting response   **2**
3   This area not serviced   **3**
4   Don't want to pay for it   **4**
5   Don't know where to make request   **5**
6   Monthly cost too expensive   **6**
7   Too busy to make request   **7**
8   Something else   **8**

99   No answer   **99**

WATER SUPPLY

I will ask you now some questions about water supply and sanitation. May I speak with the person who has the most information about this service? Are you that person?

V49. Please write down the code number of household member *who has the most information* about the service.

        Household member code (TABLE H1, column 1): [ ]

V50. Please write down the code number of household member *who will provide information* about the service.

        Household member code (TABLE H1, column 1): [ ]

V51. What is the source of drinking water used in your household?

1   Running water within house/unit (public water pipe)   **1**
2   Running water on property (public water pipe)   **2**
3   Running water from local water pipe   **3**
4   River, stream, spring   **4**
5   Other   **5**

V52. (IF REPLY ABOVE WAS NOT "1") Please tell the reasons why you do not have a public line of water supply in your house?

1   It is unaffordable.   **1**
2   We do not have such kind of services.   **2**
3   There is no need.   **3**
4   Other   **4**

8   Don't know   **8**

V53. How far is the water source away from your house (dwelling unit)?

         Write number of meters: [ ]

V54. To which extent does the water supply system in your house/apartment need maintenance?

1   Needs intensive and urgent maintenance   **1**
2   Needs maintenance   **2**
3   Neither nor   **3**
4   Does not need   **4**
9   No answer   **9**

V55. On average, how many hours a day did your household receive water during the past month?

         Write number of meters: [ ]

V56. Do you have any of these problems with water supply? **(multiple responses possible)**

1	Poor quality	1
2	Unexpected interruptions	2
3	Physical conditions of pipes	3
4	Too far/inconvenient to fetch	4
5	Other	5

97	No problems PROPER SKIPPING PATTERN	6

V57. How frequently do you face such problems?

1	Several times a day	1
2	Several times a week	2
3	Several times within a month	3
4	Several times within a year	4
5	Less than once a year	5
9	No answer	6

V58. Is there a meter measuring the volume of utilized water in your house/apartment?

1	Yes	1
2	No	2

SANITATION

V59. Is your household connected to a sewer or sanitation system?

1	Yes, public sewers	1
2	Yes, septic tank	2
3	No, latrine/outhouse only	3
4	Other	4

9	No answer	9

V60. Please tell me the reasons why your household is not linked to the public sewerage system?

1	System is unaffordable.	1
2	We do not have such services.	2
3	There is no need.	3
4	Other	4

9	No answer	9

V61. In your opinion, to what extent does the sewerage system in your household need maintenance?

1	Needs intensive and urgent maintenance	1
2	Needs maintenance	2
3	Neither nor	3
4	Does not need	4
9	No answer	9

V62. Does your household face problems concerning the sewerage system?

1	Yes	1
2	No	2

V63. Could you explain what kind of problems you face with the sewerage system? (multiple responses possible)

1	Regular obstruction of pipes (backups)	1
2	Physically bad condition of pipes	2
3	Does not work at all	3
4	Smells	4
5	Other	5

9	No answer	9

HEATING OF HOUSEHOLD

I will ask you now some questions about heating in your household. May I speak with the person who has the most information about this service? Are you that person?

V64. *Please write down the code number of household member who has the most information about the service.*

Household member code (TABLE H1, column 1):

V65. *Please write down the code number of household member who will provide information about the service.*

Household member code (TABLE H1, column 1):

V66. What is the main source of heating for your household?

1	District heating by utility	1
2	Own central heating system (multiunit housing)	2
3	Own heating device	3
4	Other	4

9	No answer	9

V67. What is the main type of energy used for heating?

1	Electric oven	1
2	Gas from networks	2
3	Gas furnace	3
4	Coal, firewood, other solid fuels	4
5	Black or heating oil, other liquids	5
6	Other	6

V68. How regularly is your household heated during winter months?

1	Regularly (according to schedule)	1
2	Irregularly	2
3	Practically it is not supplied	3

V69. In your opinion, to what extent does the heating system in your house/apartment need maintenance?

1	Needs intensive and urgent maintenance	1
2	Needs maintenance	2
3	Does not need	4

V70. Do you have any problems concerning the heat supply (for district heating or gas supply)?

1	Yes	1
2	No	2

V71. What kind of problems does your household face in regard to heat supply?

