

Citizen Grievance Mapping at the Ward Level



GalliGalli

Gyaneshwor-33 Kathmandu

Tel: 977-01-4422804

Email address: info@galligalli.org

Website: www.galligalli.org

I. Background

Since the last local elections were held in 1997, drastic changes have taken place in the Nepal. From the point of view of urban governance, Nepal's towns and cities have expanded rapidly. The Kathmandu Valley has grown especially rapidly – from a population of about 1.6 million in 2001 to a population of about 2.5 million in 2011. This unexpected and unplanned growth has proven a challenge to many aspects of city life. A daily evident toll has been seen in physical infrastructure such as roads, water supply, and garbage collection. With the influx of migrants, the nature of social dynamics and ties in Kathmandu's neighbourhoods have also changed. The systems by which residents communicate, organize themselves, and negotiate with each other and the state has altered. In this changed context, there is limited information on the nature of day-to-day problems faced by citizens and the manner in which neighbourhoods organize.

As a first step, there is a need to map which services are most lacking according to citizens. Alongside this demand side work, there is also a need to look at supply side issues. This is looking at the constraints of the ward and other service sector providers such as Water and Road Departments. Similarly, there is also a need to look at private service providers who have become increasingly active.

II. Objectives

- Understand and map citizen perceptions on delivery of six basic infrastructure services.
- Map local-level stakeholders responsible for delivering these services.
- Identify response pathways to address these issues.
- Lay the groundwork to influence broader urbanization policy.

III. Target Areas

Considering the timeframe, human resources, and finances, the pilot has been taking place in two wards – 33 and 6 – in the Kathmandu Valley. Within these wards, the work took place in two areas with *Tol Sudhar Samitis*, or neighbourhood improvement associations, and one without such associations in each ward. The targeted areas in each ward are as follows:

Ward 33

- Shastri Marg Tol Upabhokta Samiti
- Rudramarg Tol Sudhar Samiti
- Gyan Bhairav Yuva Club, Gyaneshwar (Non-TSS Area)

Ward 6

- Saraswatinagar Sudhar Sangh
- Shantinagar Upabhokta Samiti
- Kumarigal, Boudha (Non-TSS Area)

Ward 7 is also part of our longer term interests. While a comprehensive survey has not been implemented in Ward 7, other interviews, research, and community events were included as a core part of the research.

IV. Methodology

All the information we present has been collected through three methods:

Surveys: We deployed surveys in each of the six areas. After culling for errors and quality control, the final number of surveys came to 667 from across six areas in two wards. It is important to highlight that these surveys are all perception surveys. This is to say we cannot assume that they necessarily reflect the reality on the ground. Nonetheless, residents' perceptions of which problems exist and their intensity are crucial indicators of

a.) the level of communication/information flow between residents and state b.) citizens' level of faith towards the state.

It must also be noted that there was no statistical sampling method for the survey. Before we implemented the survey in each tol, we did go out and explore the contours of the area: What streets were affluent and what poor; which area had lots of shops and which were very residential; which were close to water sources and which far. In this way, we were careful to include a representative sampling of each area.

Interviews: We conducted interviews with stakeholders ranging from TSS members to ward staff to MP's office staff to political players to departmental staff. A full list of interviewees is included in the annex. The views expressed in those interviews are interwoven into the substantive part of this report below. For the interviews, we always pre-prepared questions we were interested in. However, we allowed the conversation to take its own direction as and when necessary.

Events: GalliGalli has both participated in and hosted a number of events as listed below by month. Those events have shed light into both the nature of relationships between different stakeholders as well as the manner in which decision-making functions at the local level. A key community event for GalliGalli has also been our monthly Sukul Bahas program. The learnings from those programs have also been woven into the narrative below. A full listing of SukulBahas topics in the past six months as well as links to the full event videos are included in the annex.

V. Major Activities

Our activities began from the walking surveys. We had a printed google maps of the all three wards and walked around all inner streets. The goal was to see the different kinds of neighbourhood, different organizations in the ward, and see if there were clear signs indicating a presence of TSS. We also did interviews of a few people in each of the wards as a means of getting a sense of citizen sentiment. An additional goal was to get an idea of the different demographics of people living in the wards to ensure a representative cross-sample during the survey. Then we compiled the list of TSSs and had an initial interviews with the people in the list after having an informal telephone conversations where they decide either to give interviews or not. After the interview, we chose the list of areas we were going to have surveys. We also attended different programs, meetings of these TSSs.

