



n



# STRENGTHENING DEMOCRATIC LOCAL GOVERNANCE (SDLG) IN BANGLADESH

## FINAL REPORT

APRIL 2015

This report was prepared for the United States Agency for International Development  
It was prepared by Tetra Tech ARD

This report has been prepared for the United States Agency for International Development, under USAID Contract Number EPP-I-00-04-00035-00, Order Number AID-388-TO-11-00001.

Tetra Tech ARD Primary Contacts:

Jessica Britt, Project Manager  
Dr. Jesse Biddle, Senior Technical Advisor/Manager  
159 Bank Street, Suite 300  
Burlington, VT 05401  
Tel: (802) 495-0282  
Email: [jessicabritt@tetrattech.com](mailto:jessicabritt@tetrattech.com); [jesse.biddle@tetrattech.com](mailto:jesse.biddle@tetrattech.com)

# STRENGTHENING DEMOCRATIC LOCAL GOVERNANCE (SDLG) PROGRAM IN BANGLADESH FINAL REPORT

APRIL 2015

## **DISCLAIMER**

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.



# CONTENTS

- CONTENTS..... i**
- ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS ..... ii**
- 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW..... 1**
  - 1.1 PROGRAM OVERVIEW ..... 1
- 2.0 ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS ..... 4**
  - 2.1 ROLES AND AUTHORITIES OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ..... 4
  - 2.2 ADVOCACY AND CAPACITY BUILDING OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATIONS..... 7
  - 2.3 TRANSPARENT AND EFFECTIVE SERVICE DELIVERY BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ..... 9
  - 2.4 CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL DECISION-MAKING ..... 10
  - 2.5 COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH ..... 13
  - 2.6 EXTENSION YEAR ..... 14
- 3.0 LESSONS LEARNED ..... 18**
  - 3.1 LESSONS LEARNED ..... 18
  - 3.2 SELECT SUCCESS STORIES..... 21
- 4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES ..... 24**
  - 4.1 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES ..... 24
- 5.0 FINANCIAL REPORT..... 26**
  - 5.1 EXPENDITURES BY LINE ITEM ..... 26
  - 5.2 EXPENDITURES BY PROGRAM COMPONENT ..... 26
- 6.0 INDICATORS ..... 27**
  - 6.1 ORIGINAL INDICATORS..... 27
  - 6.2 EXTENSION YEAR INDICATORS ..... 32
- 7.0 GOVERNMENT, DONOR AND CIVIL SOCIETY INSTITUTIONS ENGAGED . 35**
  - 7.1 NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS..... 35
  - 7.2 LOCAL GOVERNMENTS..... 36

# ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AI	Appreciative Inquiry
BUPF	Bangladesh Union Parishad Forum
CDPDs	Closed-Door Policy Dialogues
CiG	Citizens-in-Governance forum
COR	Contracting Officer's Representative
CUS	Center for Urban Studies
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DPR	Democratic Participation and Reform in Bangladesh Project
GiZ	<i>Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit</i> (German International Cooperation Agency)
GoB	Government of Bangladesh
HDI	Howard Delafield International
HLP	Horizontal Learning Program
ISS	Institute of Social Sciences
LCG	Local Consultative Group
LG	Local Government
LGCI	Local Government Capacity Index
LGSP	Local Government Support Program
LGU	Local Government Unit
MAB	Municipal Association of Bangladesh
MLGRD	Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives
MP	Member of Parliament
MPG	Media Professionals Group
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
PNGO	Partner Nongovernmental Organization
PRODIP	Promoting Democratic Institutions and Practices Project
PSP	Participatory Strategic Planning
RDA	Rural Development Academy
RRT	Regional Roundtable
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SDLG	Strengthening Democratic Local Governance Program
TOTs	Training of Trainers
UNDP	United Nations Development Program

UP	Union Parishad
US	Unnayan Shamannay
UZPAB	Upazila Parishad Association of Bangladesh
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WB	World Bank



# 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

## 1.1 PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Strengthening Democratic Local Governance in Bangladesh (SDLG) Project was a 52-month activity (December 2010–February 2015) funded by the United States Agency for International Development’s Bangladesh Mission (USAID/Bangladesh). Tetra Tech ARD was the implementing partner for SDLG, which was contracted via the Sustainable Urban Management II Indefinite Quantity Contract.

SDLG was initially planned to last for a 39-month timeframe. The project had four component areas for programmatic focus. These were:

- Research and policy advocacy for local governance reform,
- Capacity development for local government associations (LGAs), including BUPF (Bangladesh Union Parishad Forum), MAB (Municipal Association of Bangladesh) and a to-be-formed association for Upazila Parishads,
- Training and technical assistance for 600 local government units at different levels and in diverse regions nationally, including rural Union Parishads (450 LGUs), country-level Upazila Parishads (100 LGUs) and municipal-level Paurashavas (50 LGUs), and
- Training and technical assistance for citizens and citizen groups to support citizen participation in local governance and decision-making.

Toward the end of the initial timeframe, USAID/Bangladesh provided for an approximately year-long extension period with a slightly modified scope of work. Thus, SDLG piloted activities during the extension year focused on building synergies through cross-sectoral activities with other diverse projects supported by the Mission’s sector teams.

A key guiding principle for SDLG was to build on the sound legacy of more than a decade’s worth of USAID-funded local government strengthening programs in Bangladesh. This included the Local Government Initiative (LGI), also implemented by Tetra Tech ARD, as well as the Democratic Local Governance Program (DLGP) and the Improving Local Governance and Creating Citizens’ Awareness Program (ILLG). USAID/Bangladesh programs had pioneered effective working strategies with local governments and communities, supported local governance policy reform and helped found the local government associations BUPF and MAB.

### **Local Governance Context**

The timing for USAID/Bangladesh to mount another substantial local government strengthening program was sound given ongoing developments in the local governance context in Bangladesh. This reflected that major changes in the legislative framework for local governance occurred in 2009 following reforms begun under a Caretaker Government, which were revised and ratified by the new government headed by the Awami League. This included reforms to the several levels of local government as codified in new laws: the

Upazila Parishad (repeal, reenactment, and amendment) Act 2009, Local Government (Union Parishad) Act 2009, Local Government (Pourashava) Act 2009, and Local Government (City Corporation) Act 2009.

While such changes to the legislative framework were significant, when SDLG began many previously existing practices remained in place while ambiguity and controversy surrounded efforts to implement the new laws. On the one hand, work needed to be done to clarify and implement provisions in the new legislations, many of which in principle provide enhanced authorities for local government units. On the other hand, there were political and bureaucratic forces working either for or against decentralization and local government strengthening. In this context, SDLG supported evidence-based research, and advocacy and constructive policy dialogue on local governance issues.

A key complication recognized by the SDLG Project team was that the new legislations posed different developmental challenges for various levels of local government. In both Paurashavas and Unions, the legislative changes expanded and clarified authorities in manners that were not highly controversial. Thus, the SDLG program focused primarily on strengthening existing governmental structures at these levels, including through enhancing linkages and accountability to citizens and local communities.

The picture for legislative reforms with Upazilas was different. One issue was to what extent newly-elected Upazila governments should assume responsibility for rural development and sector service (e.g., health and education) delivery. As well, the 2009 Upazila Act had created ambiguities about roles and responsibilities and fostered political controversy between the elected Upazila officials and the Members of Parliament (MPs), local civil servants and ministry officials. SDLG work with Upazilas thus focused on issues of basic roles and responsibilities, including relationships between elected versus bureaucratic officials, along with supporting the formation of a new local government association, the Upazila Parishad Association of Bangladesh (UzPAB).

The SDLG project further took most seriously the importance of supporting elected women officials while encouraging both men and women to better understand and welcome women's contributions to local governance. In this, while Bangladesh had set aside three designated seats for women in Union Councils in the mid-1990s, there were still many councils that did not take these women seriously or simply regarded them as stand-ins for male relatives. At the Upazila level, the position of newly-elected women vice-chairs was especially problematic as the Upazila Act essentially stripped this position of meaningful responsibilities. In response to such challenges, the SLDG Program provided enhanced support for elected women, both to help build their professional capacities as well as to clarify and reinforce their important roles in local government structures.

### **SDLG Program Design**

In this complex and evolving context for local governance in Bangladesh, the SDLG project during the original 39-month timeframe had a scope of work to organize activities to achieve results in association with four key component areas noted above.

However, during the extension year period of program implementation, which largely overlapped with the calendar year 2014, SDLG's scope of work was modified in negotiation between USAID and Tetra Tech ARD. The original Component 2, which focused on local government associations, was not continued. At the same time, while continuing to organize activities that supported the other three existing component areas, SDLG also piloted with the Mission a set of cross-cutting activities through which SDLG complemented the activities and supported the achievement of the goals and objectives of other Mission sector programs, particularly ones funded through U.S. Government Presidential Initiatives, Feed the Future (FTF), Global Climate Change (GCC) and Global Health Initiative (GHI).

In designing and carrying through with an implementation strategy for the complex and evolving scope of work, SDLG opted to form strong partnerships with Bangladeshi organizations as the best means of ensuring programmatic results. SDLG partnered with reputable research and analytical partners, Unanyan

Shamannay (US) and Center for Urban Studies (CUS), using its grants program to help organize national-level evidence-based research informing local governance policy reform and advocacy discussions. SDLG Project also engaged with two regional Universities, Rajshahi University in the northwest and Kushtia in mid-north of the country, to develop their research and advocacy capacities through local governance research.

SDLG also used the grants program to establish substantial collaborations with nine partner NGOs (PNGOs). These PNGOs helped design and then deliver training and technical assistance to over 600 local government units (LGUs), including to Unions, Upazilas and Paurashavas. As well, these partners helped form Citizens-in Governance (CIG) Forums of community members to engage with their local governments. These PNGOs were chosen both because they demonstrated requisite expertise in the field of local governance strengthening as well as because they possessed distinct regional experiences, presences and networks to support the SDLG coverage of the 600 LGUs.

Lastly, using subcontracts, SDLG mounted a communications and outreach campaign via partnerships with international firm Howard Delafield International and Bangladeshi firms Media Professionals Group (MPG) and UNITREND.

As with any substantial and complex local government project, SDLG encountered challenges during the course of implementation. For example, frequent street demonstrations – referred to as “hartals” in Bangladesh – regularly made it difficult to stick to timeframes for planned training and technical assistance activities, not the least by sometimes making it impossible for SDLG and partner staff members to travel outside of Dhaka. And the SDLG program team had the unexpected challenge of adjusting and scaling back some activities in response to a substantial reduction in the anticipated funding from USAID/Bangladesh – due to Mission-wide and agency-wide complications – which occurred midstream (i.e., February, 2013) in program implementation.

However, the program weathered such challenges and achieved significant accomplishments as detailed in this report. This was in large part due to the consistent and constructive engagement from the USAID/Bangladesh Mission, particularly from the three SDLG Contracting Officer Representatives who oversaw the project -- Dianne Cullinane, Patrick Bowers and Sherina Tabassum. As well, SDLG was fortunate to have strong leadership from Chief of Party, Jerome Sayre, Deputy Chief of Party, Zarina Rahman Khan and home office Senior Technical Advisor/Manager, Jesse Biddle, all of whom worked with the project effectively and professionally for its entire duration.

# 2.0 ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This section focuses on key activities and accomplishments, as well as challenges faced, of the SDLG project. The discussion is organized in four subsections that correspond to the key component areas for SLDG. The extension year is discussed in a fifth subsection.

## 2.1 ROLES AND AUTHORITIES OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Under this component, SDLG's organized evidence-based research and encouraged advocacy efforts to support the Government of Bangladesh to reform policies or legislations clarifying the roles and authorities of local governments. At the same time, SDLG sought to identify and promote innovative practices by local governments and local government associations enabling them to be more responsive to local needs and provide enhanced services to citizens.

SDLG's strategy included partnering with nationally-respected Bangladeshi think tanks and universities to conduct research, support policy advocacy and help organize policy reform dialogues. Following a competitive grantee selection process, two research organizations were selected as partners. These were the Center for Urban Studies (CUS) and Unnayan Shammanoy (US), both of which enjoyed established research programs and links to diverse stakeholders in the areas of urban and rural governance. As well, SDLG reached out to regional universities to include them in the evidence-based research program and further develop the capacity of the universities and faculty interested in local government reform.

### **Research and Information Dissemination**

In order to focus the project-sponsored research, SDLG prioritized three key subject matter areas of interest for legal and policy reform.<sup>1</sup> These subject areas were: 1) financial management and revenue generation; 2) participatory planning and budgeting; and 3) service delivery and monitoring. In partnership with US and CUS, the SDLG evidence-based research program sought to identify the key local governance reform issues associated with each of these subject areas in light of provisions in the existing law governing elected councils at the three tiers of local government.

Key activities included:

**National policy conferences:** CUS and US helped organize and host national conferences on December 12, 2011 and August 30, 2012. The conferences focused on issues related to the new local government legislations, implementation challenges and reform suggestions. They received much media coverage and were attended by LG association leaders, civil society representatives, academics, senior officials from the LG Ministry and Members of Parliament.

**Regional university and faculty development:** The SDLG Project engaged two regional Universities, Rajshahi University in the northwest and Kushtia in the mid-north, to develop research and advocacy capacities through local governance research. The research objectives, methodology and key findings were shared among social science faculty and the Institute of Development Studies in Rajshahi University as well

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that these three priority areas were also emphasized in SDLG training and technical assistance activities for LGAs and LGUs.

as invited faculty members from Kushtia University. The research contributed also to training curriculum for Upazilas.

**Research on Local Government Audit and Accountability Systems:** Through a grant to the Bangladesh Enterprise Institute, SDLG supported an in-depth study of the system of laws and policies for LGU accountability, reporting, monitoring and auditing. Subsequently, through field visits to 28 sites, actual practices were examined. The study diagnosed significant performance deficits as many of the audit and accountability systems were not practiced or not effective. Findings and reform recommendations were presented to officials from the Controller and Auditor General and Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development (MLGRD).

