

Working Paper # 172

**Measuring Institutional
Performance in Pakistan: Can
governance indices help?**

By:

Shehryar Khan Toru, Syed Mohsin Ali, Vaqar Ahmed

All rights reserved.

No part of this paper may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or information storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission of the publisher.

A publication of the Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI).

The opinions expressed in the papers are solely those of the authors, and publishing them does not in any way constitute an endorsement of the opinion by the SDPI.

Sustainable Development Policy Institute is an independent, non-profit research institute on sustainable development.

First edition: July 2019

© 2019 by the Sustainable Development Policy Institute

Mailing Address:

PO Box 2342, Islamabad, Pakistan

Telephone: 0092-51-2278134, 2278136, 2277146, 2270674-76

Fax: 0092-51-2278135,

URL: www.sdpi.org

Acknowledgement

We acknowledge the data related support provided by Ahmad Durrani, Maryam Waqar, and Syeda Rubab. We are grateful for support and cooperation by United Nations Development Program (UNDP), Pakistan Office, NADRA, CDA and NHMP. Ashfaq H. Khan, Nohman Ishtiaq and Shahid Sattar provided experts' input on the methodology. The team is grateful for their support and services. The usual disclaimer applies.

Abstract

In Pakistan, several efforts have been made to measure the government performance at national and sub-national levels. Our efforts build on an existing framework for measuring service delivery. Though the previous tool, which has been applied to study the select federal government ministries includes supply side governance and accountability indicators, there is, however, a need to also incorporate demand side indicators to capture community satisfaction from publicly provided services. In this study, an effort has been made to formulate an augmented index and by using survey data, application of this index on three public sector entities has been analyzed. Results show that this approach has the benefit of validating supply and demand side information and perceptions.

Keywords: Governance, BGI, Public sector institutions,

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Literature Review.....	2
3. Methodology	6
4. Construction of Performance Index	8
4.1. Performance Indicators for Demand Side	8
4.2. Performance Indicators for Supply Side	8
5. Findings-I: Citizen Feedback survey	10
6. Findings-II: Results from augmented performance index	12
7. Conclusion	14
References.....	15
Annexure-I: (Detailed computation of index).....	16
a. Construction of demand side governance index.....	16
b. Construction of supply side index.....	22

1. Introduction

The study aims to measure the performance of a select number of public sector institutions using both supply and demand side indicators. Our starting point is Better Governance Index (BGI) framework developed by Moriani and Rehman¹. We supplement the effort from 2015 using a demand side client satisfaction survey to be explained later. The study, on the one hand, provides a conceptual tool to merge internal and external outcome measures, while on the other it goes on to apply this tool on a select number of select public sector entities, including National Database & Registration Authority (NADRA), National Highways and Motorway Police (NHMP), and Capital Development Authority (CDA). These institutions have been selected on the basis of their public interface as well as the high frequency with which their services are demanded by the society.

At the outset, the performance measurement framework adopted in BGI² sets the basis of engaging different frameworks for measuring institutional performance in public sector institutions. The importance of inputs, outputs and strategic goals are mentioned to illustrate -institutional efficiency in more general terms. The terms and process indicators of BGI are explained to gain familiarity with types of performance frameworks. The rationale behind gauging performance is to benchmark performance indicators on a set of pre-selected indicators, namely quality of governance, accountability, inclusion and openness, effectiveness and responsiveness.

Measurements of institutional efficiency generally focus on the relationship between institutional resources and activities on the one hand, and institutional outcomes, on the other (Cristescu et al. 2010; Castro 2011; Gokey et al. 2013; Khattri and Roberts, 2012). Systems of measuring performance efficiency have indicators functioning both at the individual level such as the qualitative service delivery survey (Bold et al. 2011; Dehn et al. 2003), and the institutional level such as the results framework (Trivedi 2014).

Measurements of institutional effectiveness focus on the relationship between the intended and actual outcomes and impacts, or the ratio between outputs and outcomes (Cristescu et al. 2010). However, while such calculations are often straightforward in the private sector, they are harder to make in the public sector due to the difficulty of conclusively establishing causal link between the level of activities and outcomes (Davies 1999).

Owing to the considerable difficulties in measuring institutional efficiency and effectiveness within the public sector, evaluation experts have developed another set of indicators that measure the nature of policy implementation such as whether it supports accountability and citizens participation. These are known as process indicators (Landman 2003). The Weberian Comparative State Data project is a comparative assessment framework that includes a number of process indicators with its focus on measuring various dimensions of bureaucratic structure and institutional meritocracy.

With its twofold objective, the study would first augment BGI framework for Pakistan with inclusion of citizen satisfaction indicators, and then make an effort to apply the augmented index to gauge the performance of select public sector entities. The study also suggests as to how such performance index can be institutionalized by the government institutions concerned.

¹ Farrukh Moriani and Hira Hafeez ur Rehman (2015) produced a report in 2015 on “Better Governance Index: a conceptual framework for measuring institutional performance”. This report uses a conceptual framework having process indicators (.....) for measuring institutional performance of select institutions.

² Adopted from Better Governance Index report authored by (Moriani & Rehman, 2015).

2. Literature Review

This section provides a brief literature review with case studies from the select countries. We also provide current gaps in literature and how some of these are addressed. This is followed by findings and conclusion section.

How countries measure institutional performance?

A review of literature was carried out to understand governance indices used by other studies, and countries in South Asia and elsewhere. Existing literature on institutional performance and their utility in different country contexts are cited as useful performance frameworks. The intention behind this effort is to strengthen the BGI framework. Efforts have been made to see in-depth at least three case studies with respect to objectives, methodology, rollout and sustainability of performance measurement frameworks (see Table 1).