1	Irregular heat supply (district heating)	1
2	Irregular gas supply	2
3	Physical condition of heating system	3
4	Insufficient capacity of heat	4
5	Other:	5

ELECTRICITY

I will ask you now some questions about electricity. May I speak with the person who has the most information about this service? Are you that person?

V72. Please write down the code number of household member *who has the most information* about the service.

Household member code (TABLE H1, column 1):

V73. Please write down the code number of household member *who will provide information* about the service.

Household member code (TABLE H1, column 1):

V74. Is your household connected to the electricity network?

1	Yes	1
2	No	2

V75. In your opinion, how strongly does the electricity supply system of your household need to be maintained?

1	Needs intensive and urgent maintenance	1
2	Needs maintenance	2
3	Does not need	4

V76. Does your household face problems concerning electricity supply?

1	Yes	1
2	No	2

V77. Could you explain the kind of problems you face with electricity supply?

1	Irregular supply of electricity	1
2	Irregular voltage	2
3	Physical condition of electricity cables	3
4	Disconnection of electricity because of nonpayment	4
5	Other	5

V78. Over the past month, how many hours a day was electricity available?

Write number of hours:

V79. Is there a meter measuring the consumed electricity in your house/apartment unit?

1	Yes	1
2	No	2
9	No answer	9

HEALTH FACILITIES

I will ask you now some questions about health care. May I speak with the person who has the most information about this service? Are you that person?

V80. Please write down the code number of household member *who has the most information* about the service.

Household member code (TABLE H1, column 1):

V80. Please write down the code number of household member *who will provide information* about the service.

Household member code (TABLE H1, column 1):

	V82. Do the following facilities exist in your municipality?	**V83.** Do you or your household members use the following health facilities on a regular basis?	**V80.** If not, why is this so?
Private doctor			
Medical office (ambulance services)			
Health center/clinic			
Hospital			
Pharmacy			
	1–Yes 2–No 8–Don't know 9–Not stated	1–Yes 2–No 9–No answer	1–Cost of service 2–Too far from home 3–High cost of transport 4–Poor quality of service 5–Wait is too long 6–Do not need 7–Other

PRESCHOOL EDUCATION

Now, I am going to ask you a few questions about preschool education.

V85. Are there children under age of 15 in your household?

1	Yes	▶ V75	**1**
2	No	▶ V82	**2**

ONLY IF THERE ARE CHILDREN: May I speak with the person who is the most responsible for the children's education? Are you that person?

V86. Please write down the code number of household member *who is the most responsible* **for the children's education.**

Household member code (TABLE H1, column 1):

V87. Please write down the code number of household member *who will provide information* **about preschool education.**

Household member code (TABLE H1, column 1):

V88. How many children under the age of 6 live in your household?

Number of children under the age of 6:

IF V88=0, GO TO V93.

V89. How many of them are enrolled in the daycare center?

Number of children enrolled:

V90. IF V78>0, for example, IF AT LEAST ONE CHILD IS ENROLLED, what is gender of the child/children enrolled?

1	Male	**1**
2	Female	**2**
3	Both	**3**

V91. IF V78=0, for example, IF NONE OF THE CHILDREN ARE ENROLLED, what is the main reason why the child/children are not enrolled? (multiple responses possible)

1	There is no daycare center in the municipality.	**1**
2	Center is too far.	**2**
3	Cannot afford.	**3**
4	There is someone in the household who takes care of the child/children.	**4**
5	A person from another household takes care of the child/children.	**5**
6	There is no daycare service for his or her age in the daycare center.	**6**
8	Something else:	**8**

V92. What is the gender of the child/children not enrolled?

1	Male	**1**
2	Female	**2**
3	Male and female	**3**

EDUCATION

V93. How many children in the school (ages 6 to 15) do you have?
_____ IF 0 ▶**next section**

V94. Name of child	**V95.** What type of school? 1. Elementary 2. Not enrolled	**V96.** What is the school status? 1. Public 2. Private
	1 2	1 2
	1 2	1 2
	1 2	1 2
	1 2	1 2
	1 2	1 2

V97. What is the means of transportation used to go to school? **(multiple responses possible)** 1. By foot 4. Car 2. Bike 5. Public Transport 3. Motorcycle 6. Other _____	**V98.** How long does it take to travel from home to school?
1 2 3 4 5 6	└──┴──┴──┘ minutes
1 2 3 4 5 6	└──┴──┴──┘ minutes
1 2 3 4 5 6	└──┴──┴──┘ minutes
1 2 3 4 5 6	└──┴──┴──┘ minutes
1 2 3 4 5 6	└──┴──┴──┘ minutes

V99. For the kids attending PUBLIC school(s): How would you assess the following physical conditions of the school for each of your children (ages 6 to 15)?