The SDLG project used and disseminated evidence and findings from these research activities in diverse and culturally sensitive manners, such as integrating findings into training activities for LGUs and CIG groups and including examples of effective local government practices in the scripts for SDLG-sponsored Folk Dramas that were held in diverse Unions and performed by local citizens, including elected officials.

These activities contributed to the following SDLG desired results:

- An expanded body of research and study of laws, ordinances and related materials on local government and decentralized service delivery,
- Increased academic centers, associations, universities, etc., which have developed units, students, professors dedicated to the study of local governance, and
- Dissemination of research materials and information, including culturally sensitive materials, to local governments, associations and citizens.

## **Policy Dialogue**

In addition to sponsoring evidence-based research, SDLG with research partners US and CUS further organized national and regional policy dialogues on local governance reform issues. The intention was to foster productive exchanges among policy makers and reform advocates who were otherwise often at odds with each other. SDLG organized both open, public dialogues as well as more private, closed-door dialogues among senior policy makers and other stakeholders in order to generate better understanding of issues and of stakeholders' respective views and interests, increase the demand for effective policy reforms and improve the overall tenor of local governance reform debate.

Key activities and accomplishments included:

**Regional Roundtable Dialogues:** CUS and US led in hosting five regional roundtable dialogues in divisional capitals of Khulna, Chittagong, Sylhet and Rajshahi and in the capital of Kishoreganj District of the Dhaka Division. These roundtable dialogues centered on issues such as local governance challenges and successes in raising taxes, strategies for better involvement of citizens in planning and budgeting, and techniques and examples for improving service delivery adopted by different local governments. Participants in the dialogues included local political leaders (i.e., UP, Upazila, Pourashava representatives), LGA members and officials, LGA Women's Committee leaders, Members of Parliament (MPs), local-based officials of key government ministries and representatives from civil society, academia and the media.

**Closed-Door Policy Dialogues:** While the regional roundtables were public events, the closed-door policy dialogues were more private discussions involving influential people, both in and outside of government. Participants for the monthly meetings were chosen as being people who potentially could support the implementation of policy reforms (e.g., revised Ministerial directions) on local governance policy issues. SDLG looked to our Bangladeshi partners CUS and US, as well as to leaders from the local government associations, BUPF and MAB, to be in the forefront in such discussions. Distinct dialogues were organized to cover urban (municipal) issues versus rural (Union and Upazila) issues.

These activities contributed to the following SDLG desired results:

- Greater understanding among policy makers on local government issues, actions, interests and capabilities,
- Increased demands for policy and legal reform for democratic decentralization channeled into the national policy debate, and
- Improved quality and tenor of dialogue on local government issues, especially between local government representatives and national policy makers.

### **Innovative Practices**

SDLG recognized that with 309 municipalities, 482 Upazila Parishads and 4498 Union Parishads in Bangladesh, there were immense differences in practices and performance between and among levels of local governance. In addition to this natural laboratory, there was also a rich history of local government training and technical assistance that had been provided by USAID, other donors and the Government of Bangladesh to many local governments nationwide. The SDLG approach involved drawing on these rich experiences, culling examples of innovative practices and undertaking activities to ensure local government officials and other stakeholders learned about these.

Key activities and accomplishments included:

***In-Country Learning Tours for Local Government Officials:*** SDLG conducted seven in-country learning tours between November, 2011 and March, 2013. The tours involved organizing local government officials and representatives of the LGAs from one region SDLG worked in to visit with and learn about local governance practices from peer counterparts in other SDLG project regions. For example, in July 2012, SDLG conducted a domestic study tour to Feni municipality to learn from Mayor Nizam Uddin Hazari his good practices, particularly in revenue generation. The mayor had overseen a doubling of revenue collection under the 2009 law with the active engagement of his council members and, in turn, had started new infrastructure projects and service initiatives with the increased revenues. SDLG also worked closely with the World Bank-sponsored Horizontal Learning Program (HLP) to broaden the impact of in-country learning. SDLG assisted UPs in the districts of Rangpur, Naogaon, Jamalpur, Sirajganj and Bhola to apply to and be accepted into HLP.

***International Learning Tour for Local Government Officials:*** In November 2012, a 10-day study tour was organized to the Philippines with 18 elected representatives from Union, municipal and Upazila councils, a senior government official from Local Government Division of MLGRD, and SDLG representatives. The Tour was organized in collaboration with the Ateneo University School of Government in Manila. The main subjects were the Philippines local government system, decentralized structures of financial management, participatory planning, and service delivery, and local government associations in the Philippines. Site visits were arranged to best practice examples of revenue generating city markets, public spaces, bus terminals and other example of successful public-private partnerships in urban and semi-rural areas such as Marikina, Legaspi, Iriga, and Goa, some of which inspired their adoption in Bangladeshi. For example, the Mayor of the City of Feni established a food testing laboratory in his city's public market, inspired by his site visit to a similar facility in Marikina.

These activities contributed to the following SDLG desired results:

- Improved service delivery, and
- Expanded pressure from citizens, civil society organizations, and above all the local governments and their national level associations for democratic decentralization based on demonstrated improved services and abilities of local governments.

## 2.2 ADVOCACY AND CAPACITY BUILDING OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATIONS

### Approach to Component

Under this component, SDLG's objective was to work with local government associations BUPF and MAB, as well as help organize a new Upazila-level local government association. SDLG assistance was oriented toward helping the LGAs to improve their organizational capacity, including to advocate on behalf of their constituent local government units, as well as to develop more sustainable operations and increased self-financing.

The SDLG implementation strategy involved supporting internal democratic election processes for BUPF and MAB, collaborating with the associations to develop their own organizational development plans and subsequently supporting and monitoring the associations' progress in organizational development and sustainable operations. SDLG further mounted a national effort to form the unified Upazila Parishad association, UzZPAB. In addition to training and technical assistance, SDLG provided core operational support for the LGAs to assist with office rent, staff salaries, supplies and committee meeting costs.

Key activities and accomplishments included:

**Formation of UzPAB:** When SDLG began implementation, an initial complication for this activity was the existence of competing nascent Upazila Parishad associations, such as the Bangladesh Upazila Parishad Association and the Upazila Chairman and the Vice-Chairmans' Oykayo Parishad. Following consultations with leaderships in these nascent associations, SDLG organized a process to develop a unified, democratically-organized association. This involved holding divisional leadership elections, holding Executive Committee elections, and then working with the new leadership in support of strategic and organizational development planning.

**Internal Election Processes:** Holding regular elections is an important means for LGAs to retain legitimacy and credibility with their members. SDLG supported internal elections for all three LGAs while encouraging the LGAs to adhere to their constitutions to be democratic associations. At the same time, SDLG in dialogue with the leaderships of the LGAs communicated that support for core operations through the SDLG grant fund was contingent on completed internal election processes. SDLG staff supported regional and national elections for MAB, district and national elections for BUPF and divisional and national elections for UzPAB.

**Organizational Development Planning:** SDLG supported the three associations – BUPF, MAB and UzPAB – to draft and adopt organizational development plans. With BUPF, emphasis was placed on addressing organizational sustainability, diversifying resource generation, membership building and dues collection, communication with membership and prioritizing advocacy issues. With MAB, the plan emphasized reviewing internal elections processes, communication with regional members, and achieving greater financial stability. With UzPAB, particularly as this was a fledgling association, a greater emphasis was placed on the importance of association building, the role of leaders, office set up, membership communication and dues collection, and issues for advocacy or litigation actions.

**Targeted Training and Technical Assistance:** SDLG provided diverse training and technical assistance to the three LGAs. Selected examples include: Leadership Training for newly-elected leaders of BUPF, MAB and UzPAB; Dues Collection Workshops to assist the LGAs to develop and implement effective strategies for growing their memberships while encouraging members to pay dues; and Communications and Outreach support and assisting the LGAs to develop and distribute quarterly newsletters in print and electronically.

***Women’s Committees in Local Government Associations:*** For this activity, SDLG built on but expanded an important achievement of USAID/Bangladesh’s LGI program during 2003–2005. LGI had assisted to form a BUPF National Women’s Caucus which was the first grouping of local government and LGA officials to focus on women’s needs and to be led by women in Bangladesh. However, this caucus had discontinued operations. Seeking a most sustainable approach, SDLG assisted in the formation of three elected Women’s Committees at the central level in BUPF and MAB as well as in the new association, UzPAB. Once the Women’s Committees were in place, SDLG helped capacitate the committees while supporting the professional development of the women members. Thus, project trainings focused on association building including dues collection, characteristics of effective leadership and effective strategies for elected women officials to assume progressive leadership responsibilities in local councils.

While SDLG achieved important accomplishments in working with the LGAs, not the least of which was the formation of UzPAB, the project nonetheless faced significant challenges in supporting MAB and BUPF, particularly with respect to organizational development. The challenges faced differed by association. With MAB, the challenge was a certain disinterest or apathy of the leadership to focus on organizational development. Thus, it took longer for SDLG to succeed with MAB, compared to BUPF or UzPAB, in achieving internal elections, organizational development planning and negotiation of agreements for core operational support. With BUPF, the challenge was more an issue of organizational performance, including leadership. Thus, for example, while SDLG provided considerable support to enhance dues collections and expand BUPF membership, progress in these areas proved slow. Informal discussions with member and potential members unions suggest they felt distant from association leadership as well as perceived a lack of democratic practices by leaders. Women members, who were as a group quite active in efforts to promote dues collection, reported receiving limited support from male district, divisional or regional committee members.

These activities contributed to the following SDLG desired results:

- Improved ability to advocate and provide substantive input on national policy issues related to local government,
- Improved ability to research, analyze, and critique policies/legislation that is subsequently used by the GOB, media, local governments, and other relevant stakeholders as an input into the national policy debates,
- Expanded in-house legal expertise that leads to improved quality and quantity of legal responses to GOB attempts to diminish local government authorities and roles (motions, writ petitions, etc),
- Achieve greater degree of financial independence with a decreasing reliance on donor funding to include an increase in membership and dues and/or other revenue generating mechanisms by 40 percent over the life of the SDLG program,
- Development and implementation of a comprehensive training plan that leads to improved technical and training skills by the associations (quantity and quality),
- Development and implementation of a communications strategy that outlines a clear plan and set of milestones for expanded outreach to members, the media, policy makers, and other relevant stakeholders,
- Knowledge acquired from participation in study tours and conferences systematically applied across key areas of operation in the associations (management, administration, advocacy, networking, financial, legal),
- BUPF and MUB become members of the UCLG and any other relevant international local government associations or organizations,
- Development of an organizational or management plan, in collaboration with MAB and BUPF, which prioritizes key issues and goals over the next three to five years, including financial sustainability, and

- Increased collaboration among the associations that more effectively leverages resources, expertise, and respective members to advocate for local government reform.

## 2.3 TRANSPARENT AND EFFECTIVE SERVICE DELIVERY BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Through this component, SDLG's objective was to help build the capacity of 600 target local governments, at all three levels of local government and in diverse regions in Bangladesh, to be more effective, transparent and responsive service providers at the local level. SDLG target LGUs included 450 Union Parishads, 100 Upazila Parishads and 50 Paurashavas, SDLG assistance focused on improving the performance of the elected councils, including helping to clarify the council's responsibilities versus the responsibilities of the line ministries and bureaucrats operating at local government levels.

To accomplish this ambitious objective, SDLG adopted an innovative strategy of identifying and working collaboratively with a set of nine core partner NGOs. The PNGOs were chosen following a major grants competition. They were selected to ensure that collectively they had relevant regional experience as well as technical capacities to provide trainings and related technical assistance in all of the districts for the 600 target LGUs. While the PNGOs provided the bulk of the assistance, the SDLG Dhaka office and field offices in Khulna, Rajshahi and Rangpur provided additional expert assistance, ensured quality control and monitored the performance of the PNGOs. The PNGOs selected were SKS Foundation, Manob Mukti Shangstha (MMS), RDRS, Wave Foundation, Democracy Watch, Shushilan, SDS, POPI and BITA.

Key activities included:

***Trainings for LGUs in Core Governance Functions:*** Given that local governance planning and budgeting is linked to a February through May annual cycle established by the national government, SDLG designed its training and assistance program to extend across two of these cycles. The trainings focused on core governance functions for elected councils. Three formal training modules were developed following review of existing NGO training materials, consultations with other donors, alignment of proposed content with guidance in local government legislation and ministry policy directives, team reviews of draft modules, and pre-tests of draft modules in the field. These modules focused on:

- Participatory planning and budgeting,
- Financial management and revenue generation, and
- Service delivery and monitoring.

Consistent with the collaborative strategy, SDLG developed the formal trainings and curricula side-by-side with the partner NGOs, and subsequently conducted training-of-trainers sessions with the PNGOs to ensure the quality and consistency of trainings. During 2012 and 2013, SDLG and the PNGOs delivered the core governance trainings to 450 Union Parishads, 50 Paurashavas and 92 Upazilas.<sup>2</sup>

***Facilitation and Mentoring for LGUs in Core Governance Functions:*** As SDLG developed the formal trainings with the PNGOs, it also built into the approach follow-on facilitation and mentoring for LGUs. The intent was to overcome a consistent challenge that had been faced by diverse previous donor and government training activities, namely that formal trainings were often insufficient by themselves to encourage councils and council members to adopt practices to improve their performance. What was needed was more informal facilitation and mentoring over time in order to assist councils to put into practice the guidance provided in the formal trainings on council roles and responsibilities under law.

---

<sup>2</sup> Note that it proved challenging to provide trainings to Upazilas compared to UPs or Paurashavas. This primarily reflected a common reluctance of Upazila Council Chairs to participate in trainings together with UP Chairs or Mayors who they perceived to be of lower status.