The criteria used for selecting country examples consists of i) governance context and relevance (to Pakistan) which captures accountability and other attributes (similar to local milieu); ii) indicators description, i.e. process and micro level indicators (similar to processes seen in Pakistan’s public sector); and iii) sustainability and institutionalization. A number of developed and developing countries have designed and implemented performance measurement systems within their domains and varying contexts. This section includes a brief review of such systems, which are: i) applicable to agency-level public sector performance; ii) broad enough to facilitate inter-agency comparison of performance; based on both subjective and objective means of data collection.³

Table 1: Select Examples of Performance Measurement Frameworks

Framework Details	Results Framework Document [RFD] (Khattri and Roberts, 2007; Trivedi, 2014)	Rwanda Joint Governance Assessment [JGA] (Kwakwa and Musoni, 2008; Rwanda Governance Advisory Council, 2011)	Open Government Directive [OGD] (Bertot et al. 2012)	Governance Report 2013/2014 (Lodge and Wegrich, 2013)
Description	Used in India, this tool compares the performance of individual departments against standardized indicators, objective targets and measurement criteria (Khattri and Roberts, 2012)	A country-specific tool developed with the aim of creating a common understanding of governance issues and measurement frameworks in Rwanda, and identifying future areas for performance improvement and priority action. Measurement areas include: Ruling Justly, Investment Climate, and Government Effectiveness. Majority of indicators geared towards country-level governance performance.	Rolled-out in USA to measure the success of transparency and open government initiatives within different public-sector agencies. Assessments were undertaken in three key areas: Transparency, Participation, and Collaboration.	A highly adaptable assessment framework that functions at the national, sub-national and agency levels of governance. Measures government’s administrative capacity (resilience and preparedness) to address contemporary

³ There may also be other measurement systems, e.g. see Hertie School of Governance Indicators: <http://www.governancereport.org/home/governance-indicators/2016-governance-indicators/>

				challenges, including the identification of problems, the use of tools to address problems, and types of responses generated towards problems. Assessments are carried out on the basis of aggregate subjective indicators measuring capacity for Delivery, Regulation, Coordination and Analytical capacities.
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Planning strategies and selecting appropriate interventions to address challenges in question b. Building consensus and ownership between different stakeholders of a policy intervention c. Providing objective performance data to inform programme decisions d. Improved intra and inter-agency communication and reporting e. Performance evaluation <p>Harmonization and rationalization of procedures</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Consolidating peace and security in the country b. Promoting inclusive governance c. Strengthening rule of law and accountability d. Linking government operations and activities to broader development goals 	Assessing the impact of transparency and open government initiatives within government agencies.	Developing an understanding of how administrative capacity of governments can be improved in terms of understanding and responding to emerging challenges in better and innovative ways
Methodology & roll-out	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Consultation between Ministers and line 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Consultations with diverse base of government and non-government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Experts from government and non-government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Governance and public administration and

	<p>departments on departmental objectives, proposed activities to achieve objectives, and corresponding success indicators (micro, macro and process) and time-bound targets</p> <p>ii. Devising weighted scores for each success indicator and target</p> <p>iii. Defining level of coordination required with outside departments for achievement of objectives</p> <p>iv. Critique and approval by Cabinet Secretariat</p> <p>v. Review by centralized Performance Management Division and non-government sector experts</p> <p>vi. Review by Cabinet Committee on Government Performance</p> <p>Final RFD placed on departmental website</p>	<p>stakeholders to design draft indicators framework</p> <p>ii. Management structure established, including Steering Committee to oversee roll-out and indicators development, Technical Committee to advise on methodological and analytical issues, and Consultant team reporting to Steering Committee on implementation</p> <p>iii. Regular meetings between different tiers in management structure to discuss progress, earlier drafts and way forward</p> <p>iv. Quality Control by consultant team during roll-out</p> <p>v. Production of evaluation reports by Consultant Team</p> <p>Training of Governance Advisory Council (GAC) staff for implementation. GAC to function as centralized secretariat for JGA implementation after pilot.</p>	<p>sectors, and employees from agencies being assessed brought together in Open Government Working Group to devise assessment criteria and data collection methods and tools</p> <p>ii. Pre-testing of assessment methods and tools, and incorporation of feedback</p> <p>iii. 3-point ordinal scale developed to eliminate problems resulting from poor goal description or inter-rater variations in scoring</p> <p>iv. Expert evaluators employed to assess agency compliance with OGD requirements</p> <p>v. Agency-level self-assessments also conducted</p> <p>Performance data displayed publicly</p>	<p>management experts design indicators framework and selected data sources</p> <p>ii. Aggregation of subjective and objective data to generate composite scores in each assessment area</p> <p>iii. Borda scoring: scores assigned to individual institutions and then aggregated to provide country-level scores</p> <p>Scores represented at three different levels: agency, national and transnational</p>
Consultative process	Consultation and review at different levels, with multiple	Consultation and review at different levels, with multiple stakeholders, both	Consultation and review at different levels, with multiple	Consultations among experts of Hertie School

	stakeholders, both government and non-government	government and non-government	stakeholders, both government and non-government	
Sustainability	<p>Consultations at multiple levels of government to ensure stakeholder buy-in and ownership</p> <p>Creation of electronic Results-Framework Management System, that aids in RFD preparation and monitoring on monthly and annual basis</p>	<p>Consultations at multiple levels of government to ensure stakeholder buy-in and ownership</p> <p>Centralized Secretariat for monitoring of JGA implementation</p>	<p>Consultations at multiple levels of government to ensure stakeholder buy-in and ownership.</p> <p>Sustainability hampered due to lack of centralized control, and resistance at agency-level against assessments by non-government sector</p> <p>Lack of evaluation criteria, especially at the level of impacts, prevents comparison of effectiveness of OGD implementation between different agencies</p>	No information provided
Evidence of impact	<p>Covers 80 departments of Government of India and being implemented in 18 Union territories</p> <p>Improved Grievance Redress after mandatory inclusion of corresponding indicators within departmental RFDs</p> <p>Improved social indicators</p>	<p>Transparency in public procurement</p> <p>Increase in competitive bidding for award of government contracts</p> <p>Decrease in corruption</p> <p>Determination of new salary schemes</p> <p>Increase in number of public sector reform initiatives</p>	<p>Open Data 500 US studies the variety of different companies and innovators using the data made accessible by different government agencies.</p>	Positive correlation among different capacities identified
Relevance to BGI	Allows comparisons of inter-agency governance performance	Aside from indicators measuring Government Effectiveness, JGA is unsuited to measuring agency-level governance	Allows for comparison of inter-agency compliance with	Allows comparisons of inter-agency governance

	Objective means of data collection Includes process indicators such as effectiveness of public grievance redress mechanisms	Objective and subjective means of data collection Includes process indicators	OGD requirements Lack of evaluation criteria at level of impacts prevents comparisons of agency performance in terms of producing social benefits Includes process indicators	Objective means of data collection Flexible enough to allow same capacity to be measured through both objective and subjective means.
--	--	--	---	--

In the case of Pakistan and to our best knowledge, the BGI framework encompasses supply side concepts that include quality of governance, internal accountability, inclusion and openness, effectiveness (e.g. in the context of usage of financial resources), and responsiveness (e.g. in the context of ability to respond to the expectations of citizens), however to make such an index truly comprehensive indicators which reflect citizen satisfaction need to be incorporated. We make this effort in the sections ahead.