USE THIS SCALE:
1 Very good
2 Fair
3 Poor condition
8 Don't know
9 Not available

		Child			
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**
a	Building in general				
b	Furniture				
c	Heating				
d	Sports/leisure facilities				
e	IT facilities				
f	Textbooks				
g	Sanitation facilities				

V100. To what extent are you satisfied with the following aspects of the school?

USE THIS SCALE:
1   Very unsatisfied
2   Unsatisfied
3   Satisfied
4   Very satisfied
8   Don't know

		Child			
		1	2	3	4
a	Quality of education				
b	Qualification of teachers				
c	Quality in taking care of children				
d	Responsiveness of administration to parents' needs and requests				

PROPER SKIPPING PATTERN

V101. For the kids attending PRIVATE school(s): How would you assess the following physical conditions of the school for each of your children (ages 6 to 15).

USE THIS SCALE:
1   Very good
2   Somewhat good
3   Poor condition
8   Don't know
9   Not available

		Child			
		1	2	3	4
a	Building in general				
b	Furniture				
c	Heating				
d	Sports/leisure facilities				
e	IT facilities				
f	Textbooks				
g	Sanitation facilities				

V102. To what extent are you satisfied with the following aspects of the school?

USE THIS SCALE:
1   Very unsatisfied
2   Unsatisfied
3   Satisfied
4   Very satisfied
8   Don't know

		Child			
		1	2	3	4
a	Quality of education				
b	Qualification of teachers				
c	Quality in taking care of children				
d	Responsiveness of administration to parents' needs and requests				

V103. What aspect of local public schools is most important to be improved in your municipality?

1	Condition of school building and equipment	**1**
2	Ability to reach school in reasonable time	**2**
3	The general quality of education	**3**
4	Teacher's attention toward students	**4**
5	Extracurricular activities	**5**
8	Other:	**8**

SERVICE DELIVERY (CONCLUDING SECTION)

May I speak again with the person who is head of household?

V104. Please write down the code number of the head of household.

Household member code (TABLE H1, column 1): _____

V105. Please write down the code number of household member *who will provide information.*

Household member code (TABLE H1, column 1): _____

V106. How regularly do you make payments for each of the kinds of services listed below?

		Each month	Once a quarter	2–3 times within a year	Once a year	Do not make payment
b	Garbage collection	1	2	3	4	8
c	Water supply	1	2	3	4	8
d	Sewerage	1	2	3	4	8
e	Heating	1	2	3	4	8
f	Gas	1	2	3	4	8
g	Building maintenance	1	2	3	4	8
j	Electricity	1	2	3	4	8

READ: Do you receive bills (notifications and so forth) for the kinds of services listed below, and do you find the billing process accurate and clear?

		V107. Receiving bill		**V108.** Clarity and accuracy of billing	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
b	Garbage collection	1	2	1	2
c	Water supply	1	2	1	2
d	Sewerage	1	2	1	2
e	Heating	1	2	1	2
f	Gas	1	2	1	2
g	Building maintenance	1	2	1	2
g	Electricity	1	2	1	2

READ: Please indicate the average amount that your family spent for each of the services named below last month and if you feel this amount is reasonable?

		V109. Amount (KM)	V110. Amount reasonable?		
			High	Reasonable	Low
a	Rent for apartment/house (if applicable)		1	2	3
b	Building maintenance		1	2	3
d	Waste collection		1	2	3
e	Water supply		1	2	3
f	Sewerage		1	2	3
g	Heating		1	2	3
b	Gas		1	2	3
c	Electricity		1	2	3
d	Private schools (if applicable)		1	2	3

V111. Please approximate what percentage of your monthly household income is spent on garbage collection, water supply, sewerage, heating, and electricity (not including expenses for health and education).