SDLG was uniquely positioned to adopt this approach due to innovative approach of working collaboratively with the nine PNGOs which had strong regional networks and capacities. Thus, after the first wave of trainings, SDLG and PNGOs worked with individual LGUs, often on a demand-driven basis, to assist them to complete the legally mandated processes of the annual planning and budgeting cycle, including ensuring proper citizen participation.

**Measuring LGU Performance Improvement – ABC Grading:** Given that SDLG formal trainings, facilitation and mentoring was designed to take place over several planning and budgeting cycles, the program developed an objective performance measurement system, referred to as ABC Grading. The purpose of the ABC Grading was not just to measure changes in LGU performance over time, but also to inform SDLG and PNGOs of the specific performance problems in individual LGUs so that facilitation and mentoring assistance following the initial rounds of formal trainings would be tailored to each LGU’s objective needs. The grading system involved each LGU receiving a score based on an index of eight indicators. The indicators tracked if LGUs were or were not implementing key practices in the three core governance functions. For example, for the function of service delivery and monitoring, indicators tracked if required council meetings were held; if Standing Committees met and took actions; and if citizen charters existed, were publicly placed and accurately informed citizens of LGU service delivery responsibilities. The chart below summarizes the impressive performance improvement of target LGUs during 2013 following SDLG’s final training, facilitation and monitoring.

LGU Grade	Q2 2013 (Baseline)	Q4 2013 (Final)	% Change (Q2 to Q4)
A	20.4% (102)	63.2% (316)	+ 210%
B	60.2% (302)	33.0% (165)	- 45%
C	19.4% (96)	3.8% (19)	- 80%

These activities contributed to the following SDLG desired results:

- Improvements in the quality and quantity of compulsory duty services, as well as additional services as appropriate, such as disaster mitigation and environmental conservation,
- More transparent and efficient management and budgeting systems in place,
- Increased number of locally elected officials trained in local government practices, roles and authorities, with a special emphasis on women members,
- Increased revenue generation by a minimum of 50 percent in all target local governments, and
- Increased understanding of the expanded capacity of local governments to deliver services and increase its revenue base among the media, policy makers, local government associations, and others.

## 2.4 CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL DECISION-MAKING

Under this component, SDLG’s objective was to help increase citizen participation in local decision-making in order to improve the transparency and accountability of local governments leading to improved service delivery.

The SDLG strategy under this component was tightly integrated with the approach discussed above for delivering training and technical assistance to the 600 target LGUs. Thus, the site selection methodology for the 600 target LGUs identified also the local communities to receive training and technical assistance for

citizen participation. Equally, the nine partner NGOs selected through the grants competition supported the SDLG citizen participation activities while the SDLG Dhaka and field offices provided expert guidance, ensured quality control and monitored the performance of the PNGOs in this work with local communities.

### **Developing Citizens-in-Governance (CIG) Forums**

SDLG's innovative approach to working with citizens and communities reflected two guiding observations. First, SDLG's collaborative work with PNGOs, which included review of prior donor-sponsored efforts in this area, found little evidence of measureable effectiveness or sustainability of donor-funded local citizen 'watchdog' and advocacy groups which had been regularly established on ad hoc bases. And second, Bangladesh's local government legislation itself provided direct channels for citizen input. Thus, citizens were legislatively empowered to participate in local governance at all three tiers of local government through, for example, participating in Ward Committees, Standing Committees and Open Budget Meetings.

Based on these observations, the SDLG tactic was to support citizen participation in a sustainable manner by linking it to opportunities provided by law. SDLG and PNGOs supported the activation of what were referred to as Citizens-in-Governance or CIG Forums of local community members, but ensured that these forums and their members progressively linked their activities to the legislatively provided avenues for citizen participation in local governance. This tactic was designed to ensure that citizens and communities broadly enhanced their civic understanding of rights and responsibilities to participate in local governance as a lasting legacy of the SDLG project.

Key activities and accomplishments included:

***Collaborative development of CIG Forum Training Curricula:*** As with the development of training curricula for elected officials in LGUs, SDLG worked closely with the nine partner NGOs to develop the training curricula and overall assistance strategy for forming and working with CIG Forums. The training curricula paralleled that for the LGUs themselves in focusing on three core governance functions – participatory planning and budgeting, financial management and revenue generation, and service delivery and monitoring – but emphasized as well the importance for the CIG Forums and members to understand their rights and responsibilities to directly participate in local government activities. SDLG also collaborated with the PNGOs in a train-the-trainer activity and in pre-testing the curricula.

***CIG Forum Formation and Activation:*** SDLG and the PNGOs formed and activated 500 CIGs in target Union Parishads and Paurashavas during 2012.<sup>3</sup> The approach to CIG Forum formation involved working with Ward Committee members to prepare a list of potential participants (with at least 40% women participants) from the local community. The committee shared the objectives of the CIG Forum at public meetings before finalizing the list of CIG Forum members. The members were invited by the Chairman or local Mayor to attend a meeting at the LGU so as to elicit their full cooperation as well as to elect an Executive Committee for the CIG Forum. Following formation, SDLG organized 2-day residential trainings for the CIG Forum Executive Committees on core LGU governance functions, the role of the CIG Forum, prioritization of community concerns and development of action plans for engaging with LGUs and elected officials.

These activities contributed to the following SDLG desired results:

- Establishment of a minimum of 400 additional Citizens' Forums,
- Increased knowledge by citizens and local government officials of citizen roles and responsibilities in local oversight,

---

<sup>3</sup> Note that priority was given to working with CIGs at Union Parishad and Paurashava levels, both because the controlling legislations were similar and so opened up similar avenues for citizen participation but also because Upazila Parishads councils in many instances were not yet functional.

- Increased transparency and accountability at the local level, specifically related to revenues and expenditures, and
- Adoption of the use of the Citizens' Forum approach or elements in local government outside the purview of the SDLG program.

### **Participatory Strategic Planning**

As noted, the SDLG approach to citizen participation focused on supporting citizens to exercise rights and responsibilities provided through local governance legislation. SDLG and PNGOs worked with the Executive Committees of the CIG Forums to choose a subset of peers to jointly participate with LGU officials in the three core governance training modules. As the modules prominently featured discussion of citizen participation under law, these core governance trainings set the stage for LGU officials and the CIG Forum members to jointly establish participatory strategic planning (PSP) practices for their communities that were consistent with controlling legislation and timed to the annual planning and budgeting cycle.

Key activities included:

***Facilitating Participatory Planning and Budgeting:*** SDLG and PNGOs facilitated CIG Forum members and LGU officials to establish participatory practices through processes consistent with law. First, CIG Forums supported and worked with the LGUs to organize and energize Ward Meetings for citizens, with the aim to involve at least 20% of the voters in each of the nine or more wards in each LGU. These meetings focused on exploring the needs of the community and assisting with prioritization of needs within the ward. Next, the prioritized development needs of each ward were reviewed by the Development Committee of each Union and Paurashava Parishad to create a consolidated development plan that considered the priorities of citizens and budget availability for the year. This consolidated plan was then presented in Open Budget Meetings where citizens had the opportunity to object if citizen priorities were not reflected or if elements of the plans were not in the public interest. And finally, the resulting consolidated budget was formally approved by the Parishad and submitted to central government administrators at the Upazila level. SDLG and PNGOs facilitated such participatory processes across two annual planning and budgeting cycles in 2012 and 2013. This enabled CIG Forum members and LGU officials during the second cycle in 2013 to also review and revise plans that had been initially laid out in the 2012 cycle. Fully 80% of the 500 LGUs targeted for CIG Forum formation and activation completed two rounds of participatory planning and budgeting.

***Citizen Folk Dramas:*** One of SDLG's most innovative activities was to mount citizen folk dramas in local communities. While other USAID projects had also supported similar activities building on Bangladesh's tradition of folk drama, the SDLG innovation in partnership with PNGOs was for the dramas to be performed by local community members themselves, including LGU officials and CIG Forum members, as opposed to being performed by professionally-trained actors. The dramas modelled examples of effective local governance with active citizen participation in the context of realistic community challenges, including natural disasters. The dramas were performed in 98% of SDLG's 450 target Union Parishads. They proved to be highly popular with local communities, including children, with over 400,000 people attending, with approximately 30% of viewers being female.

***Women's Participation in Local Government Standing Committees:*** Under this activity, SDLG worked with four women-headed NGO grantees to help activate Standing Committees (SCs) in LGUs, and encourage the participation of women. In this, under Bangladeshi law, Union Parishads and Paurashavas must establish committees dedicated to monitoring and supporting service delivery in sectoral areas, such as health, education, agriculture and women and children's issues. However, in many LGUs such committees had only existed on paper. SDLG and the women-headed NGOs targeted three SCs in each of the projects 500 target Unions and Paurashavas and provided training and support for these committees to become active per their mandates. Through this activity, 82% of the targeted 1500 SCs selected women councilors to chair the committee and the targeted SCs received training in service monitoring in areas such as primary

schools, health clinics, agricultural services, women and children welfare, and finance and accounts. Indicating the effectiveness of activating these SCs is that by the end of 2013 74% of the activated committees had submitted reports to their local councils identifying concerns due to site monitoring visits and 58% of the time the local councils discussed or took action to address the concerns.

These activities contributed to the following SDLG desired results:

- Implemented and institutionalized strategic planning in at least 600 target Union Parishads, Upazila Parishads and Municipalities,
- Established mutually accepted standards for citizen participation in local governance,
- Improved local decision-making, strategic planning, budget formulation and privatization of development projects as a result of consistent citizen engagement,
- Increased information available on participatory planning and community engagement to key actors, and
- Adoption and use of the PSP approach or elements in local governments outside of the purview of the SDLG program.

## 2.5 COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH

SDLG developed a communications and outreach strategy to support the overall goals of the project. International subcontractor, Howard Delafield International, provided technical expertise and also worked closely with SDLG's Bangladeshi media partners UNITREND and MPG in implementing communications and outreach activities. The SDLG communications strategy overall revolved around three themes. These were:

- Media training and capacity building activities to educate journalists and other media personnel in local governance issues, and encourage insightful and engaging coverage,
- Local government associations and citizen participation activities to improve the ability of LGAs to communicate with their members, and
- Advertising and promotion campaign activities to spur citizen participation understanding and participation in local governance.

Key activities and accomplishments included:

***Women's Hour Radio Program:*** A weekly radio magazine program titled "Jagorone Nari" by and for women was produced featuring women representatives speaking on key topics. The radio program, devised as a 'living room comedy', featured women from different walks of life such as a teacher, an NGO worker, a laborer and a homemaker. Service delivery and monitoring, financial management and revenue generation, participatory budget and planning and the inclusion of citizens in decision making processes were all featured using conversation, human interest stories and folk songs. The radio program aired weekly on FM and community radio stations.

***Improving Media Coverage of Local Governance:*** SDLG with its communications partners undertook a series of activities to improve Bangladeshi media coverage of local governance issues. Workshops were held with national-level senior print and broadcast editors to understand challenges and develop strategies for more effective media coverage. To complement the national workshops, SDLG also organized regional roundtables -- such as one in Bogra, a center for press coverage in northern Bangladesh -- with local reporters and editors. The project developed and widely distributed a "Reporters' Handbook on Local Governance".

***Websites for Local Government Association and Local Government Online Clearinghouse:*** SDLG worked with the the LGUs, BUPF and UzPAB, to develop and host visitor friendly websites: [www.bupfbd.org](http://www.bupfbd.org) and [www.uzpabbd.org](http://www.uzpabbd.org) respectively. As well, with media partner MPG, SDLG in May, 2013 launched the LG Online Clearinghouse at [www.lgbd.org](http://www.lgbd.org) to serve the media and others interested in

local government by presenting news, articles of interest and featuring Bangladesh's first Bangla-language biweekly periodical on local government called "Shokoler Kotha" ("Voice of All").

**Public Service Announcements:** SDLG supported a series of public service announcements (PSAs) to promote key messages supportive of strengthening democratic local governance. Built around the slogan, "We are the Government", SDLG PSAs featured Bangladeshi women and men and focused on issues such as the importance of citizen participation in governance to support local development, the value for citizens in participating in Ward Meetings and Open Budget Meetings and the direct link between taxation and services provision. PSAs were aired on prominent satellite TV channels approximately 500 times and were also uploaded to Facebook, YouTube, the SDLG website and the LG Online Clearinghouse web portal.

**Citizen Participation Promotional Kits:** SDLG and its communications partners designed and distributed comprehensive kits to each of the project's 450 Union Parishads. The kits contained posters for public exhibition, financial literacy flyers and citizen's guides to local government. The promotional materials were distributed at Ward and other meetings and were made available as well at the Union Information Service Centers in each Parishad.

## 2.6 EXTENSION YEAR

While the SDLG Project was originally scheduled to close out toward the end of calendar year 2013, USAID/Bangladesh executed a contract modification to enable program activities to continue into an extension year in 2014. During the extension year, SDLG continued support for key components focused on the role and authorities of local governments, service delivery by local governments and citizen participation in local-decision making while discontinuing support for local government associations. At the same time, SDLG undertook a new emphasis by designing program activities to cross-cut and complement the Mission's programming in different sectors, including programs funded under Presidential Initiatives such as Feed the Future, Global Climate Change and Global Health.

### Roles and Authorities of Local Governments

In the 2011-2013 period, SDLG had previously conducted primary research and mounted public and private advocacy events to increase the understanding of policy makers of the potential for reforms to help improve local government service delivery, including options made possible under the new local government legislative acts. At the Union and Paurashava levels, the reforms identified were improvements to an otherwise sound set of rules and regulations. However, for Upazilas, the reforms required to improve services were less understood at this new level of local government.