3. Methodology

Methodology encompasses mixed methods’ approach where quantitative and qualitative research tools are employed. After undertaking a literature review to learn about the utilization, roll-out and institutionalization of performance measurement tools, we embarked upon the construction of index. Our point of departure was to revise BGI through revisiting the criteria of governance index, sources of data available on indicators, and suggest possibilities of future research on BGI framework, with a particular focus on possible inclusion of qualitative indicators.

Data collected through different sources (such as official documents, websites, and secondary research) was triangulated. An added feature of validating data pertains to the feedback of local experts on governance and institutional performance. This particular activity entails the constitution of a feedback mechanism, thus allowing critical reflection of public sector institutions on governance indicators.

While supply side indicators remain similar to BGI (and frameworks from other countries mentioned in section 2), a survey was designed to gauge the perception of citizens on the functions of select institutions. The survey included specific questions regarding experiences of citizens, process of service, outcome, and grievance redressal processes. To validate findings, key informant interviews were held with experts who have in the past either developed or used performance measurement frameworks.

There are certain challenges in the way of implementation of this methodology. This also gives rise to limitations of this study. First, since governance index involves performance assessment of public sector entities, the project team faced informational and public disclosure challenges. The public officials were sometimes reluctant to provide information on matters which fall in official domain. For example, seeking information on employees might raise eyebrows. The institution may not like to share such information. Similarly, some specific budget-related information at a disaggregated level is difficult to obtain.

The public officials asked SDPI for completing unanticipated written approvals. This resulted in unnecessary delay which may have changed the political economy context of our analysis. This however should not affect the conceptual value of the tool developed in this study.

The following public-sector institutions are selected for applying the augmented performance index.

Highway and Motorway Police are mandated to ensure safe and citizen centric safety environment for drivers. Their core functions are issuance and renewal of driving licenses, assurance of road safety, enforcement of traffic rules, and assistance of driver in accidents and emergencies.

National Database & Registration Authority (NADRA) is a federal institution having branches across the country. It provides services related to: issuance of Computerized National Identity Cards; Juvenile card⁴; National Identity Card for Overseas Pakistanis; Child registration certificate; Cancellation certificate⁵; Family registration certificate⁶; and Pakistan Origin Card⁷.

Capital Development Authority (CDA) provides municipal services in Islamabad which include (but are not limited to): residential and commercial property registration and transfer; refuse (waste) collection; approval of construction of houses; collection of property tax; ensuring health and safety of residents; approval for the construction of commercial buildings; imposition and collection of water charge; development of new residential sectors; water supply connection; land accusation for new schemes; and streetlighting.

The aforesaid institutions are selected on the basis of following criteria:

Access: One of the most influential criteria of acquiring information from government institutions is access. The criterion of access is selected on the basis of good professional relations of SDPI with selected institutions and on the basis of receptivity and ownership for the pilot study amongst the institutions.

Public Interface and service provision: The selected institutions are public sector entities mandated to provide public and collective services to clients. As a result of state officials' interaction with citizens on the diverse services, these institutions have a public interface considered essential to understand governance perceptions and benchmarking institutional performance.

Regarding the citizen feedback survey, a quantitative research methodology was adopted to acquire answers to multiple options of inquiry. In some instances, descriptive qualitative inquiry is also included. A purposive sampling technique is adopted to ensure the selection of stakeholders from pre-determined pool. This pool includes beneficiaries of the select public sector entities. One of the advantages of such sampling approach is that it allows targeted questions specific only to the users of public services. The overall sample size for the survey is 300, selected from the stratum of service users. The team ensured at least 100 responses per institution. This minimum response rate can increase if a single respondent also wishes to answer questions related to multiple public sector entities and services, accessed during the past. All respondents are above 18 years of age and 50 per cent respondents for each institution are women. The final gender mix of our respondents varies depending upon the refusal rate.

⁴ "Juvenile card is an identity card issued to children under the age of 18 years".

⁵ Cancellation certificate is a registration document issued to register the termination of ID card in case of death of any citizen.

⁶ "Family Registration Certificate (FRC) is a mean of being identified with your NADRA's record".

⁷ "Pakistan Origin Card is issued to facilitate the eligible foreigners. This card is for those foreigners who have some roots in Pakistan i.e., they are natives of Pakistan.

Prior to the pre-testing and implementation, enumerators were trained on how to use the survey instrument. To ensure accuracy of data and its analysis, enumerators ensured the elimination of inconsistencies and incorrect responses during the phase of data collection.

4. Construction of Performance Index

4.1. Performance Indicators for Demand Side

The criteria used for each measurement area are presented in Table 2. A total of 19 indicators are proposed for eight criteria under five measurement areas. Since in the pilot phase of index is to be developed for the selected three institutions, (e.g. NADRA, CDA, and NHMP), the indicators aim at measuring performance at that level.

Table 2: Demand Side Indicators

Measurement Area	Criteria (C)	Indicators (I)
Quality of Governance	No Corruption	No informal payments or gifts in lieu of accessing services
		Transparency in service delivery
Accountability	Customer Feedback	Availability of criteria for Customer Service Feedback
Inclusion and Openness	Inclusion	Not internally-deprived during accessing service
	Openness	Complaint procedure is easy and accessible
		No social discrimination
Effectiveness	Service Delivery	Availability of services in the vicinity
		Quality of service
		Institution and its staff are trustworthy
		Payment system is very convenient and transparent
		Cost of services are affordable
		Accuracy in the cost of service
Responsiveness	Mechanisms for facilitating access to information	Designated official nominated under Right to Information Act 2010
		Accessibility of source of information
		Standards for access to information services
	Mechanisms for public grievance redress	Complaint mechanism is available for desired service
		Acknowledgement of complaints by relevant department
		Standards for grievance redress services
	Use of ICT tools	Availability of online services for complaints, information, registration, social media

4.2. Performance Indicators for Supply Side

List of performance indicators given in table 3, for measuring supply side index are proposed on the basis of:

- i) classification of each indicator;
- ii) an evaluation of each indicator with respect to its relevance, coverage and cost-effectiveness.