The second round of activities went around developing survey questionnaires, training survey enumerators, testing survey to check for the feedback and we also had pilot survey among 42 households. After selecting the sampling site, we attended different programs and activities of these areas. Our monthly Sukul Bahas was going side by side with the survey along with the interviews with representatives of different institutions like Kathmandu Metropolitan City officials, ward level political representatives, police officers.

VI. The Context: Survey, Ward, Tol

The perception survey implemented had a total of 121 questions divided into three sections: demographic information, rankings/details on six infrastructural/service deliver sectors, and explorations into the Tol Sudhar Samitis. The findings presented here will also be presented in these three divisions as well as include an additional section, which will focus on each sector in terms of complains. In the latter section, the following questions will be asked: Do people complain? Where? Why do they not complain? What is the impact of the complaints in their view? We focus heavily on the complaints because we think they can be an impactful pathway to advocate for greater attention to participatory politics and accountability, strengthening the relationship between both the demand and supply sides of governance. With the survey data as the anchor of the findings, the analysis in each sector will also interweave the discussions through the interviews and events to contextualize, reinforce, or question what the perception survey findings reveal.

i. Demographics

The demographic data collected includes caste, age, gender, occupation, education level, number of occupants living in the household, number of years residents have lived in the house, and whether they own/rent the house. Breakdowns of the survey findings co-related to such demographic information are essential to our understanding of the faultlines along which the quality of service delivery can vary. Interestingly, we found that the rankings and responses essentially do not vary across these faultlines. This is perhaps the case because all the six sectors covered in the survey deal with physical infrastructure; since there are fundamental problems within each of the sectors, the effects of them are similar across demographics. For example, while wealthier families can afford generators and/or inverters, for the purposes of this survey they would still rank loadshedding as a key problem. The same logic applies to roads, where the fundamental failures of governance mean that all residents of a particular area suffer equally.

Before delving into responses, the two tables below contain basic breakdowns of the number of individuals who took the survey by ward and by individual tols.

Respondents by Ward

Wards	Respondent #	Respondent Percentage
Ward 33	139	20.87%
Ward 6	523	78.53%
Ward 7	4	0.60%
Ward Total	666	

The few interviews in ward 7 emerged because a number of the survey areas adjoin the ward, and some households in the tol are in that ward. While we did conduct interviews in Ward 7, we did not implement the survey there.

Before analyzing the data, it is important to understand that the context of the two wards is very difficult. To that end, the summary tables below highlight key aspects of both wards.

Wards at a glance

Ward No	Area (hectares)	No of Households	Population		Major Business Hub	Major Social Organization/Government Office
6	366.8	15,434	Total:60,344		Hyatt Regency Hotel	KUKL Tanker Branch
			Male	Female		
			30,472	29,872		
33	85.7	6,876	Total: 25,694		City Center	Charkhal Jail
			Male	Female		

			13,560	12,134		
--	--	--	--------	--------	--	--

Source: National Population Census 2011 and http://www.kathmandu.gov.np/Page_Ward+No.+33_48

The two wards vary not only in size, as the table above demonstrates, but also in character. Ward 33 is an old settlement, in the heart of the city, and largely residential. Ward 6, meanwhile, falls on the outskirts of the city (outside the ring road), and still borders village development committees. While heritage sites such as the Boudhanath Stupa are located in the area, it is only in the last 15 years that the paddy fields in the area were converted to houses and businesses. Huge swathes of the area, especially on the outskirts of the ward, are new settlements, with houses built by recent migrants. The area has both a large number of renters as well as many businesses located in it. These differences – old vs new settlement, renters vs owners, and residential vs mixed-use – are all important factors when looking at infrastructure and governance. Three key issues must be noted:

1. The newer settlements emerged ad hoc, rather than based on proper planning, and thus still lack basic infrastructure such as drainage and connection to water mains. Indeed, one can argue that service provision bodies such as the KUKL pay less attention to these areas than they do to older areas where basic infrastructure, weak as it may be, still exists. At a time when service provision bodies struggle to maintain existing infrastructure, they are woefully lacking in building suitable infrastructure in the newer settlements. Perhaps as a result, the home owners in newer settlements often appear to be able to work collaboratively to improve their neighbourhood. Such communal efforts are far less in evidence in the older areas. Whether this balance will shift – with the newer areas acquiring better infrastructure – as the Melamchi Project leads to the re-laying of water and drainage pipes (as well as the digging up and re-paving of roads) remains to be seen.
2. Through the course of the work, it became increasingly evident that problematic power dynamics exist between renters and owners. In just one telling example, almost none of the TSSs we worked with allowed renters to become members (one TSS allowed membership to renters who had lived in the area for over three years). As a result, renters have little incentive to invest their time and energy into improving services in the area. Furthermore, because Nepali law also requires renters to travel to their home district (defined as where they own property or the place marked as their home in their citizenship papers), they cannot access most critical services in the wards where they reside. Consequently, renters are largely disenfranchised in a city where the trend of renting will only increase. This is an area of policy and practice requiring further attention and work if Kathmandu, and other parts of Nepal, are to enjoy equitable urbanization.
3. Mixed-use areas see inflows of strangers near homes and public spaces in the way that largely residential areas do not. In Ward 6, in casual conversation, the question of security with a common and reoccurring issue. This is especially so because many of the businesses in the area are small-scale drinking shacks. In addition, mixed-use areas also experience tussles based on use of resources, whereby commercial interests may use up more water as well as cause more wear and tear to the roads than residents. Well thought out policies for resource distribution and conflict resolution are needed for mixed-use areas as Kathmandu becomes a larger city.

ii. Major Responsibilities of the Wards

The duties and responsibilities of the wards are clearly stated in the Local Self Governance Act (LSGA) of 1999. But the letter of the law is often different from the manner in which it is understood and wielded. In conducting interviews with ward staff, especially the ward secretaries, our intention was to get a sense of what they perceived to be their own duties, the resources they had at their disposal to fulfil their duties, and their relationships with the different actors in their ward. These comparisons are valuable in a situation where the system is weak, and decisions are based on the individual will of the ward secretary.

The table below summarizes and compares the differences between the responses of the secretaries of wards 33, 6, and 7.

	Ward 33	Ward 6	Ward 7
Responsibilities of the ward	The responsibilities of the ward are clearly delineated by the KMC, which gives power to the wards to fulfil their assigned duties.	The responsibilities of the ward can be divided into four clusters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Physical development: To construct roads, drainage, electricity, drinking water, etc. b. Rendering of Services: Registration of any organization, business hub; recommendations for migration and emigration, property transactions, among others. c. Revenue collection: Business tax, land and house tax, rent tax. d. Social services: Conserve and protect guthis, temples, and cultural heritage. 	According to the Citizen Charter, the ward has 73 distinct duties. In reality, there are some 20-25 more services which the ward provides, but which are not included in the citizen charter. In short, the main responsibility of the ward is to address the problem of its residents.

Responsibilities for addressing complaints around infrastructure.	For water supply, drainage management and road construction, there are different responsible departments within the KMC. It is the responsibility of these departments to deal with residents problems in these areas. But because residents first approach the wards, the wards usually try to resolve the issue if possible. If the problem cannot be solved locally, the ward informs the respective departments at the KMC.	Note: Ward Secretary did not address this question.	Ensuring the smooth flow of water/power and other infrastructure upkeep is the job of bodies such as the KMC, KUKL, and NEA. But people come to the ward first for all the above issues. Because it is the job of the ward to assist residents, we address the problem as much as we are able to. If we cannot address them, we work alongside the concerned authorities to solve the problem.
No of Staff	There are nine staff.	There are 18 staff.	There are 15-16 staff.
Use of technology	Recommendations, house and land tax collection are done through the computer. There is, however, no battery back-up for loadshedding hours. Work is often delayed due to this.	Note: Ward Secretary did not address this question.	Most ward functions are done on computers. They have battery back-up for loadshedding hours.