Given this context, SDLG's strategy during the extension year involved partnering with research grantee US to conduct and present policy research in two areas of focus. On the one hand, research focused on emerging examples of Upazila level governance practices, including with respect to service delivery in agriculture, health, women's rights and disaster management/climate change. US and SDLG presented findings and case examples at a national conference in June, 2014 and also in the bilingual Banla-English booklet "Upazila Parishad Governance to Improve Service Delivery: Policy, Practice and Model Upazila Functioning". On the other hand, policy research focused on case examples of how Standing Committees can play significant roles in improving local governance and service delivery. A second national conference was held in October, 2014 to present findings and these were also presented in the booklet "Improving Services: the Role of Union Parishad Standing Committees".

These activities contributed to the following SDLG desired results:

- Greater understanding among policy makers on local government issues, actions, interests and capabilities,
- Increased demands for policy and legal reform for democratic decentralization channeled into the national policy debate,

- Improved service delivery, and
- Expanded pressure from citizens, civil society organizations, and above all the local governments and their national level associations for democratic decentralization based on demonstrated improved services and abilities of local governments.

### **Transparent and Effective Service Delivery by Local Governments**

Under this component, the SDLG Project continued to work with a subset of 200 (190 Unions and 10 Paurashavas) of the original 600 LGUs targeted for program assistance.<sup>4</sup> This subset was chosen from regions in which diverse USAID sector programs were also implementing activities. Sector programs that SDLG collaborated with included:

- NHSPD – NGO Health Service Delivery Project,
- MH II -- Mayer Hashi II Project (family planning),
- ACT – Action in Combating Trafficking in Persons Project,
- Ag Ext -- Agricultural Extension Project,
- PHR – Protecting Human rights Project, and
- CREL – Climate Resilient Environments and Livelihoods.

The intent was for SDLG programming, particularly training and related activities with the LGUs, to develop cross-sector linkages and synergies with the other programs by supporting improved local governance and service delivery. SDLG approached this task through again partnering with five of the original nine partner NGO grantees that had supported field work during 2012-2013.

An initial activity involved providing refresher trainings combined with follow-on facilitation and mentoring for the 200 LGUs in core governance processes: Financial Management and Revenue Generation; Participatory Planning and Budgeting; and Service Delivery and Monitoring. An indication of the effectiveness of SDLG’s approach is indicated by the substantial progress target LGUs made during the extension period in improving their governance processes as measured by SDLG’s ABC grading system. The chart below shows that by October, 2014 when SDLG and PNGO technical assistance was completed, many LGUs had advanced from B to A grades and no LGUs remained with the lowest C rating.

	<b>As of June</b>	<b>As of Oct.</b>	<b>% Change</b>
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Q2 2014</b>	<b>Q4 2014</b>	
<b>A</b>	<b>75.5%</b>	<b>96.0%</b>	<b>+20.5</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>21.5%</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>- 17.5</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>- 3.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

Following the completion of the refresher trainings, SDLG and PNGOs provided more detailed training for the LGU’s sector Standing Committees, also with follow-on facilitation and mentoring. The sector SCs that SDLG targeted were Health, Agriculture, Women and Children Affairs, and Audit and Accounts. Emphasis in these trainings was placed on improving LGU performance in service delivery through the monitoring and actions of the sector SCs. Representatives from USAID/Bangladesh’s sector programs participated in

<sup>4</sup> Note that there were 13 new sites among the 200 LGUs.

these trainings for the SCs, and answered questions from committee members and discussed ways the SCs could cooperate with and support their program objectives. Out of these trainings, each SC developed standardized action plans which included service monitoring site visits in areas under their jurisdiction.

These activities contributed to the following SDLG desired results:

- Improvements in the quality and quantity of compulsory duty services, as well as additional services as appropriate, such as disaster mitigation and environmental conservation,
- More transparent and efficient management and budgeting systems in place,
- Increased number of locally elected officials trained in local government practices, roles and authorities, with a special emphasis on women members, and
- Increased revenue generation by a minimum of 25 percent in all target local governments.

### **Citizen Participation in Local Decision-Making**

During 2012-2013, SDLG along with the PNGOs had fostered the Citizens-in-Governance Forums to help citizens and communities better understand and effectively engage with their local governments. In the extension period, SDLG continued to work with those CIG Forums associated with the target 200 LGUs. Refresher trainings focused on citizen roles in local government planning, financial accountability of LGUs and community oversight of service delivery. At the same time, as a sustainability measure, SDLG and PNGOs discussed with the CIG Forums the importance for members to continue to participate in and integrate into local government mandated bodies and meetings, even in those instances where the CIG Forums intended to continue functioning after SDLG project assistance ended. In this fashion, the members and their communities would continue to better participate in local government decision-making.

Beyond the work with the CIG Forums in the extension year, SDLG also mounted a second folk drama, titled “A Friendly Football Match”. The drama was performed in all 200 target LGUs, and again the performers were local council members and citizens trained by SDLG and PNGOs. The drama introduced the responsibility of councils and the authority of their Standing Committees to seek improved services in health, family planning, agriculture; and to advance women’s rights through prevention of child marriage, domestic violence, and trafficking in persons. Messages on climate change and its impact on crop cultivation and natural disasters were also included. The drama highlighted the role of citizens in SCs oversight of services, in planning decisions through the Ward Meetings and in resource mobilization through tax payments.

A third significant activity SDLG supported under this component was youth “Eye Reporting” on social media of local government activities and performance. Following a series of workshops in three different regions in June, 2014, SDLG actively worked with the youth trainees to support the production of their videos. Seven videos were produced and published on the social media platform, Facebook. Three of the seven videos featured people’s participation in Standing Committees, Ward Meetings or Open Budget Meetings. Three more videos focused on people’s participation in tax fairs. And a final video documented irregularities in health clinic operations.

These activities contributed to the following SDLG desired results:

- Institutionalized participatory strategic planning in the project areas to be covered during the extended period,
- Increased knowledge by citizens and local government officials of citizen roles and responsibilities in local oversight, and of agricultural capacity, health and climate change issues and response options,
- Increased transparency and accountability at the local level, specifically related to revenues and expenditures,
- Institutionalization of CIGs or adoption and use of CIGs in local governments outside the purview of the SDLG program,

- Established mutually accepted standards for citizen participation in local governance,
- Improved local decision-making, strategic planning, budget formulation and privatization of development projects as a result of consistent citizen engagement, and
- Increased utilization of information available on participatory planning and community engagement to key actors.

# 3.0 LESSONS LEARNED

## 3.1 LESSONS LEARNED

The following presents a series of brief statements that summarize the broader and significant lessons that were learned during the implementation of the SDLG project with respect to what went well and why as well as what may be learned as a result of challenges that were encountered. These lessons learned emerged from a day-long Lessons Learned Workshop held in Dhaka on December 14, 2014 after program implementation was completed. Participating was SDLG leadership composed of the COP, DCOP and home office Senior Technical Advisor/Manager, SDLG component team leaders and representatives from several of SDLG's key partners (grantees and subcontractors). The workshop was organized into discussions of related but distinct themes focused on program design and implementation strategy.

### **Program Design**

A key issue that permeated the workshop discussion was that the SDLG program design was quite complex and ambitious. It was comprised of four component areas, which was narrowed to three for the extension year with the elimination of the component focused on strengthening LGAs. While all component areas broadly supported local governance strengthening, they collectively involved SDLG tackling multiple tasks simultaneously. Thus, SDLG consistently worked with government officials at the national and multiple local levels; with multiples sets of non-governmental actors that included local communities, policy and research communities, multiple local government associations; and with a large number (600) of local government units across widely dispersed geographic locations. This complex and ambitious program design, and how the SDLG team handled it, posed opportunities and challenges.

***Learning from and building on USAID and other donor experiences:*** In crafting a program implementation approach, Tetra Tech ARD purposefully sought to learn from and build on past experiences in local governance strengthening in Bangladesh. Several effective strategies stand out. For example, as the implementing partner for USAID's Local Governance Initiative in 2001-2005, Tetra Tech ARD was able to call on experienced former staff who possessed institutional memory of LGI and other programs. This included the SDLG COP, DCOP and one component leader as well as several home office technical staff with Bangladesh experience. Similarly, in designing the program, SDLG was able to call on a network of proven NGOs with established good relationships with the Tetra Tech ARD home office. And then, the SDLG field team purposefully sought to avoid "reinventing the wheel" by carefully examining the footprint of other donors doing similar local governance-related work while also adopting approaches to build on effective practices development by earlier USAID or other donor programs.

***Trade-offs between breadth of program and depth of program:*** The challenge of providing technical assistance to 600 LGUs across three tiers of local governance while at the same time working with local communities strongly influenced the type of engagement SDLG could organize with the LGUs and communities. Simply put, given the resources available to the SDLG program and given the original 39 month timeframe (modified to 52 months ultimately), SDLG by its design prioritized breadth over depth. Consequences of this design element included an extended preparatory phase while SDLG identified and established grant relationships with major program partners with appropriate competencies and geographic presences to work across Bangladesh, a limited implementation period for core trainings for LGUs that per the original 39-month period extended across only two annual budget cycles, and limitations on how many trainings and other technical engagements were possible with each individual LGU. One tactic SDLG

effectively employed to mitigate this challenge of breadth over depth was to establish over-time mentoring and follow-up mechanisms, particularly with those LGUs that demonstrated political will to implement local governance improvements.

***Collaborative Partnering with Bangladeshi Organizations:*** Understanding that there existed a strong community of experienced and potentially partner organizations in Bangladesh, the SDLG program also developed innovative collaboration methods with grantees and subcontractors. For example, when developing the core training curricula to roll out to 600 LGUs, pre-testing it in the field, and using a train-the-trainer method to ensure the consistency of trainings across regions and between partners, SDLG did this side by side with its nine core Partner NGOs during each step. As a result, these PNGOs brought their own insights and experiences to improve the curricula and then the PNGOs also more truly understood and “owned” the curricula than if SDLG staff had developed it in isolation. Another example relates to SDLG’s use of adaptive program management, monitoring and evaluation in collaboration with PNGOs. Thus, as LGU and CIG Forum training and follow-on mentoring took place, SDLG organized quarterly meetings with all nine PNGOs to transparently present and discuss the pace of implementation, PNGO performance per objective metrics and the various lessons being learned by the various organizations.

***Integrating program efforts across program components:*** A significant challenge that emerged from discussions of the SDLG program design related to integrating activities across program components. Thus, while weekly office meetings and other management techniques helped to share information across component teams, at times the component teams felt that there was inadequate synergy or integration between components (even when each team was effectively organizing component activities). This experience of component teams of insufficient integration diminished when there were clear goals or substantive themes that cross-cut the components. Thus, for example, SDLG’s leadership in the area of gender characterized work in all components. Similarly, with the extension year, the SDLG focus on key substantive and policy reforms of interest to USAID sector teams in areas such as health and agriculture cross-cut the component areas thereby creating more natural synergies.

***Responding to changes in program budget and scope of work:*** During the 52 months of implementation the SDLG program had to respond to two unanticipated yet significant changes to the design of the program called for by the USAID/Bangladesh Mission. These were, first, adjusting the program to a reduction in the budget from a ceiling of approximately \$19.2 million to \$14.6 million in the first quarter of the SDLG Year 3. And second was the modification of the SDLG scope during the extension year to remove the component focused on strengthening LGAs while reorienting the remaining components, including to develop programmatic synergies between SDLG and other Mission programs in diverse sectors and in relationship to Presidential Initiatives. While these were significantly different changes from each other, they nonetheless both called for SDLG to rapidly reorient its programming approaches.

The ability of SDLG to navigate these changes effectively, that is the key lessons learned in this area, reflected that SDLG adopted quick and transparent communication with partners and stakeholders so that they too could understand the changes and that SDLG then collaborated with the partners and stakeholders in adjusting or redesigning relevant program elements as needed. For example, the representatives from Partner NGOs in the workshop noted how helpful it was for SDLG to immediately call a partners meeting with grantees and subcontractors to discuss the pending budget reductions. The PNGOs appreciated that the USAID COR as well as the SDLG home office Senior Technical Advisor/Manager participated. And they noted that as a result of this proactive and transparent approach it was easier to work collaboratively with SDLG in modifying the grants and subcontract relationships.

## **Program Implementation**

As with all significant local governance strengthening programs, there are many and varied program implementation lessons that may be learned. Most of these relate to the strategies, methods and tools utilized by the SDLG program.

***Strategic focus on and leveraging of local government laws and regulations for program results:*** SDLG made the strategic choice to focus on and leverage opportunities presented by the major changes in the legislative framework which had occurred in 2009. Key new LG legislations included the Upazilla Parishad Act 2009, Local Government (Union Parishad) Act 2009, Local Government (Pourashava) Act 2009 and Local Government (City Corporation) Act 2009. This focus and leveraging proved useful in a number of ways. For example, the trainings and other technical assistance SDLG organized for LGU officials was directly focused on assisting officials to understand new roles and responsibilities in law, and not just comparative practices or examples they might be able to usefully learn from. Equally, the enactment of the new local governance legislations, and challenges that emerged over time as they began to be implemented, provided important and timely topics to focus SDLG research and advocacy upon. Perhaps most significant, however, was the SDLG program focus on the prospects inherent in local governance legislation for activating the Standing Committees of local governments. The SDLG program demonstrated that SCs present an excellent and official structure through which the performance of local governments in service delivery or otherwise may be monitored by locally-elected officials and local community members. As well, SCs provide an official means for local officials at lower government levels (e.g., Unions) to bring government performance issues to higher levels (e.g., Upazilas).