Table 3: Supply Side Indicators

Measurement Area	Criteria	Indicators	Indicator Classification	Evaluation (relevance, coverage, cost)
Quality of Governance	Clarity of institutional vision and mission	Statements are clear, brief and reflect the values, philosophy and culture of the institution	Process indicator	Relevant, global, and cost effective
		Vision statement expresses in sensory terms, the future position or image of the institution	Process indicator	Relevant, global, and cost-effective
		Mission statement focuses on one or a few strategic goals	Process indicator	Relevant, global, and cost-effective
	Budget Accuracy	Variance between revised budget and budget estimates	Micro-level	Relevant, global, and cost-effective
	Gender Equity in HR	Proportion of female employees in total working staff	Process indicator	Relevant, global, and cost-effective
	Investment in Capacity Building	Training budget as a proportion of total Personnel budget	Micro-level	Relevant, global and cost-effective
	Political Accountability	Regular submission of briefings to the Standing Committees of Parliament	Process indicator	Relevant, global and cost-effective
Accountability	Accountability to citizens	Publication of Annual Budget on institution's website	Process indicator	Relevant, global and cost-effective
		Publication of Yearbook	Process indicator	Relevant, global, and cost-effective
		Majority of tenders follows PPRA rules	Process indicator	Relevant, global and cost-effective
		Use of social accountability tools	Process indicator	Relevant
		Citizens' Charter issued	Process indicator	Relevant and cost-effective
Inclusion and Openness	Participatory and inclusive decision making and oversight	No. of forums on which citizens, private sector, academia or civil society are represented	Process indicator	Relevant, global, and cost-effective
	Proactive public disclosure	Publication of updated policies, strategies on website	Process indicator	Relevant, global, and cost-effective
		Availability of expenditure data	Process indicator	Relevant, global, and cost-effective
Effectiveness	Budget execution	Proportion of released annual budget actually utilized	Micro-level	Relevant, global, and cost-effective

	Implementation of priority programs	Completion level of priority programs	Micro-level	Relevant and global
Responsiveness	Linkage with National/Provincial priorities and strategies	Explicit linkage of priority programs with the Vision 2025	Process indicator	Relevant and global
		Explicit linkage of priority programs with relevant sector policy	Process indicator	Relevant and global
	Mechanisms for facilitating access to information	Designated Official nominated under Right to Information Act	Micro-level	Relevant, global, and cost-effective
		Standards for access to information services clearly mentioned on website	Process indicator	Relevant, global, and cost-effective
	Mechanisms for public grievance redress	Designated Official for public grievance redress and addressing references from Ombudsmen	Micro-level	Relevant, global, and cost-effective
		Standards for grievance redress services clearly mentioned	Process indicator	Relevant, global, and cost-effective
	Use of ICT tools	Availability of online services for complaints, information, registration, social media	Micro-level	Relevant, global, and cost-effective

5. Findings-I: Citizen Feedback survey

The highest percentage of respondents had availed services related to NADRA. For example, 72% male and 58% female respondents availed the services of acquiring Computerized National Identity Card (CNIC). Furthermore, 10% males and 19% females acquired Child Registration Certificate. Only 3% males and 2% females availed the service of cancellation certificate; whereas only 2% males and 3% females availed family registration certificate. Getting Juvenile card was the least availed service as only one female respondent opted for it. The reason for the higher percentage of service acquisition in the case of CNIC is its requirement on daily basis; the Juvenile card is not in common usage as most of the people are not aware of its utility. The quality of services provided by NADRA was also termed very satisfactory.

In the case of CDA, the highest percentage of respondents benefitted from ‘Residential or Commercial Property Registration and Transfer’, which accounts for 59% males and 48% females. ‘Approval of construction of houses’ is the second most commonly availed service by 25% males and 19% females. None of the male respondents availed facilities of ‘collection of property tax’, ‘Ensuring health and safety of residents’ and ‘Approval of construction of commercial building’, only 4% (constitutes one female) availed the aforementioned services. Similarly, none of the female respondents benefitted from services of ‘imposition and collection of water charges’ and ‘refuse (waste) collection,’ and only 03% (constitutes only 1 man) availed the aforementioned services. The service of ‘water supply connection/reconnection’ was availed by 6% males and 7% females. Similarly, 03% males and 15% females availed the service of land accusation for new schemes.

Upon inquiring about the quality of services provided by CDA, more than half of the respondents indicated low priority for services (including Residential or commercial property registration and transfer, Collection of property tax, Water supply connection/reconnection, Ensuring health and safety of residents, Land accusation for new schemes, Approval of construction of houses, and Approval of construction of commercial buildings) due to high rate of corruption and informal payments. Around 25% respondents ranked residential and commercial property registration and transfer, and Approval of construction of houses somewhat lowest due to unspecified duration of time span. Few respondents held a neutral stance, asserting keeping quiet as their specific request for a service may be unnecessarily delayed by CDA.

From the services being offered by National Highways and Motorway Police (NHMP), issuance of driving license was availed by 63% males and 64% females. The issuance of international standard driving licenses had been the least common among the respondents as they accounted for only 4% female. On the other hand, 17% males and 32% females availed the service of renewal of driving license and 20% respondents availed the service “acquittal from challan”.

Considering the quality of services, 16% respondents were of the view that the quality was somewhat satisfactory. In the case of 6% respondents, the services of ‘Issuance of driving license’ and ‘Acquittal from challan’ were least satisfactory. Whereas 44% beneficiaries indicated entire services of ‘highest’ rank. In the case of 14% respondents, issuances of driving license, renewal of driving license and acquittal from challan were ranked less satisfactory.

In terms of lodging of a complaint, majority complaints were lodged against NHMP as they accounted amongst 20% male and 48% females. The least number of complaints was lodged against NADRA, i.e. 4% amongst female and 28% amongst male respondents. In the case of CDA, 18% respondents lodged complaints. The reason for lodging least complaints against NADRA is the effective, timely and transparent provision of services.

Around 88% NHMP service users were satisfied with their complaints as they were addressed within a reasonable time. Similar response concerning timely redressal of complaints was observed in the case of NADRA. A glaring observation relates to CDA’s non-redressal of complaints in more than 70% male and 60% female respondents.

When probed for not lodging a complaint, 19% consumers in the case of CDA were not aware of the complaint procedure; whereas 5% consumers made reference to a complicated procedure for lodging complaint. Similarly, only 3% respondents found complaint procedure of NHMP complex. In the case of CDA, 36% consumers found the complaint procedure ineffective, which constitutes the highest proportion of complaints when compared with 19% NHMP and 2% NADRA. In the case of CDA, 19% service users lodged complaints because of the fear of harassment.