A brief history of Tol Sudhar Samitis

Community and collective organizing is not a new idea to Kathmandu's neighbourhoods. Traditional institutions such as guthis, in addition to their ritual roles, have also been platforms for collective action and improvement. Even outside these institutions, neighbours and neighbourhoods were able to and did organize around specific issues. The category of the Tol Sudhar Samiti (neighbourhood improvement association) or the Tol Upabhokta Samiti (neighbourhood consumer association) is, however, a relatively new legally recognized

body which can organize households, carry out infrastructural activities, mediate between residents, and mediate between citizens and the state.

The TSS or TUS (referred to just as TSS in the rest of the report) was first provided for in the Local Self Government Act (LSGA), 1999. The fundamental goal of the LSGA was to provide for the institutional development of local bodies so as to strengthen democracy by devolving power. In addition to devolving power to the wards (the lowest rung of the bureaucracy and elected representatives), the LSGA also provided for neighbourhoods to form associations. These associations, as well as any other NGOs, were empowered to undertake certain infrastructural activities, ie road pitching, in collaboration with the ward and the KMC. The key roles and duties of the consumer groups, as noted in Page 67-68 of the LSGA under the heading“Operation of Projects by Consumers’ Group and Non-governmental Organization:”are as follows:

- (1) In implementing and operating a project, consumers' group and non-governmental organization shall have to do so in coordination with the District Development Committee.
- (2) The District Development Committee may get any plan implemented and operated through consumers' group and non-governmental organization.
- (3) The consumers' group and non-governmental organization implementing the project shall have to maintain and up-date the records of accounts of their financial transactions.
- (4) The consumers' group and non-governmental organization implementing the project shall have to give a report of the accounts of their transactions to the District Development Committee and the body implementing the project and the District Development Committee shall have the responsibility for getting the accounts audited.
- (5) The cost estimate of the project shall be done as prescribed.
- (6) The consumers' group and non-governmental organization may, after the examination and release of the project, take necessary charges form the consumers receiving service, for the repair, maintenance and operation of the project.”

Many of the existing TSSs were established first as consumer’s group formed to work towards specific, time-bound goals such as road construction or transmitter fitting. Once these tasks were finished, these groups would then choose to become more permanent, thus registering with the KMC to become a TSS or a TUS. As the table below shows, in each ward, the surveys were conducted in three areas: two areas with active TSS’, and one without a TSS or with a non-active TSS. To provide the necessary context to understand the report findings, the table below summarizes key points about the four TSSs we worked with.

TSS Profiles

TSS Name	Formation Date	Area Covered	Ward No	Member Households No	Committee Members No	Income Source	Major Works/Responsibilities
Shastri Marg Tole Upabhokta Samiti	2004 A.D	South-west of the Maitidevi temple, within the area bounded by the narrow lanes of Milan Chowk.	33		13		Security and development of the community, developing sense of neighbourliness, social

							conscious raising, and social welfare.
Rudra Marga Tol Sudhar Samiti	2000 A.D	Pashupati Sadak, Gyaneshwor, in front of Welcare hospital.	33	150	13	Collects money from households, who donate amounts as they desire.	Maintaining discipline, running Rudramati cleanliness campaign, installing street lights for security.
Shantinagar Upabhokta Samiti	1996-1997 A.D	Whole area of Shantinagar tol.	6	400-500	15	Income from recommending new water tap and drainage connections; rent from kriyaputri house, occupied during death rituals.	Managing drainage, regular water supply, garbage.
Saraswotinagar SudharSangh	1990-91 A.D	From south of Gopi Krishna hall to Daffodil School.	6	800-900	11	Reserve Fund; money collected from recommendations for new drainage/tap connections; Garbage collection fee.	Cleanliness programs, garbage management, road extension and pitch.
Non-TSS Area							
Gyan Bhairav Youth Club	The club covers the area of Bishnu Paduka Marg, Baikuntha Marg, Bhairav Marg and Ananda Bhairav temple area. It was established 6-7 years back. Their income source is membership fee for which they charge NPR 2000 for local residents and NPR 4000 for others. There are 11 executive board members. They try to reconstruct roads which have been damaged, work for managing water supply, drainage system, waste management and renovating temples. They also provide mourning place for those completing death rituals. While the group appears active on paper, they have in fact been dormant for some time. They are not well known in the area nor do they work actively on behalf of their area.						
Kumarigal	The Kumarigal TSS was established in 2006 A.D with 17 board members. According to an executive committee member: "It was established to address the problems of water, road and drainage but now these are not the problems here so, this TSS is inactive". While its registration and old board remains intact, it does not work anymore.						