1	Less than 10% of income	1
2	11%–25% of income	2
3	26%–50%	3
4	51%–75%	4
5	More than 75%	5
8	Don't know	8

V112. To what extent are you satisfied with the local services delivery in your municipality? (1) Very unsatisfied, (2) Unsatisfied, (3) Satisfied, or (4) Very satisfied

		Very unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Don't know
a	Local roads	1	2	3	4	8
b	Solid waste collection	1	2	3	4	8
c	Public transport	1	2	3	4	8
d	Water supply	1	2	3	4	8
e	Sewerage	1	2	3	4	8
f	Electricity supply	1	2	3	4	8
g	Heating	1	2	3	4	8
h	Preschools (if applicable)	1	2	3	4	8
i	Public schools (if applicable)	1	2	3	4	8
j	Private schools (if applicable)	1	2	3	4	8
k	Public hospitals and health facilities	1	2	3	4	8
l	Private health facilities (if applicable)	1	2	3	4	8
m	Efforts of municipality to improve local business environment	1	2	3	4	8
n	Green areas (parks, playgrounds, public areas)	1	2	3	4	8
o	Cultural activities	1	2	3	4	8

V113. Has the quality of local public services improved in the past three years? (1) To large extent, (2) To small extent, (3) No change, (4) Worse

		To large extent	To small extent	No change	Worse	Don't know
a	Local roads	1	2	3	4	8
b	Solid waste collection	1	2	3	4	8
c	Public transport	1	2	3	4	8
d	Water supply	1	2	3	4	8
e	Sewerage	1	2	3	4	8
f	Electricity supply	1	2	3	4	8
g	Heating	1	2	3	4	8
h	Preschools	1	2	3	4	8
i	Public schools	1	2	3	4	8
k	Public hospitals and health facilities	1	2	3	4	8
m	Efforts of local government to improve business environment	1	2	3	4	8
n	Green areas (parks, playgrounds, public areas)	1	2	3	4	8
o	Cultural activities	1	2	3	4	8

V114. In your opinion, what are three main priorities in your municipality in terms of improving services delivery? Which of the following services deserve to be treated as (1) first priority, (2) second priority, and (3) third priority?

a	Local roads	
b	Solid waste collection	
c	Public transport	
d	Water supply	
e	Sewerage	
f	Electricity supply	
g	Heating	
h	Preschools	
i	Public schools	
k	Public hospitals and health facilities	
m	Efforts of local government to improve business environment	
n	Green areas (parks, playgrounds, public areas)	
o	Cultural activities and heritage (historic buildings)	

V115. For problems with the public services discussed, how do you find out the contact person to complain to? (multiple responses possible)

1	Housing/Communal service department	1
2	Public building manager	2
3	Service desk in the local government building	3
4	Notice board in the local government building	4
5	Notice board in your MZ	5
6	Notice board in other MZ	6
7	MZ council	7
8	Friend/Relative/Neighbor	8
9	Civil servants	9
10	Other	10

97	No experience	97
99	No answer	99

V116. If you were to have problems with any of the following services, to whom would you turn first and second?

1 Relevant service provider
2 Municipality
3 MZ council
4 Relatives/Neighbors
5 Private providers
6 Someone else

		First place	Second place	I fix it myself	Don't know
a	Local roads			7	8
b	Solid waste collection			7	8
c	Public transport			7	8
d	Water supply			7	8
e	Sewerage			7	8
f	Electricity supply			7	8
g	Heating			7	8
h	Preschools			7	8
i	Public schools			7	8
k	Public hospitals and health facilities			7	8

V117. INTERVIEWER: PLEASE REMEMBER IF THE HOUSEHOLD HAD ANY PROBLEMS WITH THE SERVICES. IF YOU CANNOT REMEMBER, ASK AGAIN! USE FIRST COLUMN IN TABLE H2 TO RECORD THAT, AND GO TO THE NEXT QUESTION. IF THE HOUSEHOLD DID NOT HAVE ANY PROBLEMS, GO TO THE NEXT SECTION.

V118. Did you or someone within your community lodge a complaint about the problem? **IF NOT, GO TO V124.**

TABLE H2—Complaining procedure

V119. Was the problem attended to?

V120. What were the results of your complaint?

V121. Within how many months after your complaint was the problem solved? **GO TO V126.**

V122. Was the problem solved?

V123. What was the reason you did not turn to the relevant body with your complaint?