Concerning the source of information, 74% respondents learned about NHMP through the word of mouth, followed by 62% in the case of NADRA and CDA. Upon inquiring about accessibility of information, 98% respondents in the case of NADRA were able to access information. On the other hand, 30% respondents in the case of CDA opted for ‘somewhat accessible’ option. The following reasons were cited for not having comprehensive access to information

- Physical access to information faced by 94% respondents in the case of CDA.
- Non-cooperation of NHMP’s staff faced by 26% respondents.

- 88% respondents do not have access to the offices of NADRA in their vicinity, so they often have to travel a long distance to access the nearest office. Similar response was recorded in the case of CDA. In the case of NHMP, 46% users opined that they have no concerning offices in their vicinity.

About half of the respondents travel between 30-60 minutes to reach NADRA, 30% users travel between 1-2 hours and 10% users travel more than two hours to reach CDA and NHMP respectively. Concerning distance travelled, 68% users travel more than 10 kilometers to reach CDA which is the highest percentage when compared with 44% users in the case of NADRA and 38% users in the case of NHMP. Almost 66% customers of NADRA stated that their required service is being delivered within stipulated time. Within the same category, the percentage was lower in the case of NHMP users. However, 50% service users in the case of CDA narrated procrastination or unwarranted delay. 42% CDA customers were of the view that the delay in the provision of services is due to corruption. In the case of NHMP, 48% service users found unpredictable service delivery time. More than half (56%) of the CDA service users felt intentionally deprived because of inordinate delay in pushing files through the counter to higher authorities for approval. To push files, they have to resort to informal payments or use the right kind of reference. 67% NADRA users found high work load to be the main cause of intentional deprivation; whereas, 46% respondents reported rent seeking to be main factor of deprivation. On the other hand, 40% NHMP customers found “low economic status” a stagnating factor in acquiring the desired level of service, 40% users believed not to have the right kind of political affiliation to be the main factor of intentional deprivation. 75% NADRA service users never reported an incident of deprivation. According to them, reporting an incident would fall on deaf ears. Similar reasons were found in the case of 89% CDA and 67% NHMP service users.

Majority users of NADRA and NHMP services were of the view that incidents of withholding services rarely take place. Whereas, more than half (58%) CDA customers experience such incidents more often. According to 84% users, CDA has no dedicated feedback channels to deal with customer complaints. More than 45% users of NHMP and NADRA did observe feedback channels concerning customers’ complaints and feedback.

According to 88% users of NADRA, customer payment system was found to be very convenient, followed by 60% users of NHMP. With regard to CDA, 60% service users found payment system to be somewhat convenient. Majority users of all three institutions found the payment system in accordance with expected cost of service. However, in the case of CDA, more than 60% female showed apprehension concerning a mismatch between the cost of service and the available information. In the case of NADRA, 67% users found cost of services as per their expectations followed by NHMP. In the case of CDA, the response was divided between those who found the service in accordance with their expectations and those who are unsatisfied with the services. More than 56% respondents in the case of CDA cited frequent informal payments from service users. Similar experience is found in 40% service users of NHMP. Majority respondents cited lack of internal and external accountability which directly contributes to less than optimal performance. Some respondents cited political pressure which undermines performance. Very few attributed bad performances to understaffing.

6. Findings-II: Results from augmented performance index

On the basis of the measurement criteria and weights provided in Annexure-I, ranking of institutional performance is given below⁸:

⁸ See also technical note on scoring method for demand and supply side computation in Annex-II.

Table 4: Ranking of Demand Side Indicators

Name of Institution(s)	Average Score	Ranking
National Highways & Motorway Police	2.86	2
National Database & Registration Authority (NADRA)	3.249	1
Capital Development Authority (CDA)	1.053	3

The above table elucidates the total scores and ranking of each institution on the basis of the selected measurement areas of demand side variables. In this regard, NADRA scored the highest, i.e. 3.249, and ranked 1st, for having good quality of governance, being least corrupted and no deprivation and discrimination of its service beneficiaries. NADRA is followed by NHMP scoring 2.860. However, CDA accounted for least average score, i.e. 1.053, because its service users felt internally deprived of getting their required services, corruption rate is high, and there is a lack of availability of criteria for customer service feedback.

Table 5: Ranking of Supply Side Indicators

Institution	Average Score	Ranking
National Highways & Motorway Police	0.845	2
National Database & Registration Authority (NADRA)	0.358	3
Capital Development Authority (CDA)	0.88	1

The aforementioned table of supply side score demonstrates the recorded scores and the ranking of three institutions, based on the selected measurement areas, according to which CDA leads by scoring 0.880 for having full budgets available for all the three years (Fiscal Year 2011-14) in English only, for updated policies, strategies and plans, and for budget execution, if not up-to the mark but at least, 65-80% and execution of priority programs less than 50%. This is followed by NHMP scoring 0.845 and NADRA is at third position with 0.358 average score. Moreover, it is interesting to note that all the three institutions performed very poorly on accountability and responsiveness, which confirms the intuitive analysis that Pakistan's public-sector institutions are unaccountable to the public and stakeholders and unresponsive to their needs.

Table 6: Final Rank

Institution	Average Score	Ranking
National Highways & Motorway Police	0.04576	2
National Database & Registration Authority (NADRA)	0.04619	1
Capital Development Authority (CDA)	0.02232	3

Combining all the scores of demand side and supply side together, it is evident from the above table that NADRA is top-ranked, having average score of 0.04619, followed by NHMP which ranked second the score of 0.04576. However, CDA accounted for least average score which caused its third position in ranking table.

7. Conclusion

The paper makes an effort to combine supply and demand side accountability measures and apply an augmented performance index framework on select public institutions in Pakistan. This pilot phase (i.e. application of three government entities) helped us in analyzing performance indicators on the one hand, and citizens' feedback on the other. The supply side indicators are useful as they provide information on how institutions perform core functions. The demand side indicators are useful in knowing how citizens evaluate performance through access and informational indicators. Based on the strengths of this index and learning from the weaknesses such as the actual performance may be political in nature, the scope of the index would be enhanced, by including in it other public-sector institutions as well as the provincial governments. It will be made a comprehensive index, which would work as a mirror for the institutions. It is hoped that some of the learning from our findings could motivate the federal and provincial governments towards more objective measurement of service delivery.