***Prioritization of gender concerns and supporting women officials and women in communities:*** Across the different SDLG components, including through the use of the Windows of Opportunity fund, the program placed priority on working with women and focusing on issues related to gender as these played out in local governance. Thus, to take just two examples, in working with the BUPF, MAB and UzPAB, training and mentoring activities regularly integrated a focus on women's participation. SDLG further worked with these LGAs to develop internal structures or committees to help organize and support women elected officials. And with respect to the field work with LGUs and communities, SDLG leveraged local governance laws mandating women's participation on LGU Standing Committees to significantly enhance the number of women who participated on and chaired committees. One interesting lesson to be learned from the SDLG work with elected women officials was that, by and large, they were highly motivated when receiving trainings or other technical assistance and demonstrated impressive intent to use what they had learned through program-sponsored support.

***Innovative use of mentoring, facilitation and follow-up to support LGUs:*** In the Lessons Learned Workshop in December, 2014 an interesting lesson to emerge related to the SDLG program's extensive effort to provide on-demand and flexible mentoring, facilitation and follow-up to the structured and more formal LGU and CIG Forum training activities. On the one hand, such post-training support proved both effective and flexible in supporting motivated LGUs and CIG Forums to progressively improve their performance. On the other hand, the workshop participants – which included a number of professionals who had longstanding experience working with USAID, other donors, diverse NGOs and the government itself in the field of local governance in Bangladesh – concluded that this was not just an SDLG innovation, but one that was worthy of replicating in other programs.

***Seeking opportunities to develop reform and governance consensus:*** While working directly with local government elected officials, the SDLG program also targeted various government officials and policy makers in the policy formulation and governing processes. This included the active participation and support of the local government administration as well as elected officials in diverse trainings and related assistance activities at local levels. Equally at national levels, MPs and ministry officials were invited to SDLG events as well as a select group of them also participating in the SDLG-organized Closed-door Policy Dialogues. The project's continued efforts helped ensure that the policy makers, local administrators and elected officials were increasingly aware of the objectives and purpose not just of the SDLG program itself, but of many of the ongoing challenges faced in implementing local government reforms along with examples of effective practices being developed by various local governments themselves. For example, SDLG's national policy conferences and related publications focused specifically on such ongoing challenges and chronicled examples of emerging effective local governance practices.

### ***Limits in supporting organizational development and self-sufficiency in local government associations:***

The USAID/Bangladesh Mission took the decision for the SDLG extension year to eliminate support for the LGA program component. This ended USAID's more than a decade-long support for BUPF and MAB as well as ended support for the newly-formed UzPAB, This decision reflected the reality that the BUPF and MAB had at best mixed results improving their organizational development and self-sufficiency despite SDLG program support for these goals.

Reflecting on this, several broad lessons emerged from the workshop. One is that the SDLG project budget cuts in 2013 negatively impacted the effectiveness of support for the LGAs. More significantly though was the variance in the goals of USAID/Bangladesh and SDLG as opposed to those of the LGAs, particularly of the association's leaders. In this, the longevity of USAID support for the LGAs, combined with it being provided across multiple implementing partners, undermined the credibility of SDLG in communicating that organizational development and self-sufficiency were project goals. The lesson from this is that USAID, and not primarily the SDLG program, needed to be the primary messenger with the LGAs that USAID assistance was coming to an end. An additional observation from the workshop was the stark difference in motivation and performance when comparing the LGAs with the SDLG partner NGOs and subcontractors. The speculation of workshop participants is that this difference was accounted for, at least in part, by differences in the economic operating environments. The PNGOs and subcontractors operated in competitive environments where their performance mattered for their ability to solicit new grant or contract agreements. In contrast, the LGAs operated without competition from rival LGAs. Put together, the presence of longstanding subsidies and the non-competitive operating environments did not prepare the LGAs to embrace organizational development and self-sufficiency as their own internal association goals.

## **3.2 SELECT SUCCESS STORIES**

The SDLG project through trainings, technical assistance, facilitation and mentoring helped local governments govern in more transparent and locally-responsive fashions. A key mechanism through which this occurred was the activation of the Standing Committees of local governments themselves. Beyond simply monitoring the performance of local governments, SCs can intervene to improve performance and enhance service delivery on their own initiative or they can report issues to their UP monthly meeting and the UP chair can place the issue with either the Upazila Parishad SC or with the Upazila Parishad monthly meeting. The following success stories were developed during the extension year and provide several selected case studies that focus not on SDLG activities but rather on ways that SDLG program support helped improve the performance of local governments.

***Women and Children Affairs Standing Committee in Burigoalini UP at Shyamnagar Upazila:*** This particular SC had been especially active following the SDLG intervention in 2012, even though it was formed earlier. Community members Faruque and Samsunnahar were married and lived in the village Datinakhali (Ward No.7). Samsunnahar was the victim of physical abuse by her husband and his relatives because of her dark complexion. She was a member of a savings club where Nargis Akhter, an SDLG CIG Forum member, was also a member. Nargis brought this issue of physical abuse to the attention of the SC President, Mst. Shazia Khatun. The SC discussed this in the next meeting and decided to intervene. The SC members Nargis Akhter and Mst. Shazia Khatun visited the house and warned Faruque against abusing Samsunnahar. The SC president also cautioned Faruque and his relatives that if they continued the physical and mental violence against Shamsunnar then she would file a case against them under the existing law on Repression against Women. This resulted in restraining Faruque and his relatives from abusing Samsunnahar.

***Education and Health Standing Committee in Krishnanagar UP at Kaliganj upazila:*** In Bangladesh the allegation of rough and rude behavior of physicians and Health Assistants with patients at public health centers is common. In Krishnanagar village (Ward No. 5), Sahidul Islam, who was a UP SC member as well as a member of the SDLG-supported CIG Forum, came to know about such behavior of a health

service provider for the patients in the Union Health and Family Welfare Centre (UHFWC). Mr. Islam informed the President of the SC, Mst. Rafiza Parveen of this problem. Three days later the SC met to discuss the rough behavior of the physician and decided to visit the clinic. Mst. Rafiza Parveen and SC members Sahidul Islam and Abdul Aziz visited the UHFWC. Initially the Health Assistant denied the allegations of unprofessional behavior reported against him. Under pressure from the SC members however he admitted and committed to change his behavior with the patients. The SC informed the Health Assistant that it would perform follow up visits in order to ensure that the change in his behavior continues.

Another case study for this particular Education and Health SC relates to a teacher's misbehavior with students. Mukta, a student of class eight at Kishan Mazdur United Academy and daughter of Asadul Tarafdar lived in Sankarpur village (WardNo. 3). One day a teacher at the school behaved badly toward her. After this incident she refused to go to school again. A neighbor of Mukta, Abdul Aziz, also a CIG Forum member, came to know of the matter and informed the SC Chair, Mst. Rafiza Parveen, about it. The SC discussed it in a meeting and decided to visit the school. The next day, Sahidul Islam and Abdul Aziz visited the school. In the presence of the Headmaster and the SC members, the teacher admitted his misbehavior in the incident and agreed to the direction of the SC and the Headmaster not to repeat such acts in the future. Both the headmaster and the SC committed to continuing to monitor the situation to ensure that the teacher honors his commitment.

***Social Welfare and Disaster Management Standing Committee of Burigoalini Union at Shyamnagar Upazila:*** This committee was formed in 2011 after the UP elections, however, it only began to meet and perform monitoring activities following SDLG interventions. The following case study concerns actions taken to help reconstruct a collapsed bridge.

Md. Zillur Rahman, a member of the SDLG-supported CIG Forum and also a member of the Social Welfare and Disaster Management SC of the UP, found that the connecting road of Kolbari wooden bridge and part of the bridge was breaking apart. He quickly informed the UP Chairman over mobile phone. Sensing the urgency of the situation the Chairman informed the President of the Social Welfare and Disaster Management SC and other members of the Burigoalini UP and requested for all to visit the site to assess what needs to be done. The President of the SC subsequently called an emergency meeting to visit the site and plan necessary interventions. The SC decided to seek from the UP immediate support to stop the road from breaking apart completely. The UP Chairman informed the Upazila Chairman who involved the Upazila Project Implementation Officer (PIO) to assist with materials and tools for fixing the road to the bridge on an emergency basis. Seeking a permanent repair, the President of the SC continued to raise the issue in UP monthly meetings. Accordingly, the UP Chairman took the issue to the Shymnagar Upazila monthly meeting, which instructed the Upazila LGED engineer to initiate construction of a well-structured bridge to resolve the problem permanently.

***Agriculture, Fisheries and Livestock Standing Committee of Krishnanagar UP at Kaliganj upazila:*** In this instance, two case studies are presented. One is with respect to the draining of water-logged land and the other is with respect to removing an obstruction from a water body.

Regarding the draining of water-logged land, farmers of Krishnanagar village faced problems with water logging from heavy rainfall in about 13.5 acres of land where the main crop cultivated is rice paddy. The CIG Forum members of this area discussed the issue with community members in a court-yard meeting in Ward No. 3. After this a UP member of Ward No. 3, who was also President of the Agriculture, Fisheries and Livestock SC, discussed the issue in the SC meeting. On the basis of a consensus decision of the SC the President raised the issue in the Krishnanagar UP monthly meeting. The SC President also raised the issue in the Union Development Coordination Committee (UDCC) meeting, which is also attended by the sub-assistant agriculture officer. After discussion in the UDCC meeting it was decided that the pipes unused from previous UP work would be used to remove the water logging. Based on the cost estimation by the Sub-Assistant Agriculture Officer (SAAO) of underground boring of the pipes to remove the water, all the

affected land owners (of about 13.5 acres) agreed to contribute the total of Tk. 9,000 for the work. The UP Chairman ordered the start of the work of installing the pipes.

However, some people objected to bore pipes under their cultivable land thus stopping the work. Unable to settle it in the locality, the UP Chairman placed this issue in the Upazila monthly meeting where it received due attention. The Upazila Chairman assigned the task to the Upazila Agriculture Officer (UAO) to work out a plan to get the pipes installed. Finally, the Chairman and members of the UP, UAO and SAAO visited the area and explained to the local people how this work would benefit all and that boring of pipes would not affect the cultivable land. The work was then completed without any further problem. The SC members also visited the area and discussed the condition of the facilities and the benefits with the affected people.

The case study regarding removing obstruction from a water body occurred in in Roghunathpur village (Wards No. 7 and 8) of Krishnanagar UP. An illegal fishing trap was helping to generate water logging whenever there was heavy rainfall. The villagers tried to solve the problem with the help of several influential people in the community, but the beneficiaries from the illegally installed trap refused to remove it from the water course. The Agriculture, Fisheries and Livestock SC discussed the issue in the SC meeting in June 2014 and resolved to bring it to the UP monthly meeting. After some discussion and time, the UP Chairman presented the issue in the Upazila monthly meeting. The Upazila Chairman and other members took the decision to remove the illegal obstruction to the water flow with the assistance of the police. Accordingly, the Upazila instructed the Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNO) to arrange for assistance from the law enforcement agencies. The Krishnanagar UP Chairman, the UNO, the UZP Chairman, Upazila Agriculture Officer and other members of council were present at the site on the day of removal of the water trap. The members of the SC made different follow up visits to ensure that there was no attempt to obstruct the canal again.

# 4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES

## 4.1 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES

In this section, we present a set of recommendations for USAID/Bangladesh to consider with respect to potential future local government initiatives. As with the discussion of lessons learned, the bulk of these recommendations emerged from the Lessons Learned Workshop held in Dhaka on December 14, 2014 after program implementation was completed. The recommendations are presented in no particular order or priority. However, some of them, such as the recommendation to prioritize working with the Standing Committees of LGUs and the recommendation to prioritize improving service delivery performance of LGUs would naturally go together in the design for a new initiative.

***Focus on depth more rather than breadth and lengthen the timeframe for engagement with local governments:*** The program design for SDLG to work with 600 LGUs during an initial 39-month timeframe limited the types and extent of technical assistance SDLG could provide to each local government. Taking into account the magnitude of resources that may be available for a new initiative, the recommendation is to focus on fewer LGUs while engaging with them in more depth and with more continuity. Just as SDLG sought to build on earlier USAID/Bangladesh local governance programs, a new initiative could build on these programs and on SDLG by focusing on a sub-set of the SDLG 600 target LGUs. At the same time, ensuring that the new initiative had more than a 39-month timeframe would be more likely to lead to sustainable results.

***Prioritize support for UzPAB as part of support for local government associations:*** The challenge of working with LGAs, as discussed above, partly related to the incentive structures for the associations. It proved difficult for SDLG to encourage MAB and BUPF to professionalize and seek self-sufficiency due, at least in part, because the ongoing and longstanding USAID and donor support had led to the expectation that such support would be continued indefinitely. UzPAB, being a newer LGA associated with the more recently formed Upazila level of local governance, does not have such a history and so provides USAID and implementing partners an opportunity to structure technical assistance more clearly with the expectation that the association prioritize the need to professionalize and seek self-sufficiency in addition to clarifying its organizational goals and building capacity to achieve them.

***Work more directly with the national-level Government of Bangladesh offices and line ministry staff at national and local levels:*** The SDLG program, similarly to other local government programs funded by USAID/Bangladesh, adopted more of a bottom-up as opposed to a top-down approach. The logic of this was premised on the need to build local understanding and demand for improved governance within local communities while working with the level of local government most accessible to and, potentially, most responsive to citizen needs. A new initiative should more directly seek to work with national offices, such as the line ministries, including the bureaucratic staff who work at local government levels. For this

recommendation to be most successful, USAID/Bangladesh may consider to negotiate an MOU with the Government of Bangladesh to pave the ground for successful project implementation.

***Ensure the initiative focuses on Standing Committees:*** As indicated in several selected success stories in the previous section, the SCs represent a considerable potential for exercising greater local control over centrally-provided services and improving the quality of those services by making their delivery more transparent and accountable. The recommendation is that a new initiative expand the work pioneered by SDLG with SCs. This focus on SCs can also be combined with a focus on improving service delivery as discussed in the next recommendation.