		Check if they had any problem	Did they complain?	Problem attended?	Results of complaining	Time it took (months)	Problem solved?	Reason no complaint was made
		V117	V118	V119	V120	V121	V122	V123
a	Local roads	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
b	Solid waste collection	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
c	Public transport	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
d	Water supply	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
e	Sewerage	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
f	Electricity supply	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
g	Heating	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
h	Preschools	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
i	Public schools	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
k	Public hospitals and health facilities	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
			1–Yes 2–No	1–Yes 2–No	1–Decision was made in my favor and was enforced 2–Decision was made in my favor but was not enforced 3–Decision was not made in my favor 4–Complaint was not considered 5–Other	Write down number of months. 99–Problem is still not solved	1–Yes 2–No	1–Did not know whom to address 2–Tried to use the help of influential persons 3–It makes no sense/no result will be obtained 4–Lack of time 5–Dangerous 6–Other

LOCAL GOVERNANCE

The last topic to be discussed is related to local government authorities and citizens' participation in your municipality.

May I speak with the person who has the most information about local authorities? Are you that person?

V124. Please write down the code number of household member *who has the most information* about local governance.

Household member code (TABLE H1, column 1):

V125. Please write down the code number of household member *who will provide information* about local governance.

Household member code (TABLE H1, column 1):

V126. Have you ever participated in the following for events at the level of local government? (1) Never, (2) Once or twice, (3) Three to six times, (4) More often

		Never	Once or twice	More often
a	Election of mayor	1	2	4
b	Election of the municipal council members	1	2	4
c	Election of community council members (MZ)	1	2	4
d	Local referendum	1	2	4
e	Local petitions	1	2	4
f	Public hearings on municipal budget	1	2	4

V127. Do you know the name of your mayor, your representative in community council (MZ), municipal council, and in cantonal parliament (if applicable)?

Mayor	
Community councilor (MZ)	
Municipal councilor	
Cantonal parliament	

V128. How likely it is that you would vote if the general elections at local level would take place next week?

1	Very likely	**1**
2	Likely	**2**
3	Unlikely	**3**
4	Definitely would not vote	**4**
8	Don't know	**8**
9	No answer, refuse	**9**

V129. How many times have you or someone from your household participated in the last 12 months in the following? (1) None, (2) Up to 5 times, (3) 6 to 12 times, (4) More often

		None	Up to five times	More often
a	Public meetings on municipal budget	1	2	4
b	Public hearings other than on municipal budget	1	2	4
c	Local council sessions	1	2	4
d	NGO activities other than meetings	1	2	4
e	Municipality assembly sessions	1	2	4
f	Any unpaid communal activities	1	2	4

PROPER SKIPPING PATTERN

V130. How do you evaluate your experience in participating in these events? (1)Very useful, (2) Useful to some extent, (3) Not useful

		Very useful	Useful to some extent	Not useful	Don't know	Didn't participate
a	Public meetings of the municipal budget	1	2	3	8	9
b	Public hearings other than on municipal budget	1	2	3	8	9
c	Local council sessions	1	2	3	8	9
d	NGO activities other than meetings	1	2	3	8	9
e	Municipality assembly sessions	1	2	3	8	9
f	Any unpaid communal activities	1	2	3	8	9

V131. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?
(1) Strongly disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neither agree nor disagree,
(4) Agree, or (5) Strongly agree

		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree not disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
a	Local elections are free and fair.	1	2	3	4	5	8
b	Civil society organizations are independent.	1	2	3	4	5	8
c	People feel free to express their opinion in public.	1	2	3	4	5	8
d	People are aware that they can participate in local government, write petitions, and so on.	1	2	3	4	5	8
e	You live in a municipality that has a culture of peace and tolerance for diversity, for example, minorities.	1	2	3	4	5	8
f	You feel safe to live in your municipality.	1	2	3	4	5	8
g	Vulnerable people and the poor are protected against abuses.	1	2	3	4	5	8
h	Local administration is prepared to react in case of a natural or man-made disaster, for example, fire, flood.	1	2	3	4	5	8

V132. To what extent does the local government consult with its citizens to include their priorities in the development of the municipality?

1	Never	1
2	Almost never	2
3	Only in some areas	3
4	To a large extent	4
5	Completely	5
8	Don't know	8
9	No answer	9

V133. To what extent do you feel that the decisions of those in power at the local government reflect your own priorities?

1	Never	1
2	Almost never	2
3	Only in some areas	3
4	To a large extent	4
5	Completely	5
8	Don't know	8
9	No answer	9

V134. To what extent do you feel that the decisions of those in power at local government attempt to improve the life of the poor?

1	Never	1
2	Almost never	2
3	Only in some areas	3
4	To large extent	4
5	Completely	5
8	Don't know	8
9	No answer	9

V135. To what extent do you feel that the decisions of those in power at local government are based on the interests of political parties rather than the interests of the population?