References

1. Bertot, JC, McDermott, P and Smith, T 2012, Measurement of Open Government: Metrics and Processes, 45th Hawai International Conference on System Sciences, Hawai
2. Bold, T, Svensson, T, Gauthier, B, Mæstad, Q and Wane, W 2011, Service Delivery Indicators: Pilot in Education and Health Care in Africa. Chr. Michelsen Institute, Norway.
3. Brown, K and Repucci, S 2009, A User's Guide to Measuring Public Administration Performance. Oslo Governance Centre, United Nations Development Programme, Oslo.
4. Burall, S, Gavelin, K and Wilson, R 2009, Open Government: beyond static measures. Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development,
5. Castro, MF 2011, Defining and Using Performance Indicators and Targets in Government M&E Systems. Special Series on The Nuts & Bolts of M&E Systems (no. 12). The World Bank, Washington, D.C.
6. Cristescu, M, Mihaiu, D and Opreana, A 2010, Efficiency, Effectiveness and Performance of the Public Sector, *Romanian Journal of Economic Forecasting*, vol. 4.
7. Davies, I 1999, Evaluation and Performance Management in Government. Evaluation, SAGE Publications, London.
8. Dehn, J, Reinikka, R and Svensson, J 2003, Survey Tools for Assessing Performance in Service Delivery, Toolkit for Evaluating the Poverty and Distributional Impact of Economic Policies. World Bank, Washington, D.C.
9. Gokey, C, Parsons, J and Thornton, M 2013, Indicators of Inputs, Activities, Outputs, Outcomes and Impacts in Security and Justice Programming, Department for International Development, London.
10. Khattri, N and Roberts, D 2012, Designing a Results Framework for Achieving Results: A How-To Guide. Independent Evaluation Group, Washington, D.C.
11. Kwakwa, V and Musoni, P 2008, Rwanda: Joint Governance Assessment report. Rwanda Joint Governance Assessment Steering Committee, Kigali.
12. Landman, T 2003, Map-making and Analysis of the Main International Initiatives on Developing Indicators on Democracy and Good Governance. University of Essex – Human Rights Centre, Essex.
13. Lodge, M and Wegrich, K 2013, Setting the Scene: Challenges to the State, Government Readiness and Administrative Capacities, Hertie School of Governance, Berlin.
14. Trivedi, P 2014, India: Performance Monitoring and Evaluation System, Proceedings of Global Roundtable on Government Performance Management, Cabinet Secretariat, Government of India, New Delhi.

Annexure-I: (Detailed computation of index)

a. Construction of demand side governance index

Table 20: Results for NADRA

BETA TEST RESULTS FOR NADRA								
Measurement Area	Criteria (C)	Criteria Weight (CW)	Weighted Score of Criteria (WSC)= Sum of WSI × CW	Indicators (I)	Raw Score on a Scale of 1-10 (RS)	Indicator Weight (IW)	Weighted Score of Indicator (WSI)= RS × IW	Sum of WSI
Quality of Governance	No Corruption	1.00	9.5	No informal payments or gifts in lieu of accessing services	10.0	0.50	5	9.5
				Transparency in service delivery	9.0	0.50	4.5	
Accountability	Customer Feedback	1.00	2.3	Availability of criteria for Customer Service Feedback	4.6	0.50	2.3	2.3
Inclusion and Openness	Inclusion	0.50	4.7	Not internally deprived during accessing service	9.4	1.00	9.4	9.4
				Complaint Procedure is easy and accessible	0.0	0.50	0	
	Openness	0.50	0	No social discrimination	0.0	0.50	0	0
Effectiveness	Service Delivery	1.00	6.969	Availability of services in the vicinity	1.2	0.17	0.204	6.969
				Quality of service	6.6	0.17	1.122	

				Institution and its staff is trustworthy	9.4	0.15	1.41	
				Payment system is very convenient and transparent	8.8	0.17	1.496	
				Cost of service is affordable	6.7	0.17	1.139	
				Accuracy in cost of service	9.4	0.17	1.598	
Responsiveness	Mechanisms for facilitating access to information	0.34	2.45956	Designated official nominated under Right to Information Act 2010	4.0	0.34	1.36	
				Accessibility of source of information	9.8	0.33	3.234	
				Standards for access to information services	8.0	0.33	2.64	7.234
	Mechanisms for public grievance redress	0.33	0	Complaint mechanism is available for desired service	0.0	0.34	0	
				Acknowledgement of complaints by relevant department	0.0	0.33	0	
				Standards for grievance redress services	0.0	0.33	0	0
	Use of ICT tools	0.33	0.066	Availability of online services for complaints, information,	0.2	1.00	0.2	0.2

Total Score (Simple Average of WSC)				registration, social media				
	3.249							

Table 21: Results for CDA

BETA TEST RESULTS FOR CDA								
Measurement Area	Criteria (C)	Criteria Weight (CW)	Weighted Score of Criteria (WSC)= Sum of WSI × CW	Indicators (I)	Raw Score on a Scale of 1-10 (RS)	Indicator Weight (IW)	Weighted Score of Indicator (WSI)= RS × IW	Sum of WSI
Quality of Governance	No Corruption	1.00	1.7	No informal payments or gifts in lieu of accessing services	3.0	0.50	1.5	1.7
				Transparency in service delivery	0.4	0.50	0.2	
Accountability	Customer Feedback	1.00	0.3	Availability of criteria for Customer Service Feedback	0.6	0.50	0.3	0.3
Inclusion and Openness	Inclusion	0.50	2.2	Not internally deprived during accessing service	4.4	1.00	4.4	4.4
	Openness	0.50	0	Complaint Procedure is easy and accessible	0.0	0.50	0	
				No social discrimination	0.0	0.50	0	0
Effectiveness	Service Delivery	1.00	2.625	Availability of services in the vicinity	1.8	0.17	0.306	2.625
				Quality of service	0.0	0.17	0	

				Institution and its staff is trustworthy	2.2	0.15	0.33	
				Payment system is very convenient and transparent	1.4	0.17	0.238	
				Cost of service is affordable	5.0	0.17	0.85	
				Accuracy in cost of service	5.3	0.17	0.901	
Responsiveness	Mechanisms for facilitating access to information	0.34	1.3	Designated official nominated under Right to Information Act 2010	2.4	0.34	0.816	3.918
				Accessibility of source of information	6.4	0.33	2.112	
				Standards for access to information services	3.0	0.33	0.99	
	Mechanisms for public grievance redress	0.33	0	Complaint mechanism is available for desired service	0.0	0.34	0	0
				Acknowledgement of complaints by relevant department	0.0	0.33	0	
				Standards for grievance redress services	0.0	0.33	0	
	Use of ICT tools	0.33	0.264	Availability of online services for complaints, information, registration, social media	0.8	1.00	0.8	0.8
Total Score (Simple Average of WSC)			1.053					