Comparative table on work of TSSs on the six sectoral issues as per interviews with board members

TSS	Issues					
	Water	Power Outage	Drainage	Road Condition	Garbage Collection	Security
Shastri Marg	Have collectively solved drinking water problem.		Drainage construction and management.	Black topped the road.		
Rudra Marg			Works for Clean Rudramati Campaign; drainage		Works with ECI for garbage collection	Street Lights

			management through Bagmati Drainage Reform			
Shantinagar			Maintenance of drainage	Black topping roads	Works with Fulbari Cleanliness Campaign, Environment Clean Campaign and Suryadarshan Cleanliness Program	Replaced old Street lights
Saraswatinagar	Working to address water scarcity issues.		Drainage		Works with Nepal Fulbari Environment Organization and Pariwartan Private Limited for garbage collection	Security is a major problem

The breakdown of the number of surveys by tol/area is as follows:

Tol	Respondent #	Percentage of Total	Percentage of Ward
Kumarigal	45	6.75	08.60
GyanBhairavYuva Club	48	7.20	34.53
RudraMarg	67	10.06	48.20
Shantinagar	191	28.68	36.52
ShastriMarg	28	4.20	20.14
Saraswatinagar	287	43.09	54.88
Grand Total	666		

VII. Rankings and Issues

Subsequent to the demographic data, we asked all respondents to rank the six sectoral infrastructure/service delivery issues from 1 to 6 with one being the biggest issue for them and six the smallest issue. When the surveys from all the wards were combined, the ranking in descending order starting from the most significant issue was water, power, garbage, roads, sewage, and security.

Ranking	Water	Power	Garbage	Roads	Sewage	Security
1	253	213	77	45	23	27
2	149	221	131	60	44	26
3	79	97	197	115	81	54
4	48	44	107	177	153	86
5	38	39	56	133	225	114
6	59	21	55	84	88	295

No Response	40	31	43	52	52	64
Grand Total	666	666	666	666	666	666
Average	2.434504792	2.272440945	3.158908507	3.88762215	4.26547231	4.858803987
Median	2	2	3	4	5	5
Mode	1	2	3	4	5	6
Percentage Not Answered	6.01%	4.65%	6.46%	7.81%	7.81%	9.61%

The key point here to consider – and a weakness of the perception system model – is that people complain most about issues that affect them immediately. Because water or poor garbage collection are everyday problems, they are ranked the highest. Meanwhile, the roads could be dismal and the sewage system (as we know to be true in Kathmandu) polluting our rivers. Nonetheless, the survey is important as a way of understanding what people feel most plagued by.

In the following section, we will share key data from the three areas ranked as most problematic by survey takers.

i. Water

Across the board, water was ranked the number 1 problem by survey takers. That the water flow is sporadic is undoubted. Therefore, the survey tried to ascertain whether there was a water schedule, clearly stating the particular, pre-given times for water, thus allowing people to plan. The follow up question to this one was whether the schedule was accurate. As the data shows, almost 50 percent of those who answered the question say the water schedule is not accurate. The answers were as follows:

Water Schedule Accuracy

Respondent Choices	Water Schedule Accuracy	Percentage
Other	22	3.30%
Yes	206	30.93%
No	327	49.10%
Don't Know/Can't Say	57	8.56%
Blanks	54	8.11%
Grand Total	666	

An important question we asked people was what they did for alternatives when there was serious water scarcity. We see that almost 46 percent buy water jars while the next largest category is that almost 16 percent buy water tankers. If these figures were to be scaled up proportionally to Kathmandu's population and multiplied by the cost of tankers/jar, we would discover that residents spent large amounts of money on buying water, in addition to paying KUKL.