***Incorporate a focus on improved service delivery:*** Given the centrality of service delivery to the work and purpose of local governments, given USAID/Bangladesh's interest to develop cross-sectoral programming among the Mission's sector teams and Presidential Initiatives, and given the SDLG project success in piloting activities with local governments focused on sectoral Standing Committees and service delivery, a new initiative should more centrally emphasize improved service delivery in its scope of work. To do so most effectively, the new initiative would need to work across levels of local governance as responsibilities for service delivery vary across these levels as well as with relevant national-level offices.

***Continue to prioritize working with women, and incorporating a gender perspective, as a cross-cutting program element:*** A consistent experience of the SDLG program was how welcoming were Bangladeshi women of the SDLG program assistance. This was the case when working with women in local communities in Citizens-in Governance Forums, in the local government associations and in Standing Committees of local governments. A new initiative can continue and expand such support.

***Emphasize horizontal learning among and between LGUs:*** Between what was learned during the SDLG program, and what has been learned from other donor initiatives as well as the Government of Bangladesh's efforts to strengthen LGUs, a new program during implementation should rigorously document success stories and clarify effective practices. Such information can be made available to local government officials and local communities through peer-to-peer exchanges and related mechanisms of horizontal learning. The program could also develop means to incentivize enhanced performance, including through building on the SDLG ABC Grading system and linking assistance to demonstrated LGU performance improvements.

***Develop opportunities for collaborative and co-creation of program design and implementation with the Government and non-governmental partners:*** The SDLG program's highly-collaborative approach to partnering with NGOs in the design of training and technical assistance activities for LGUs enhanced the initial quality of assistance and provided ongoing opportunities to review, modify and improve the assistance over time. The recommendation is for a new initiative to call for the implementing partner to adopt mechanisms for collaboration and co-creation with program stakeholders as it engages in program implementation. One option USAID/Bangladesh may consider is a the model for encouraging stakeholders to co-create development solutions referred to as the "Development Innovation Accelerator", which is being piloted in a number of missions worldwide by the USAID Global Development Lab.

# 5.0 FINANCIAL REPORT

## 5.1 EXPENDITURES BY LINE ITEM

The Table 2.1 provides a final financial reporting of how SDLG in Bangladesh funds were expended, broken down by contract line items.

**TABLE 5.1. FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT BY CONTRACT LINE ITEM**

<b>CONTRACT NO.: EPP-I-00-04-00035-00</b>			
<b>Bangladesh Strengthening Democratic Local Governance (SDLG)</b>			
<b>Contract Line Items</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Total Invoiced To Feb 20, 2015</b>	<b>% Budget Spent</b>
Workdays Ordered	\$1,441,126.47	\$1,412,589.12	98%
Other Direct Costs	\$10,520,281.01	\$10,501,405.69	100%
Window of Opportunity Fund	\$659,514.42	\$659,514.42	100%
Indirect Costs (OH, MHO, G&A)	\$1,389,895.01	\$1,367,677.05	98%
Fixed Fee	\$717,257.20	\$717,256.99	93%
Cost plus Fixed Fee	\$14,728,074.12	\$14,658,443.27	99%

## 5.2 EXPENDITURES BY PROGRAM COMPONENT

The Table 2.2 provides a final financial reporting of how SDLG in Bangladesh funds were expended, broken down by the program components, media, M&E and Windows of Opportunity.

**TABLE 5.2. FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT BY PROGRAM COMPONENT**

<b>CONTRACT NO.: EPP-I-00-04-00035-00</b>	
<b>Bangladesh Strengthening Democratic Local Governance (SDLG)</b>	
<b>Contract Line Items</b>	<b>Total Invoiced To Feb 20, 2015</b>
Workdays Ordered	\$1,408,719.60
<b>Comp 1</b>	\$346,020.36
<b>Comp 2</b>	\$728,434.20
<b>Comp 3&amp;4</b>	\$5,742,007.19
<b>Comp 6 Media</b>	\$487,587.12
<b>Comp 5 M&amp;E</b>	\$160,950.39
Other Direct Costs	\$3,036,406.43
Window of Opportunity Fund	\$659,514.42
Indirect Costs (OH, MHO, G&A)	\$1,367,677.05
Fixed Fee	\$717,256.99
Cost plus Fixed Fee	\$14,658,443.27

# 6.0 INDICATORS

## 6.1 ORIGINAL INDICATORS

The Table 3.1 provides results data on the original set of SDLG PMP indicators for the project years 2011 – 2013.

For the extension year, a different set of indicators was adopted as presented in Section 3.2 below.

**TABLE 6.1 SDLG PERFORMANCE INDICATORS – RESULTS OF 2011 (1ST YEAR), 2012 (2ND YEAR) AND 2013 (3RD YEAR)**

Indicator Definition	Treatment/ Control	Baseline	Target Yr 1	Actual Yr 1	Target Yr 2	Actual Yr 2	Target Yr 3	Actual Yr 3	LOP Target	LOP Actual
<b>Component 1- Roles and Authorities of Local Governments</b>										
1.1 } Number of LGUs where information on local government services is readily available to community members (Citizen Charter)	Treatment	0	0	0	500	394	500*	499	500	
1.2 } Percentage of elected council officials and civil servants with increased understanding of local government issues and capabilities	Treatment/ Control	4% of Sample	4% Baseline	4%	20% of Sample	22.48%	40% of Sample	51%	40% of Sample	
1.3 } Number of policy dialogue roundtables or research conferences on local government held regionally or nationally	Treatment	0	1	1	7	12	4	4	12	
1.4 } Number of advocacy actions conducted by women elected representatives in local government	Treatment	0	4	4	6	7	8	1	18	
<b>Component 2 – Advocacy and Capacity Building of Local Government Associations</b>										
2.1 } Percentage increase of BUPF, MAB and Upazila Association's own revenue**	Treatment <b>MAB</b>	Tk500,000 includes contributions	0% Baseline	0% Baseline	100% Tk 1,000,000	+ 270% Tk1,842,000 includes contributions (Tk 404,000 in Dues)	150% Tk 1,250,000	<b>+ 70.4% Tk852,000 in Dues</b>	MAB=150% Tk 1,250,000	
	Treatment <b>BUPF</b>	Tk50,000 includes contributions	0% Baseline	0% Baseline	BUPF=3000% Tk 1,550,000	+ 1077% Tk 588,500 in Dues	BUPF=8000% Tk 4,050,000	<b>+ 1968% Tk1,034,000 in Dues</b>	BUPF=8000% Tk 4,050,000	
	Treatment <b>Upz Assoc.</b>	Upz=Tk0	0% Baseline	0% Baseline	50% Dues Tk. 723,000	Tk 155,550 in Dues	70% Dues Tk1,012,200	<b>21.4% Dues Tk309,000 in Dues</b>	70% Dues Tk1,012,200	
2.2 } Total number of BUPF and MAB members**	Treatment	MAB= 200 BUPF= 3000	Baseline	Baseline	MAB= 275 BUPF= 3500	MAB-308 (67 dues paid) BUPF=593	MAB= 300 BUPF= 4200	<b>MAB = 308 -136 dues paid BUPF = 1034</b>	MAB 300 BUPF= 4200	

Indicator Definition	Treatment/ Control	Baseline	Target Yr 1	Actual Yr 1	Target Yr 2	Actual Yr 2	Target Yr 3	Actual Yr 3	LOP Target	LOP Actual
2.3 } Number of local and nongovernmental and public sector associations supported with USG assistance	Treatment	0	2	2	3 (2* + 1)	3	3*	3	3	
2.4 } Number of legal challenges to GOB limits on local gov't authority	Treatment	1	1	0	2	4	1	1	4	
<b>Component 3 – Transparent and Effective Service Delivery by Local Governments</b>										
3.1} Number of sub-national government entities receiving USG assistance to improve their performance	Treatment	0	0	0	600	526 (including 26 Upazila)	600*	<b>592</b> (including 92 Upazila)	600	
3.2} Number of sub-national governments receiving USG assistance to increase their annual own-source revenues (OSR)	Treatment	0	0	0	500	500	500*	<b>500</b>	500	
3.3 } Number of individuals who received USG-assisted training, including management skills and fiscal management, to strengthen local government and/or decentralization	Treatment	0	4008	4426 (revised)	24,610	23,207	25,900 (23,500* + 1500)	<b>35,058</b>	30,118	
3.4) Percentage increase in tax revenue generated in targeted LGUs (own source revenue – OSR)	Treatment / Control	<u>Avg. OSR</u> Union – 220,000 / 220,000  Muni – 18,500,000 / 18,650,000	Baseline	Baseline	30% above baseline	<u>Avg. OSR</u> Union- 300,274/159,173 Mean: 21.7% incr. Median: 20.5% Incr.  Muni- 11,072,225/1,049,278	50% above baseline	<u>Avg. OSR</u> Union- 719,420/491,569 <b>Treatment: +227%</b> <b>Control: +123%</b>  <b>Muni-</b> 42,736,010/9,787,297	50% above baseline	

Indicator Definition	Treatment/Control	Baseline	Target Yr 1	Actual Yr 1	Target Yr 2	Actual Yr 2	Target Yr 3	Actual Yr 3	LOP Target	LOP Actual
						Mean: 43.8% incr. Median: 58.3% incr.		<b>Treatment: +131%</b> <b>Control: -47%</b>		
3.5) Percentage increase in citizen satisfaction with selected LGU services	Treatment	% Good or <u>Excellent</u> Union-47% (local roads)  Muni-37% (local markets)	Baseline	Baseline	15% above baseline	% Good or <u>Excellent</u> Union-69.5% (local roads) Result: 17.0% incr.  Muni-67.8% (local markets) Result: 19.5% incr.	30% above baseline	% Good or <u>Excellent</u> <b>Union-56.9%</b> (local roads) <b>Result: +10%</b>  <b>Muni-54.9%</b> (local markets) <b>Result: +18%</b>	30% above baseline	
<b>Component 4 – Citizen Participation in Local-Decision Making</b>										
4.1) Number of Citizens' Forums established	Treatment	0	0	0	500	499	500*	<b>500</b>	500	
4.2) Percentage of citizens that are better informed about LGU revenue generation capacity and fiscal transparency.	Treatment / Control	% Yes  <u>Revenue Generation</u> Union-5%/4% Muni-5%/18%  <u>Fiscal Transp.</u> Union-25%/19% Muni-17%/25%	Baseline	Baseline	15% above baseline	% Yes  <u>Revenue Generation</u> Union-19.9%/9.7% Muni-25.3%/32.7%  Increase in Union:15%/4.70% Muni:19.7%/15.4%  <u>Fiscal Transp.</u> Union-41%/48% Muni-47%/36.7%  Increase in Union:15.1%/25.2% Muni:28.7%/19.5%	30% above baseline	% Yes  <u>Revenue Generation</u> Union-11.6% / 4.1% Muni-10.3% / 16.0%  Increase in <b>Union:6% / 0%</b> <b>Muni:5% / -2%</b>  <u>Fiscal Transp.</u> Union-48.2% / 37.3% Muni-57.3% / 57.9%  Increase in <b>Union:23% / 18%</b> <b>Muni:40% / 33%</b>	30% above baseline	
4.3) Participatory strategic planning and budgeting implemented in targeted LGUs	Treatment	0	0	0	500	247	600 (500* +100)	<b>498</b> <b>(including 8 Upazila)</b>	600	
4.4) Number of local mechanisms supported with USG assistance for citizens to engage their sub-national government.	Treatment	0	0	0	3	5	5 (3* + 2)	<b>5</b>	5	
4.5) Percentage of citizens that feel their	Treatment / Control	% Somewhat or	Baseline	Baseline	15% above baseline	% Somewhat or <u>Very Much</u>	30% above baseline	% Somewhat or <u>Very Much</u>	30% above baseline	

Indicator Definition	Treatment/ Control	Baseline	Target Yr 1	Actual Yr 1	Target Yr 2	Actual Yr 2	Target Yr 3	Actual Yr 3	LOP Target	LOP Actual
input and feedback was considered in local government decision making process		<u>Very Much</u> Union- 34% / 30%  Muni- 29% / 26%				Union-99.4% Muni- 99.4%  <i>*For increase, see the footnote on 4.5 below</i>		<b>Union/Muni - 94.9% / 90.3</b>  <i>*For increase, see the midline footnote on 4.5 below</i>		

## 6.2 EXTENSION YEAR INDICATORS

The adoption of new indicators reflected the revised scope of work for the project during the extension period. This revised SOW included emphasis on cross-cutting activities relevant not just for USAID/Bangladesh's Democracy and Governance portfolio but also for Mission activities under the Feed the Future, Global Climate Change and Global Health Initiatives.