Table 22: Results for Motorway Police

BETA TEST RESULTS FOR Motorway Police								
Measurement Area	Criteria (C)	Criteria Weight (CW)	Weighted Score of Criteria (WSC)= Sum of WSI × CW	Indicators (I)	Raw Score on a Scale of 1-10 (RS)	Indicator Weight (IW)	Weighted Score of Indicator (WSI)= RS × IW	Sum of WSI
Quality of Governance	No Corruption	1.00	7.4	No informal payments or provides gifts in lieu of accessing services	9.0	0.50	4.5	7.4
				Transparency in service delivery	5.8	0.50	2.9	
Accountability	Customer Feedback	1.00	2.4	Availability of criteria for Customer Service Feedback	4.8	0.50	2.4	2.4
Inclusion and Openness	Inclusion	0.50	4.5	Not internally deprived during accessing service	9.0	1.00	9	9
	Openness	0.50	0	Complaint Procedure is easy and accessible	0.0	0.50	0	0
				No social discrimination	0.0	0.50	0	
Effectiveness	Service Delivery	1.00	6.366	Availability of services in the vicinity	5.2	0.17	0.884	6.366
				Quality of service	4.2	0.17	0.714	
				Institution and its staff is trustworthy	6.4	0.15	0.96	
				Payment system is very convenient and transparent	6.0	0.17	1.02	

				Cost of service is affordable	8.2	0.17	1.394	
				Accuracy in cost of service	8.2	0.17	1.394	
Responsiveness	Mechanisms for facilitating access to information	0.34	1.5	Designated official nominated under Right to Information Act 2010	1.2	0.34	0.408	4.368
				Accessibility of source of information	7.0	0.33	2.31	
				Standards for access to information services	5.0	0.33	1.65	
	Mechanisms for public grievance redress	0.33	0	Complaint mechanism is available for desired service	0.0	0.34	0	0
				Acknowledgement of complaints by relevant department	0.0	0.33	0	
				Standards for grievance redress services	0.0	0.33	0	
	Use of ICT tools	0.33	0.726	Availability of online services for complaints, information, registration, social media	2.2	1.00	2.2	2.2
Total Score (Simple Average of WSC)			2.860					

Based on the above-mentioned results of all the three selected institutions, main results of the Demand Side Better Governance Index (BGI) is as follow:

Table 23: Scoring of Demand Side

Institution	Average Score
National Highways & Motorway Police	2.86
National Database & Registration Authority (NADRA)	3.249
Capital Development Authority (CDA)	1.053

Scoring methods can be found in annexure I (Table 1)

b. Construction of supply side index

Table 24: Results for NADRA

BETA TEST RESULTS FOR NADRA								
Measurement Area	Criteria (C)	Criteria Weight (CW)	Weighted Score of Criteria (WSC)= Sum of WSI × CW	Indicators (I)	Raw Score on a Scale of 1-10 (RS)	Indicator Weight (IW)	Weighted Score of Indicator (WSI)= RS × IW	Sum of WSI
Quality of Governance	Clarity of institutional vision and mission	0.35	0	Statements are clear, brief and reflect the values, philosophy and culture of the institution	0	0.4	0	0
				Vision statement expresses, in sensory terms, the future position or image of the institution	0	0.3	0	
				Mission statement focuses on one or a few strategic goals	0	0.3	0	
	Budget Accuracy	0.40	0	Variance between revised budget and budget estimates	0	1.0	0	0

	Gender Equity in HR	0.25		Proportion of female employees in total working staff	0	1.0	0	0
	Investment in Capacity Building	1.00		Training budget as a proportion of total Personnel budget	0	1.0	0	0
Accountability	Political Accountability	0.40	0	Timely and complete responses to PAC review queries	0	0.5	0	0
				Regular submission of briefings to the Standing Committees of Parliament	0	0.5	0	
	Accountability to citizen	0.60	0	Publication of Annual Budget on institution's website	0	0.2	0	0
				Publication of Yearbook	0	0.2	0	
				Majority of tenders follow PPRA rules	0	0.2	0	
				Use of social accountability tools	0	0.2	0	
				Citizens' Charter issued	0	0.2	0	0
Inclusion and Openness	Participatory and inclusive decision making and oversight	0.50	0	Forums on which citizens, private sector, academia or civil society are represented	0	1.0	0	0

	Proactive public disclosure	0.50	0.75	Publication of updated policies, strategies on website	3	0.5	1.5	
				Availability of expenditure data	0	0.5	0	1.5
Effectiveness	Budget execution	0.40	0	Proportion of released annual budget actually utilized	0	1.0	0	0
	Implementation of priority programs	0.40	0.4	Completion level of priority programs	1	1.0	1	1
	Strengthening institutional capacities for implementation	0.20	0	Training expenditure as a proportion of total Personnel expenditure	0	1.0	0	0
Responsiveness	Linkage with National/Provincial priorities and strategies	0.25	0	Explicit linkage of priority programs with the Vision 2025	0	0.5	0	
				Explicit linkage of priority programs with relevant sector policy	0	0.5	0	0
	Mechanisms for facilitating access to information	0.25	0.5	Designated official nominated under Right to Information Act 2010	0	0.5	0	
				Standards for access to information services clearly mentioned	4	0.5	2	2
Mechanisms for public grievance redress	0.25	0.5	Designated official for public	0	0.5	0	2	

				grievance redress and addressing references from Ombudsmen				
				Standards for grievance redress services clearly mentioned	4	0.5	2	
	Use of ICT tools	0.25	2.5	Availability of online services for complaints, information, registration, social media	10	1.0	10	
Total Score (Simple Average of WSC)			0.358					10

Table 25: Results for CDA

BETA TEST RESULTS FOR CDA								
Measurement Area	Criteria (C)	Criteria Weight (CW)	Weighted Score of Criteria (WSC)= Sum of WSI × CW	Indicators (I)	Raw Score on a Scale of 1-10 (RS)	Indicator Weight (IW)	Weighted Score of Indicator (WSI)= RS × IW	Sum of WSI
Quality of Governance	Clarity of institutional vision and mission	0.35	0	Statements are clear, brief and reflect the values, philosophy and culture of the institution	0	0.4	0	0
				Vision statement expresses, in sensory terms, the future position or image of the institution	0	0.3	0	
				Mission statement focuses on one	0	0.3	0	

				or a few strategic goals				
	Budget Accuracy	0.40	2	Variance between revised budget and budget estimates	5	1.0	5	5
	Gender Equity in HR	0.25		Proportion of female employees in total working staff	0	1.0	0	0
	Investment in Capacity Building	1.00		Training budget as a proportion of total Personnel budget	0	1.0	0	0