Alternatives to tap water

Options	Water Alternative	Percentage
----------------	--------------------------	-------------------

Buy a water tanker	96	15.71%
Closest public tap	56	9.17%
Buy water jars	281	45.99%
Community source	32	5.24%
Don't Know/Can't Say	27	4.42%
Ground water (well/boring/tubewell)	56	9.17%
Neighbours + Home Owners	12	1.96%
Other	51	8.35%
Blanks	55	8.26%
Total Water Alternative Answered	611	
Grand Total	666	

ii. Power

The question we asked was how often power goes out outside the loadshedding schedule. More people ranked water as the number one issue over power. But, in fact, if we add the no 1 and 2 rankings for water and power, a larger number of people care about power. In that sense, power has more weightage, so to speak, than water. We can assume that because loadshedding is such a burden, there was/is an bias towards considering power a huge problem. Whether or not, power outage outside loadshedding hours is such a huge occurrence cannot be verified. We can also perhaps see this bias in play because through we had put in options such as outages happen every month and week, some 56 percent chose the rather more vague, 'outages happen often' over these more specific answers.

Outage Frequency

Options	Outages	Percentages
Other	8	1.20%
Outages happen sporadically	201	30.18%
Outages never happen	43	6.46%
Don't Know/Can't Say	23	3.45%
Outages happen often	373	56.01%
Outages happen every month	6	0.90%
Outages happen every week	11	1.65%
Blank	1	0.15%
Grand Total	666	

To ascertain perceptions on causes behind the power outages outside loadshedding, one survey question asked respondents to identify the root causes behind the power outages. The top answer, with over 35 percent of respondents, attributed the outages to poor maintenance of poles and wires. The second largest answer, with 25

percent of the respondents, was that the power outages were a consequence of wires getting shot. What is surprising is that the two next most common answers are rather more technical; small capacity transformers in the area (22.52 %) and use higher than grid capacity (15.62 %).

Outage Causes

Options	Causes	Causes Percentage
Natural disasters	64	9.61%
Poor Maintenance of Poles and Wires	235	35.29%
Wires Getting Shot	167	25.08%
Use higher than grid capacity	104	15.62%
Small capacity transformer in area	150	22.52%
Poles/Wires damaged in street accident	31	4.65%
Other	89	13.36%
Don't Know/Can't Say	88	13.21%
Total	928	

iii. Garbage

As evidenced regularly on our streets, garbage collection is a significant problem in Kathmandu. One thing we had observed through prior research was that here has been a massive privatization of garbage collection. The municipality now only collects garbage from the main roads; it does not service any of the inner streets. According to a ward secretary, the municipality does not pick up garbage from inner streets because the number of municipal-hired cleaners has dropped from 2400-2500 to 700-800 over the course of the last decade. Meanwhile, population has risen rapidly. Nonetheless, the wards still do have municipal cleaners; ward 7 has 35 cleaners; ward 6 has 16 sweepers, ward 33 has 7\8 cleaners. Everywhere else, garbage collection has been outsourced to private companies. Through the course of the survey process, we found that most residents do not know the name of the private company servicing them. Consequently, many assume that the municipality collects their garbage, even when this is not the case. There is no evidence to suggest that the municipality hires the private companies, it is usually the TSS/Community which does so. The question of why people assume the municipality hires companies is an interesting one.

According to the data below, about 47 percent people say the KMC picks up their garbage. Meanwhile, about 17 percent say garbage is picked up by a company hired by the municipality or the community. Through interviews with ward secretaries and TSS leaders, we identified six private companies in Ward 6, four in Ward 7, and two\three in Ward 33. Each household pays between NPR 250 to 300 monthly for garbage pick-up. The amount residents pay private companies can indirectly become a source of income for the TSSs. For example, in Saraswatinagar, 22% percent of what the private companies earn goes to the TSS.

Garbage Collection Institutions

Options	No of Respondents	Percentage
Other	9	1.35%
Community-Appointed Private Company/Non-Government Organization	111	16.67%
Don't Know/Can't Say	117	17.57%

Municipality	313	47.00%
Municipality-Appointed Private Company/Non-Government Organization	115	17.27%
Blank	1	0.15%
Grand Total	666	

There is deep dissatisfaction with the accuracy of garbage collection as per the schedule; about 36 percent say collection is never on time and over 25 percent say it is only sometimes on time. With such dismal perception number, the question of whether residents feel they have recourse to change the behaviour of the collection body is a key question.