1	Completely	1
2	To a large extent	2
3	To a small extent	3
4	Not at all	4
8	Don't know	8
9	No answer	9

V136. Who represents the family in these pubic meetings?

1	Woman	1
2	Man	2
3	Both	3
4	None	4

V137. Do you think that women and men have equal access and influence to the decisions taken by local authorities?

1	No, men's influence is stronger.	1
2	No, women's influence is stronger.	2
3	Yes, men and women have equal influence.	3
8	Don't know	8

V138. To what extent do women have sufficient positions/seats to represent themselves in the local authority? (1) Not at all, (2) To a small extent, (3) Sufficient, (4) To a large extent

		Not at all	To small extent	Sufficient	To large extent	Don't know
a	Local administration	1	2	3	4	8
b	Municipal council	1	2	3	4	8
c	Community council (MZ)	1	2	3	4	8

V139. Do you consider the following information about the local government as (1) Very useful, (2) Useful, or (3) Not useful?

		Very useful	Useful	Not useful	Doesn't exist	Don't know/ No experience
a	Local development planning	1	2	3	4	8
b	Budgeting information	1	2	3	4	8
c	Municipal council review and approval information	1	2	3	4	8
d	Public procurement information	1	2	3	4	8
e	Service delivery and implementation of public works information	1	2	3	4	8

V140. Do you consider that the following sources information are (1) Very useful, (2) Useful, or (3) Not useful for you to get information about the local government?

		Very useful	Useful	Not useful	Doesn't exist	Don't know/ No experience
a	Noticeboard in the municipal town house	1	2	3	4	8
b	Noticeboard in your MZ	1	2	3	4	8
c	Local radio	1	2	3	4	8
d	Your MZ council representatives	1	2	3	4	8
e	Service desk in the municipal building	1	2	3	4	8
f	Municipal bulletin	1	2	3	4	8

V141. How often have you or has someone from your household contacted local government representatives in the past 12 months? (1) Never, (2) Rarely (3) Often, or (4) Always

		Never	Rarely	Often	Always
a	Mayor	1	2	3	4
b	Civil servants	1	2	3	4
c	Councilors	1	2	3	4
d	Community council (MZ)	1	2	3	4

V142. What were the main reasons for contacting local a government representative? After I state a reason, tell me if it was (1) Never, (2) Rarely (3) Often, or (4) Very often the reason for the contact.

		Never	Rarely	Often	Very often	Don't know/ No experience
a	Improve local service	1	2	3	4	8
b	Facilitate issuing licenses or documents	1	2	3	4	8
c	Obtain information	1	2	3	4	8
d	Asking for financial support	1	2	3	4	8

V143. What is your level of satisfaction with the contacts you have had with local government representatives in the past 12 months? (1) Very unsatisfied, (2) Unsatisfied, (3) Satisfied, or (4) Very satisfied

		Very unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Don't know/ No experience
a	Mayor	1	2	3	4	8
b	Civil servants	1	2	3	4	8
c	Councilors	1	2	3	4	8
d	Community council (MZ)	1	2	3	4	8

V144. In your opinion, what are the main obstacles for better quality of life in your locality? (Read aloud; multiple responses possible)

1	Weak political leadership	1
2	Lack of resources	2
3	Lack of skilled public servants	3
4	Corruption	4
5	Interest of political parties	5
6	Lack of citizens' participation	6
8	Don't know	8
9	No answer	9

V145. Please give a score from 0 to 10 for integrity and trustworthiness of the following local public and social institutions:

a	Local legislature		e	Local media	
b	Local executive		f	Local civil society organizations	
c	Local judiciary		g	Local religious organizations	
d	Local police				

V146. To what extent are you satisfied with the quality of local government decisions and administrative functions regarding the issues below? (1) Very unsatisfied, (2) Unsatisfied, (3) Satisfied, or (4) Very satisfied

		Very unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Don't know
a	Local development plans	1	2	3	4	8
b	Municipal budgets	1	2	3	4	8
c	Issuing licenses and other documents	1	2	3	4	8
d	Collecting local taxes, fees, and charges	1	2	3	4	8

V147. To what extent do you think that the following local factors undermine the development of local business and creation of jobs in the municipality in general? Are they (1) A big obstacle, (2) A moderate obstacle, (3) A small obstacle, or (4) Not an obstacle?