**TABLE 6.2. SDLG PMP CHART EXTENSION YEAR**

Indicator Definition	Treatment/ Control	Baseline	Target Ext. Yr	Actual Ext. Yr (Final Q4 2014)	Comment	Variance – Actual vs. Target
<b>Component 1 – Policy Advocacy for Local Government</b>						
1.1} Number (#) of mechanisms to advocate for local government decentralization	Treatment	0	4	4		0%
<b>Component 2 – Transparent and Effective Service Delivery by Local Governments</b>						
2.1} Number (#) of sub-national governments receiving <b>USG</b> assistance to increase their annual own-source revenues (OSR)	Treatment	0	200	200	10 PS (Municipalities) 190 UPs (Unions)	0%
2.2 } Number (#) of individuals who received <b>USG</b> -assisted training, including management skills and fiscal management, to strengthen local government and/or decentralization	Treatment	0	4400	4269 Male – 3309 Female – 960	LGU representatives – 2661  CiG citizens – 1608	- 3%
2.3} Percentage increase in revenue generated in targeted LGUs (own source revenue – OSR)	Treatment	FY 2012-2013 Revenues	30% increase over FY 2012-13	PS – 68% increase UP – 34% increase	10 PS (Municipalities) 190 UPs (Unions)	+ 126% (Municipalities) - greater focus on household taxes than prior years and government circular on proper tax assessment contributed to unexpectedly high increase  +13% (Unions) - greater focus on business taxes than prior years and government circular on proper tax assessment contributed to unexpectedly high increase
2.4} Number (#) of health clinics offering improved services in response to local standing committee oversight <b>Health SDLG</b>	Treatment	0	200	189	of 190 unions – one union has no health clinic	- 6%
2.5} Percentage (%) of community served by clinics supported by groups of mobilized local influential stakeholders <b>Health GHI</b>	Treatment	0	25%	36%		+ 44% - standing committee monitoring more effective than expected, SDLG- trained citizens often joined separate health clinic management committees
2.6} Number (#) of agriculture extension officer actions improving services in response to local standing committee oversight <b>Agriculture SDLG</b>	Treatment	0	95	118		+ 24% - standing committee monitoring more effective than expected
2.7} Number (#) of individuals who have received USG supported training on accessing local agricultural extension and agricultural information services <b>Agriculture FtF</b>	Treatment	0	950	926	Agriculture SC, Extension Officers & USAID Agriculture Project Participants	- 3%
2.8} Number (#) of citizens receiving information on climate change adaptation during local government outreach activities <b>Climate Change SDLG</b>	Treatment	0	30,000	52,779 Male – 37,560 Female – 15,219	On average, 264 citizens reached per outreach activity in 200 LGUs (folk drama)	+ 79% - target value represents 150 person audience per outreach activity based on 2013 folk drama experience; however audience size exceeded expectations

Indicator Definition	Treatment/ Control	Baseline	Target Ext. Yr	Actual Ext. Yr (Final Q4 2014)	Comment	Variance – Actual vs. Target
2.9) Number (#) of institutions with improved capacity to address climate change issues as a result of USG assistance <b>Climate Change GCC</b>	Treatment	0	190	187	Agriculture SCs active	- 2%
2.10) Number of local standing committees successful in preventing women's rights violations <b>Human Rights SDLG</b>	Treatment	0	200	173	Family Dispute SCs, (1635 incidents prevented of child marriage, dowry, VAW or trafficking)	- 14% - In the 27 LGUs where SCs did not report preventing violations, such cases likely went unreported. Also, 10 of the 27 LGUs were PSs where citizens cannot serve on standing committees and resolution of disputes through negotiations or complaints to police are prevalent
<b>Component 3 – Citizen Participation in Local-Decision Making</b>						
3.1) Number of local mechanisms supported with <b>USG</b> assistance for citizens to engage their sub-national government.	Treatment	3	3	3	-Ward Meetings -Open Budgeting -Standing Committees	0%
3.2) Number of citizens participating in local standing committee oversight	Treatment	0	2200	1718 Male – 1086 Female – 601		- 22% - Estimate of target value assumed that all 4 citizen members of each standing committee would participate in monitoring oversight when in practice an average of 3 citizens per committee participated.

# 7.0 GOVERNMENT, DONOR AND CIVIL SOCIETY INSTITUTIONS ENGAGED

## 7.1 NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

The SDLG project interacted closely with diverse government and nongovernmental institutions and organizations during the life of the project. The list below identifies the key counterpart and partner organizations engaged by the project, including Government of Bangladesh offices, local government associations, civil society partner organizations, subcontractors and donors.

### **Government of Bangladesh**

- Local Government Division, Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives (MLGRD)
- National Institute of Local Government, MLGRD

### **Local Government Associations**

- Bangladesh Union Parishad Forum (BUPF)
- Municipal Association of Bangladesh (MAB)
- Upazila Association of Bangladesh (UzPAB)

### **Civil Society (Partner NGO or Research Organization Sub-Grantees)**

- Banchte Shekha (BS)
- Bangladesh Enterprise Institute (BEI)
- Bangladesh Institute of Theatre Arts (BITA)
- Bangladesh Nari Pragati Sangha (BNPS)
- Bangladesh Union Parishad Forum (BUPF)
- BROTEE
- Centre for Urban Studies (CUS)
- Chandradip Development Society (CDS)
- Democracywatch (DW)
- Manab Mukti Sangstha (MMS)
- Media Professionals Group (MPG)
- People's Oriented Program Implementation (POPI)
- PRIP Trust

- PUSPO Bangladesh
- RDRS Bangladesh
- Shariatpur Development Society (SDS)
- Shushilan
- SKS Foundation
- Unnayan Shamannay (US)
- WAVE Foundation

#### **Subcontractors (Host Country)**

- Asian University for Women, Chittagong
- Data International Ltd.
- The Neilsen Company (Bangladesh) Ltd.
- Md. Maksudul Hannan Research
- Org-Quest Research Ltd.
- UNITREND Ltd.

#### **Subcontractors (Third Country)**

- Ateneo University School of Government, Philippines
- Institute of Social Science, India

#### **Donor Organizations**

- DANIDA Danish International Development Agency
- GiZ Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (German International Cooperation Agency)
- JICA Japan International Cooperation Agency
- SDC Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
- UNDP United Nations Development Program
- WB World Bank

## **7.2 LOCAL GOVERNMENTS**

Over the life of the project, SDLG provided technical assistance and worked directly with over 600 local governments in Bangladesh. The original contract period involved SDLG working with 100 Upazilas, 450 Unions and 50 municipalities as presented in Table 5.1. During the extension year, SDLG worked with 200 LGs comprised of 190 unions and 10 municipalities as presented in Table 5.2. Of these 200 LGs, 13 were ones SDLG did not work with during the original contract period.

**TABLE 7.1. 600 SDLG TRAINED LGS**

District	Upazila	Union Parishad	Municipality
1.Rangpur	1.Badarganj	1.Gopalpur	1.Badarganj
		2.Modhupur	
	2.Kanunia	3.Kursha	
		4.Sarai	
	3.Mithapukur	5.Bara Hazratpur	
		6.Durgapur	
		7.Latibpur	
	4.Pirghacha	8.Kallani	
		9.Parul	
	5.Pirganj	10.Pirganj	
		11.Raipur	
		12.Ramnathpur	
	6.Rangpur	13.Chandanpath	

District	Upazila	Union Parishad	Municipality
		14. Saddyapuskurinir	
	7. Taraganj	15. Alampur	
		16. Ekurdhali	
2. Gaibandha	8. Fulchari	17. Chanchipara	
		18. Uddakhali	
	9. Gaibandha	19. Badiakhali	
		20. Bollamjhar	
	10. Gobindaganj	21. Horirampur	2. Gobindaganj
		22. Nakai	
	11. Palashbari	23. Barisal	
		24. Betkapa	
		25. Mohadipur	
	12. Sadullahpur	26. Banagram	
		27. Bhatgram	
	13. Shaghata	28. Bonarpara	
		29. Padumshahar	
14. Sundarganj	30. Dahabandha	3. Sundarganj	
	31. Ramjebon		
	32. Tarapur		
	33. Bamondanga		
3. Naogaon	15. Dhamoirhat	34. Dhamoirhat	
		35. Jahanpur	
		36. Umar	
	16. Manda	37. Manda	
		38. Kusumba	
		39. Poranpur	
	17. Niamotpur	40. Niamotpur	
		41. Bhabicha	
		42. Rosulpur	
	18. Atrai	43. Ahshanganj	
		44. Bhonpara	
		45. Monihari	
	19. Badhalgachi	46. Badhalgachi	
		47. Adhaipur	
		48. Balubhora	
	20. Mohadevpur	49. Mohadevpur	
		50. Enayetpur	
		51. Uttargram	
	21. Naogaon sadar	52. Dobullhati	4. Naogaon
		53. Hapania	
		54. Shikarpur	
	22. Patnitala	55. Patnitala	5. Nozirpur
		56. Krisnapur	
	23. Porsha	57. Ganguria	
		58. Nithpur	
		59. Tetulia	
	24. Raninagar	60. Raninagar	
		61. Kaligram	
		62. Kashimpur	
25. Sapahar	63. Sapahar		
	64. Goala		
	65. Sueronty		
4. Bogra	26. Adamdighi	66. Chanpapur	
		67. Chatiagram	
		68. Kundagram	
		69. Nashratpur	
	27. Bogra Sadar	70. Lahiripara	6. Bogra Sadar
		71. Shekherkola	
		72. Shakharia	
		73. Noongola	
	28. Dhunat	74. Gosaibari	
		75. Chikashi	
		76. Mathurapur	
		77. Kaler Para	
29. Gabtali	78. Mohishaban	7. Gabtoli	

District	Upazila	Union Parishad	Municipality
		79.Dashhinpara	
		80.Nashipur	
		81.Gabtolli	
	30.Shibgonj	82.Dauli	
		83.Raigonj	
		84.Moidanhata	
	31.Kahalo	85.Durgapur	8.Kahalo
	86.Kahalo		
	87.Jamgram		
5.Sirajganj	32. Sirajganj Sadar	88.Saidabad	9. Sirajganj
		89.Kalia Hariipur	
		90. Bagbati	
		91. Shialkole	
		92. Khokshabari	
		93.Songacha	
	33.Belkuchi	94. Dawlatpur	
		95. Bhanga bari	
		96.Dhukuria bara	
	34.Ullahpara	97.Purnimagati	10.Ullahpara
		98.Bangla	
		99. Barahar	
		100.Hati Kumrul	
		101.Durganagar	
		102.Ramcrispur	
	35.Sahjadpur	103.Garadaha	11.Sahjadpur
		104.Rupbati	
		105.Kaizuri	
		106.Kayampur	
		107.Ghurka	
	108.Pangashi		
36.Raiganj	109.Brahmagacha	12.Raiganj	
	110.Dhamai Nogor		
	111.Dhangora		
	112.Chandaikona		
	113.Nalka		
	114.Dhubil		
6.Pabna	37. Pabna Sadar	115.Barara	13.Pabna sadar
		116.Dapunia	
		117.Dogachi	
		118. Atikula	
		119.Himaitpur	
		120.Malanchi	
	38. Sujanagar	121. Vayana	
		122.Satbaria	
		123.Monirhat	
		124.Ahmedpur	
	39. Ishwardi	125.Dashuria	14.Ishwardi
		126.Laxmikunda	
		127.Muladuli	
	128.Paksey		
	129.Sara		
	130.Shahapur		
7.Natore	40.Natore Sadar	131.Baraharishpur	15. Natore
		132.Bipra Belgharia	
		133.Kafuria	
		134.Chatui	
		135.Dighapatia	
		136.Halsha	
	41. Baraigram	137.Baraigram	
		138.Majgaon	
		139.Nagare	
		140.Gopalpur	
42.Singra	141.Chaugram	16. Singra	
	142.Hatian Dah		
	143.Italy		

District	Upazila	Union Parishad	Municipality
		144.Kalam	
		145.Tajpur	
		146.Sherkole	
	43.Gurudaspur	147.Biaghat	17.Gurudaspur
		148.Dharabarisha	
	44.Bheramara	149.Chandgram	18.Bheramara
		150.Dharampur	
		151.Juniadah	
		152.Mokurimpur	
	45.Doulatpur	153..Boalia	
		154.Chilmari	
		155.Doulatpur	
		156.Fhilipnagar	
	46.Khoksa	157.Gopgram	
		158.Janipur	
		159.Jayantihazra	
		160.Khoksa	
8. Kushtia	47.Kushtia Sadar	161..Abdalpur	19. Khoksa
		162.Ailchara	
		163.Alampur	
		164. Ujangram	
		165.Gossain Durgapur	
		166.Harinarayaynpur	
		167.Bottoil	
		168.Jhaudia	
	48.Kumarkhali	169.Bagulat	20.Kumarkhali
		170.Chorshadipur	
		171.Panti	
		172.Chapra	
	49.Alamdanga	173.Dauki	
		174.Hardi	
		175.Jamjami	
9.Chuadanga	50.Jibannagar	176.Utholi	21.Jibannagar
		177.Baka	
		178.Abdulbaria	
	51.Chuadanga Sadar	179.Mominpur	22.Chaudanga
		181.Begumpur	
		182.Kutubpur	
	52.Meherpur Sader	183.Kutubpur	23.Meherpur
		184.Pirijpur	
		185.Amjupi	
		186.Boripota	
		187.Amdaha	
	53.Mojibnagar	188.Dariapur	
		189.Monakhali	
		190.Mohajanpur	
		191.Bagoun	
10.Meherpur	54.Gangni	192.Sharbati	24.Gangni
		193.Katholi	
		194.Bamondi	
		195.Tatulbaia	
		196.Dhankhola	
	55.Bagherpara	197.Basuary	25.Bagherpara
		198.Bondabila	
		199.Darajhat	
		200.Dhalgram	
11.Jessore	56.Jessore	201.Arabbpur	26.Jessore
		202.Basundia	
		203.Chacera	
		204.Churamonkati	
		205.Derara	
		206.Nerendrapur	
		207.Haibatpur	
		208.Nowapara	
	57.Monirampur	209.Chaluahati	27.Monirampur