Measurement Area	Criteria (C)	Criteria Weight (CW)	Weighted Score of Criteria (WSC)= Sum of WSI × CW	Indicators (I)	Raw Score on a Scale of 1-10 (RS)	Indicator Weight (IW)	Weighted Score of Indicator (WSI)= RS × IW	Sum of WSI
Accountability	Political Accountability	0.40	0	Timely and complete responses to PAC review queries	0	0.5	0	0
				Regular submission of briefings to the Standing Committees of Parliament	0	0.5	0	
	Accountability to citizens	0.60	0.24	Publication of Annual Budget on institution's website	2	0.2	0.4	

				Publication of Yearbook	0	0.2	0	
				Majority of tenders follow PPRA rules	0	0.2	0	
				Use of social accountability tools	0	0.2	0	
				Citizens' Charter issued	0	0.2	0	
Inclusion and Openness	Participatory and inclusive decision making and oversight	0.50	0	Forums on which citizens, private sector, academia or civil society are represented	0	1.0	0	0
	Proactive public disclosure	0.50	2.25	Publication of updated policies, strategies on website	5	0.5	2.5	4.5
				Availability of expenditure data	4	0.5	2	
Effectiveness	Budget execution	0.40	0.8	Proportion of released annual budget actually utilized	2	1.0	2	2

Measurement Area	Criteria (C)	Criteria Weight (CW)	Weighted Score of Criteria (WSC)=	Indicators (I)	Raw Score on a Scale	Indicator Weight (IW)	Weighted Score of Indicator	Sum of WSI
------------------	--------------	----------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------	----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------	------------

			Sum of WSI × CW		Weight of 1-10 (RS)		Score (WSI)= RS × IW	
	Implementation of priority programs	0.40	0.4	Completion level of priority programs	1	1.0	1	1
	Strengthening institutional capacities for implementation	0.20	0	Training expenditure as a proportion of total Personnel expenditure	0	1.0	0	0
Responsiveness	Linkage with National/Provincial priorities and strategies	0.25	0.75	Explicit linkage of priority programs with the Vision 2025	0	0.5	0	3
				Explicit linkage of priority programs with relevant sector policy	0	0.5	0	
	Mechanisms for facilitating access to information	0.25	1.25	Designated official nominated under Right to Information Act 2010	6	0.5	3	5
				Standards for access to information services clearly mentioned	4	0.5	2	

	Mechanisms for public grievance redress	0.25	1.25	Designated official for public grievance redress and addressing references from Ombudsmen	6	0.5	3	
				Standards for grievance redress services clearly mentioned	4	0.5	2	5
	Use of ICT tools	0.25	2.5	Availability of online services for complaints, information, registration, social media	10	1.0	10	10
Total Score (Simple Average of WSC)			0.880					

Table 26: Results for Motorway Police

BETA TEST RESULTS FOR Police								
Measurement Area	Criteria (C)	Criteria Weight (C)	Weighted Score of Criteria (WSC) = Sum of WSI × CW	Indicators (I)	Raw Score on a Scale of 1-10 (RS)	Indicator Weight (IW)	Weighted Score of Indicator (WSI) = RS × IW	Sum of WSI
Quality of	Clarity of	0.35	0.7175	Statements are clear, brief and reflect the values,	4.0	0.4	1.6	

Governance	institutional vision and mission			philosophy and culture of the institution				2.05
				Vision statement expresses in sensory terms, the future position or image of the institution	0.0	0.3	0	
				Mission statement focuses on one or a few strategic goals	1.5	0.3	0.45	
	Budget Accuracy	0.40	2	Variance between revised budget and budget estimates	5.0	1.0	5	5
Gender Equity in HR	0.25	Proportion of female employees in total working staff		3.0	1.0	3	3	
Investment in Capacity Building	1.00	Training budget as a proportion of total Personnel budget		0.0	1.0	0	0	
Accountability	Political Accountability	0.40	0	Timely and complete responses to PAC review queries	0.0	0.5	0	0
				Regular submission of briefings to the Standing Committees of Parliament	0.0	0.5	0	
	Accountability to citizens	0.60	0.12	Publication of Annual Budget on institution's website	0.0	0.2	0	0.2
				Publication of Yearbook	1.0	0.2	0.2	
				Majority of tenders follow PPRA rules	0.0	0.2	0	
				Use of social accountability tools	0.0	0.2	0	
				Citizens' Charter issued	0.0	0.2	0	
Inclusion and	Participatory and inclusive	0.50	0	Forums on which citizens, private sector, academia or civil society are represented	0.0	1.0	0	0

Openness	decision making and oversight							
	Proactive public disclosure	0.50	2	Publication of updated policies, strategies on website	5.0	0.5	2.5	4
				Availability of expenditure data	3.0	0.5	1.5	
Effectiveness	Budget execution	0.40	0.4	Proportion of released annual budget actually utilized	1.0	1.0	1	1
	Implementation of priority programs	0.40	0	Completion level of priority programs	0.0	1.0	0	0
	Strengthening institutional capacities for implementation	0.20	0	Training expenditure as a proportion of total Personnel expenditure	0.0	1.0	0	0
Responsiveness	Linkage with National /Provincial priorities and strategies	0.25	0.75	Explicit linkage of priority programs with the Vision 2025	0.0	0.5	0	3
				Explicit linkage of priority programs with relevant sector policy	0.0	0.5	0	
	Mechanisms for facilitating access to	0.25	1.25	Designated Official nominated under Right to Information Act 2010	6.0	0.5	3	5
Standards for access to information services clearly mentioned				4.0	0.5	2		

	informat ion							
	Mechani sms for public grievanc e redress	0.25	1.25	Designated Official for public grievance redress and addressing references from Ombudsmen	6.0	0.5	3	5
				Standards for grievance redress services clearly mentioned	4.0	0.5	2	
	Use of ICT tools	0.25	2.5	Availability of online services for complaints, information, registration, social media	10.0	1.0	10	10
Total Score (Simple Average of WSC)			0.845					