		Big obstacle	Moderate obstacle	Small obstacle	Not an obstacle	Don't know/Don't understand
a	High local taxes	1	2	3	4	8
b	Corruption of local officials	1	2	3	4	8
c	Local crime	1	2	3	4	8
d	Bureaucracy burden in local authority	1	2	3	4	8

V148. In your opinion, what is the level of regulatory burden imposed by the local administration on these administrative services? (1) A big burden, (2) A moderate burden, (3) Little burden, or (4) Not a burden?

		Big burden	Moderate	Little	It's not a burden	Don't know/No experience
a	Land registration	1	2	3	4	8
b	Building permission	1	2	3	4	8
c	Commercial licensing	1	2	3	4	8
d	Notary services	1	2	3	4	8
e	Tax payments	1	2	3	4	8
f	Household registration	1	2	3	4	8
g	Birth certification	1	2	3	4	8
h	Petitions, complaints, and other claims	1	2	3	4	8

V149. To what extent do the factors below contribute to the existence of informal economy in your municipality? (1) To a large extent, (2) To some extent, (3) A little, or (4) Don't contribute

		To large extent	To some extent	Little	Don't contribute	Don't know/ Don't understand
a	High taxes	1	2	3	4	8
b	Regulatory burden	1	2	3	4	8
c	Expensive labor laws	1	2	3	4	8
d	Lack of employment inspection	1	2	3	4	8
e	Low awareness of employees to fight for their rights	1	2	3	4	8
f	Criminality	1	2	3	4	8

V150. To what extent do you feel that the rule of law is applied?
(1) Always, (2) Often, (3) Rarely, or (4) Never applied

		Always	Often	Rarely	Never	Don't know
a	Property rights	1	2	3	4	8
b	Administrative decisions	1	2	3	4	8
c	Tendering and procure of public works, services, and goods	1	2	3	4	8

V151. If your household has ever had experience with the municipal court, were its decisions:

		Yes	No	Don't know	No experience
a	Fair—decisions were independent, impartial, and transparent	1	2	8	9
b	Honest—not subject to corruption	1	2	8	9
c	Efficient—cases processed quickly	1	2	8	9
d	Consistent—decisions were coherent	1	2	8	9
e	Enforced—decision were implemented	1	2	8	9
f	Affordable—court costs were acceptable	1	2	8	9

V152. Do you know of any case when a person had to give a nonofficial financial contribution to a government representative to facilitate solving a problem?

		Yes	No
a	Mayor	1	2
b	Civil servants	1	2
c	Councilors	1	2
d	Community council (MZ)	1	2

V153. Have you experienced a situation where you had to give a nonofficial financial contribution to a government representative to facilitate solving a problem you had contacted them about?

		Yes	No
a	Mayor	1	2
b	Civil servants	1	2
c	Councilors	1	2
d	Community council (MZ)	1	2

V154. How do you perceive the issue of corruption in your local government as being a hindrance to solving the problem you contacted them about?

		Very serious problem	Serious problem	It exists, but it is not a problem	It doesn't exist	Don't know
a	Mayor	1	2	3	4	8
b	Civil servants	1	2	3	4	8
c	Councilors	1	2	3	4	8
d	Community council (MZ)	1	2	3	4	8

V155. What is your level of satisfaction with the effort of local government representatives in the past 12 months to control corruption in your municipality?

		Very unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Don't know
a	Mayor	1	2	3	4	8
b	Civil servants	1	2	3	4	8
c	Councilors	1	2	3	4	8
d	Community council (MZ)	1	2	3	4	8

HOUSEHOLD DEMOGRAPHY (CONCLUDING SECTION)

Finally, there are few questions about your household.

V156. How many persons live in this household, regardless of age?

Number of household members: [＿＿＿＿]

V157. Which one statement best characterizes the situation in your household?

1	Difficult to provide the family with basic foodstuffs	1
2	Manage to provide basic food but find it difficult to pay utility bills and buy clothes	2
3	Can afford required foods, clothes and pay utility bills but cannot afford such goods as TV, refrigerator, and so on	3
4	Can afford to buy a TV or refrigerator, but cannot afford a car, a new house, or travel to another country	4
5	Can afford to buy a car, a new house, or travel to another country, and so forth	5
9	No answer	9

V158. What are three main sources of income (monetary or in-kind) for your household?

1	Salary, wages	**1**
2	Cash or in-kind rent or lease payments received	**2**
3	Farm plot	**3**
4	Private enterprise	**4**
5	Pensions	**5**
6	Unemployment benefit	**6**
7	Social assistance and other benefits	**7**
8	Money or in-kind assistance from relatives in the country	**8**
9	Assistance from relatives outside of the country	**9**
10	Other	**10**
99	No answer	**99**

V159. What was the average monthly income for the whole household from all sources, including the incomes of each household member and any collective household sources of income?