District	Upazila	Union Parishad	Municipality	
		210.Dhakuria		
		211.Durbadanga		
		212.Jhampa		
12.Narial	58.Narial Sadar	213.Tularampur	28.Narial	
		214.Bechali		
		215.Mulia		
	59.Kalia	216.Joynagar	29.Kalia	
		217.Pohardanga		
		218.Kalabaria		
		219.Chanchri		
220.Hamidpur				
13.Satkhira	60.Assasuni	221..Anulia		
		222.Assasuni		
		223.Bardal		
		224.Budhata		
		225.Dargapur		
		226.Kada Kati		
	61.Debhata	227.Debhata		
		228.Kulia		
		229.Nowpara		
		230.Parulia		
		231.Sakhipur		
		232.Chandanpur	30..Kolaroa	
		233.Derra		
	234.Helatola			
	235.Jalalabad			
	236.Joynagar			
	237.Keralkata			
	63.Satkhira	238.Agardari		31.Satkhira
		239.Alipur		
		240.Balli		
		241.Banshdaha		
		242.Boikari		
		243.Bhomra		
		244.Atulia		
	64.Shyamnagar	245.Bhurulia		
		246.Burigoalini		
		247.Gabura		
		248.Ishwaripur		
		249.Kashimari		
		65.Tala	250.Dhandia	
			251.Islamkathi	
			252.Khalinagar	
			253.Khesra	
			254.Nagarghata	
	255.Tala			
	66.Kaliganj	256.Bharashimla		
		257.Bishnupur		
		258.Champaphul		
		259.Daskhin Sreepur		
		260.Dhalbaria		
		261.Krishnanagar		
		14.Bagerhat	67.Bagerhat	262.Baruipara
263.Jatrapur				
264.Karapara				
265.Khanpur				
266.Sait Gambuz				
68.Fakirhat	267.Bahirdia Mansa			
	268.Betaga			
	269.Fakirhat			
	270.Lockpur			
	271.Mulghar			
69.Mongla	272.Burirdanga	33.Mongla		
	273.Chandpai			
	274.Chila			

District	Upazila	Union Parishad	Municipality
		275.Sonaittala	
		276.Sundarban	
	70.Morelgonj	277.Hoglabunia	34.Morelgonj
		278.Nishanbaria	
		279.Panchokaron	
		280.Putikhali	
	71.Mollarhat	281.Morlgonj	
		282.Udaypur	
15.Bhola	72.Kachua	283.Kulia	
		284.Gopalpur	
		285.Gozalia	
	73.Bhola	286.Rajapur	35.Bhola
		287.Bapta	
		288.Beduria	
		289.Uttar Dhigholdi	
		290.Chairsomia	
		291.Elisha	
	74.Daulatkhan	292.Modanpur	36.Daulatkhan
		293.Bhabanipur	
		294.Char Khalifa	
		295.Syedpur	
		296.Medua	
		297.Uttar Joynagar	
	75.Monpura	298.Sakuchia	
		299.Monpura	
		300.Hajirhat	
16.Faridpur	76.Borhanuddin	301.Gangapur	37.Borhanuddin
		302.Hasan Nagar	
		303.Kachia	
		304.Daula	
		305.Boromanika	
	77.Tazimuddin	306.Sonapur	
		307.Boromologchara	
	78.Lalmohan	308.Lalmohan	
		309.Badarpur	
	79.Faridpur Sadar	310.Aliabad	38.Fairipur
		311.Ambicapur	
		312.Gerda	
	313.Ishan Gopalpur		
	314.Kajjuri		
	315.Kanai Pur		
80.Madhukhali	316.Bagat		
	317.Gazna		
	318.Kamerkhali		
	319.Madhukhali		
	320.Megchami		
	321.Noapara		
	322.Raypur		
81.Nagarkanda	323.Bhowal	39.Nogarkanda	
	324.Kaichail		
	325.Laskerdia		
	326.Majhardia		
	327.Purapara		
	328.Talma		
17.Gopalganj	82.Gopalganj Sadar	329.Borashi	40.Gopalganj
		330.Chandradighalia	
		331.Durgapur	
		332.Haridaspur	
		333.Karapara	
		334.Kathi	
		335.Latifur	
		336.Magigati	
		337.Raghunathpur	
		338.Ulpur	
	83.Kasiani	339.Fukura	

District	Upazila	Union Parishad	Municipality
		340.Mahmudpur	
		341. Orakand	
		342.Parulia	
		343..Rajpat	
		344.Ratiol	
		345.Sazail	
	84.Tungipara	346. Borni	41.Tungipara
		347.Dumaria	
18.Jamalpur	85.Jamalpur Sadar	348.Bashchara	42.Jamalpur
		349. Dighpait	
		350. Ghoradhap	
		351.Kendua	
		352.Narundi	
		353..Ranagacha	
		354.Rashidpur	
		355.Shahabazpur	
		356.Sreepur	
	357.Titpalla		
	86.Melandaha	358.Adra	
		359.Charbonipakuria	
		360.Durmud	
		361.Fulkucha	
		362.Kulia	
		363.Nanla	
		364.Nayanagor	
		87.Sarishabari	365.Auna
		366.Bhatara	
	367.Dowail		
	368.Satpoa		
	369.Mohadan		
	370.Pigna		
19. Sherpur	88.Nalitabari	371.Baghber	
		372.Jugania	
		373.Kakarkandi	
		374.Nalitabari	
		375.Nonni	
		376.Poragou	
		377.Rajnagar	
	89.Sherpur Sadar	378.Bajidkhila	44.Sherpur
		379.Bhatashala	
		380.Char Sherpur	
		381.Dhala	
		382.Kamaria	
		383.Pakuria	
		384.Prijpur	
90.Bajitpur	385.Koilas		
	386.Dighirpar		
	387.Gazir Char		
	388.Halimpur		
	389.Hilochia		
	91.Bhairab	390.Sararchar	45.Bhairab
		391..Aganagar	
	392.Gazaria		
20.Kisoreganj		393.Kalikaproshad	
		394.Shadekpur	
		395.Shibpur	
		396.Shimul kandi	
	92.Hossainpur	397.Araibari	46.Hossanpur
		398.Pumdi	
		399. Gobindapur	
		400.Jinary	
		401. Shahadul	
		402. Shidla	
	93.Karimganj	403.Kazir Jungal	
404.Baragharia			

District	Upazila	Union Parishad	Municipality
		405.Niamatpur	
		406.Ghundar	
		407.Guzaria	
		408.Joyka	
	94. Kisoreganj Sadar	409.Sutarpara	47.Kishoreganj
		410.Binnati	
		411.Bowly	
		412.Jashodal	
		413.Maria	
		414. Karsha	
		415.Rashidabad	
	95.Lakshmipur Sadar	416..Bangakha	48.Laxmipur
		417.Dalal Bazar	
		418.Dattapara	
	419.Deghali		
21.Lakshmipur		420.Hagir Para	
		421.Laharkandi	
		422.Mandari	
		423.Parbbatinagoar	
		424.South Hamchadi	
		425.Uttar Joypur	
	96.Raipur	426.Bamni	
		427.Keroa	
		428.Sonapur	
	97.Ramganj	429.Bhadur	
		430.Noagaon	
		431.Vholacut	
	98.Chandpur Sadar	432.Bagadi	49.Chandpur
		433.Bishnopur	
	434.Chandra		
	435.Kallanpur		
	436.Shamahmudpur		
	437.Tarpurchandi		
22.Chadpur	99.Haziganj	438.Barakul East	50.Hajiganj
		439.Barakul West	
		440.Hatila (East)	
		441.Hatila (West)	
		442.Kalachow (S)	
		443.Kalochow (N)	
	100.Kachua	444..Asrafpur	
		445..Gohat North	
		446..Gohat South	
		447.Kachua North	
		448.Kachua South	
		449.Kadla	
		450.Karaiya	

**TABLE 7.2. 200 SDLG EXTENSION YEAR TRAINED LGS**

District	Upazila	Union Parishad	Municipality
1.Sirajganj (17)	Sirajganj Sader	1.Saidabad	Sirajganj
		2.Kalia Haripur	
		3. Bagbati	
		4. Shialkole	
		5. Khokshabari	
		6.Songacha	
	Ullahpara	7.Purnimagati	
		8.Bangla	
		9. Barahar	
		10. Hati Kumrul	
		11. Durganagar	
	Sahjadpur	12.Garadaha	
		13.Rupbati	
		14. Kaizuri	
		15. Kayampur	
Raiganj		Raiganj	
2.Bogra (17)	Adamdighi	1.Chanpapur	
		2.Chatiagram	
		3.Kundagram	
		4.Nashratpur	
	Bogra Sadar	5.Lahiripara	
		6.Shekherkola	
		7.Shakharia	
		8.Noongola	
	Dhunat	9.Gosaibari	
		10.Chikashi	
		11.Kaler Para	
	Gabtali	12.Mohishaban	
		13.Nashipur	
	Shibgonj	14.Dauli	
		15.Rainagar	
Kahalo	16.Jamgram	Kahalo	
3.Rangpur (12)	Kanunia	1.Kursha	
		2.Sarai	
	Mithapukur	3.Bara Hazratpur	
		4.Durgapur	
		5.Latibpur	
	Pirghacha	6.Kallani	
		7.Parul	
	Pirganj	8.Pirganj	
		19.Raipur	
	Rangpur Sadar	10.Ramnathpur	
		11.Chandanpath	
		12.Saddyapuskurini	
Natore (14)	Natore Sadar	1.Baraharishpur	Natore
		2.Bipra Belgharia	
		3.Kafuria	
		4.Chatui	
		5.Dighapatia	
		6.Halsha	
	Baraigram	7.Baraigram	
		8.Majgaon	
		9.Nagare	
		10.Gopalpur	
	Gurudaspur	11.Dharabarisha	Gurudaspur
		12. Biaghat	
5.Pabna (10)	Sujanagar	1.Sujanagar	

District	Upazila	Union Parishad	Municipality
	Ishwardi	2.Satbaria	
		3.Monirhat	
		4.Ahmedpur	
		5.Dshuria	
		6.Laxmikunda	
		7.Muladuli	
		8.Paksey	
		9.Sara	
		10.Shahapur	
		6.Naogaon (6)	Dhamoirhat
2.Jahanpur			
3.Umar			
Badalgachi	4.Badhalgachi		
	5.Adhaipur		
	6.Balubhora		
7.Jessore (14)	Bagherpara	1.Basuary	
		2.Bondabila	
	Jessore Sadar	3.Arabpur	
		4.Basundia	
		5.Chachara	
		6.Churamonkati	
		7.Derara	
		8.Norendrapur	
		9.Haibatpur	
		10.Nowapara	
	Sharsha	11.Benapol	
	Monirampur	12.Durbadanga	
		13.Dhakuria	
		14.Jhapa	
8.Narial (6)		Narial Sadar	1.Tularampur
	2.Bechali		
	3.Mulia		
	Kalia	4.Joynagar	
		5.Chanchri	
		6.Hamidpur	
9.Faridpur (6)	Faridpur Sadar	1.Aliabad	
		2.Ambicapur	
		3.Gerdha	
		4.Ishan Gopalpur	
9.Faridpur (6)	Faridpur Sadar	5.Kajjuri	
		6.Kanai Pur	
10.Rajbari (5)	Rajbari Sadar	1.Chandani	
		2.Dadshi	
		3.Khankhanapur	
		4.Khangnj	
		5.Mizanpur	
11.Bagerhat (22)	Bagerhat	1.Baruipara	Bagerhat
		2.Jatrapur	
		3.Karapara	
		4.Khanpur	
		5.Sait Gambuz	
	Fakirhat	6.Betaga	
	Mongla	7.Burirdanga	Mongla
		8.Chandpai	
		9.Chila	
		10.Sundarban	
		11.Suniltala	
	Kachua	12.Gopalpur	
		13.Gozalia	
	Morelgonj	14.Hoglabunia	

District	Upazila	Union Parishad	Municipality
		15.Nishanbaria	
		16.Panchokaron	
		17.Putikhali	
		18.Morlgonj	
	Mollarhat	19.Udaypur	
		20.Kulia	
12.Satkhira (22)	Satkhira Sadar	1.Agardari	
		2.Alipur	
		3.Banshdaha	
		4.Boikari	
		5.Bhomra	
		6.Bramharajpur	
		7.Fungri	
		8.Dhulihor	
	Shyamnagar	9.Atulia	
		10.Bhurulia	
		11.Burigoalini	
		12.Ishwaripur	
		13.Kashimari	
	Kaliganj	14.Khesra	Kaliganj
		15.Bishnupur	
		16.Champaphul	
		17.Daskhin Sreepur	
		18.Dhalbaria	
		19.Krishnanagar	
		20.Nalta	
		21.Taril	
13.Gopalganj (9)	Kasiani	1.Fukura	
		2.Mahmudpur	
		3.Orakand	
		4.Parulia	
		5.Rajpat	
		6.Ratiol	
		7.Sazail	
	Tungipara	9.Borni	
		9.Dumaria	
14.Kishoregonj (7)	Bhairab	1.Aganagar	Bhairab
		2.Gazaria	
		3.Kalikaprosad	
		4.Shadekpur	
		5.Shibpur	
		6.Shimul kandi	
15.Lakshmipur (13)	Sadar	1.Bangakha	
		2.Dalal Bazar	
		3.Dattapara	
		4.Deghali	
		5.Hagir Para	
		6.Laharkandi	
		7.Mandari	
		8.Parbbatinagoar	
		9.South Hamchadi	
		10.Uttar Joypur	
	Ramganj	11.Bhadur	
		12.Noagaon	
		13.Vholacut	
16.Chandpur (14)	Sadar	1.Shahmahmudpur	
		2.Bishnupur	
	Haziganj	3.Barakul East	Hajiganj
		4.Barakul West	
		5.Hatila (West)	

District	Upazila	Union Parishad	Municipality
	Kachua	6.Kalachow (S)	
		7.Kalochow (N	
		8.Asrafpur	
		9..Gohat North	
		10..Gohat South	
		11.Kachua North	
		12.Kadla	
17.Feni (4)	Dagonbhuyan	13..Karaiya	
		1.Ramnagar	
		2.Dagonbhuyan	
		3.Jailashkara	
18.Noakhali (3)	Begumgonj	4.MathuBhuia	
		1.Eaklashpur	
		2.Rajgonj	
		3.Chayani	
<b>18 District</b>	<b>48 Upazila</b>	<b>190 UP</b>	<b>10 PS</b>

**US Agency for International Development/Bangladesh  
Madani Avenue,  
Dhaka Bangladesh  
Phone: (880-2) 885-5500  
Fax: (880-2) 882-3648  
[www.usaid.gov/bd/](http://www.usaid.gov/bd/)**