Total household income: [＿＿＿＿＿] **KM**

99   No answer

V160. In your opinion, what monthly income you would consider enough for your household?

Sufficient income: [＿＿＿＿＿] **KM**

99   No answer

V161. Do you consider your household as poor?

1	Yes	1
2	No	2
3	In between	3
9	No answer	4

V162. What is main ethnic heritage of your household?

1	Bosnian	1
2	Serb	2
3	Croat	3
4	Bosniak	4
5	Other	

9   No answer   9

THAT'S ALL. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION.

CLOSURE TIME		
	HOUR	**MINUTE**

RESPONDENT'S PHONE NUMBER →	

0   Respondent doesn't want to give the phone number.   0

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE INTERVIEWER AFTER (S)HE LEAVES RESPONDENT'S HOUSEHOLD

I1.   BACK CHECK: *How many times did you visit respondent's household before she or he completed the interview?*

Number of attempts:

I2.   The interview was carried out in:

1   Respondent's house   1
2   Respondent's workplace   2
3   Somewhere else:

I3.   Was there anybody else present during the interview?

1   Yes   1
2   No   2

I4.   How would you evaluate respondent's cooperation?

1   Very unresponsive   1
2   2
3   3
4   4
5   Very responsive   5

I5.   To what extent respondent was interested in the topic at the beginning of the interview?

1   Very interested   1
2   2
3   3
4   4
5   Very uninterested   5

I6.   General evaluation of respondent's cooperation:

1   Very unresponsive; refused to answer majority of the questions   1
2   Unresponsive; hardly completed the interview   2
3   Responsive; but (s)he was not giving detailed answers 3
4   Responsive; (s)he gave some detailed answers   4
5   Very responsive; (s)he was giving detailed answers and explanations   5

I7.   Have you faced any specific problems regarding wording and notions?

1   Yes   1
2   No   2

→   WRITE DOWN THE QUESTION NUMBERS WITH WHICH YOU HAD DIFFICULTIES:

→   DESCRIBE PROBLEMS THAT YOU FACED:

I8.   Did you face any other problems?

1   Yes   1
2   No   2

→   DESCRIBE THE PROBLEMS YOU FACED:

I9.   Interviewer's gender

1   Male   1
2   Female   2

I10. Interviewer's age? →

I11.   Interviewer's ethnicity

1   Bosnian   1
2   Serb   2
3   Croat   3
4   Bosniak   4
5   Other: 5

9   No answer   9

PLEASE WRITE DOWN IF YOU WANT TO POINT TO ANYTHING YOU HAVE OBSERVED DURING THE INTERVIEW. IF YOU WANT TO GIVE ANY SUGGESTION THAT MIGHT HELP US TO IMPROVE QUALITY OF THE RESEARCH ALSO WRITE THAT DOWN.

I declare that this interview was carried out in accordance with the given instructions and with a respondent who was selected in accordance with instructions for respondent selection.

Date and signature:

_____

About the World Bank Institute's Governance Practice

Governance is one of seven priority themes in the World Bank Institute's recently launched renewal strategy—a strategy that responds to client demand for peer-to-peer learning by grounding WBI's work in the distillation and dissemination of practitioner experiences. The Institute is committed to building knowledge and capacity on the "how to" of governance reforms, with emphasis on supporting and sustaining multi-stakeholder engagement in bringing about such reforms.

WBI's Governance Practice works with partners, including networks of country and regional institutions, to develop and replicate customized learning programs. Its programmatic approach aims at building multi-stakeholder coalitions and in creating collaborative platforms and peer networks for knowledge exchange.

The Practice focuses on three thematic areas: governance of extractive industries, procurement reform, and access to information. A fourth program supports anti-corruption programs for Parliamentarians, the Judiciary and the Private Sector. A Mobilizing Stakeholders for Reform group links stakeholder groups in support of these priority areas, documents and codifies knowledge, and builds capacity in cross-cutting areas. And lastly—but importantly—a Leadership Development Program focuses on strengthening the capacity of potential leaders to harness the energies of stakeholder groups and to and channel these efforts toward reform.

For further information:
WBI
The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20433
Fax: 202-522-1492

Visit us on the web at: http://wbi.worldbank.org/wbi/topics/governance