Garbage Collection Accuracy

Option	Schedule Accuracy	Percentage
Other	11	1.65%
Sometimes on time	170	25.53%
Never on time	240	36.04%
Don't Know/Can't Say	28	4.20%
Usually on time	162	24.32%
Always on time	54	8.11%
Blank	1	0.15%
Grand Total	666	

Perhaps the biggest evidence that there are poor accountability measures for garbage collection is circumstantial and can be extrapolated from structural weaknesses. When our researchers asked ward secretaries what they do when people complaint about garbage, the response was that the ward 'talks to' the private company. Because there is no public-private partnership policy for garbage, what has occurred is a de facto privatization without any monitoring systems in place. The wards and the KMC have no real coercive/regulatory powers over the companies. TSSs and communities together can kick them out, but because the companies do kick back money to TSS, the latter have a stake in keeping certain companies in their area

That these weaknesses of policy and implementation are the key causes of the inefficiencies in garbage collection appears to be the public view as well. Altogether almost 80 percentage of all those who answered the question said non-collection was due to lack of accountability; about 39 percent said non-accountability of garbage companies and about 38 percent said non-accountability of KMC. While officials within the KMC state that a framework to guide public-private partnerships for garbage collection is nearing completing, no concrete steps have been evidenced to date.

Accountability in Garbage Collection

Options	Accountability	Percentage
Lack of Accountability of company collecting garbage	262	39.34%
Lack of Accountability of Municipality	255	38.29%
Distance of Garbage Collection Centers	53	7.96%
Strikes and Protests	67	10.06%
Lack of financial resources	42	6.31%
Don't Know/Can't Say	72	10.81%

Others	43	6.46%
--------	----	-------

VIII. Complaints

For each of the sectors, we asked a question about whether people complain when things break down; where they complain; what medium they complain through; the impact of the complaint; and to the people who don't complain, why they do not. For each sector, the set of questions about complaints was only asked to those respondents who were dissatisfied with the service they were getting. For example, all the respondents saying tap water came according to schedule were not asked about complaints. Consequently, the sample size for respondents who spoke about complaints is notably smaller than the overall sample size for each sector.

Looking at the complaints data together and with an eye to comparison, we found that it is an important sector to focus on. It raises questions such as: Does having a clear cut and easy place to complain increase complaints? Is there value to having complaints mechanisms in the absence of structures to address the complaints systematically? Do people have faith that their complaints will be heard? If people don't complain, why so? After thinking through these questions, we have taken these complaints as a proxy for how much people think the state listens to their voices. This is a reflection on both the interest of the state to listen as well as its capacity to listen. Consequently, thinking about complaints mechanisms as pathways to intervening in the local governance process (including in the role of non-government actors such as TSS'), we think it important to present the wealth of data here.

As the chart below shows, overall the complaint rates are very low, with the 'never complain' category ranging from about 58 (sewage) percent at the lowest to about 74 percent (roads) at the highest. Two points of omission must be noted here. First, in the survey, there are two sections on road – one covering pitch roads and one gravel roads. Because the complaints numbers for both were similar, and miniscule, only the data for the pitch roads is shown here. The security category is also omitted; the section had numerous categories of criminal activities, with questions around reporting included for each. Because security emerged as the last issue of concern in the survey, we have omitted them for this purpose.

Percentage Complaints

Complaint	Water	Water %	Power	Power %	Garbage	Garbage %	Roads	Roads %	Sewage	Sewage %
Blanks	339	50.98 %	73	10.96 %	403	60.51%	450	67.67%	88	13.21%
Other	9	2.76%	5	0.84%	6	2.28%	6	2.79%	41	7.09%
Complain sometimes	65	19.94 %	168	28.33 %	49	18.63%	25	11.63%	75	12.98%
Never complain	216	66.26 %	368	62.06 %	169	64.26%	161	74.88%	340	58.82%
Don't Know/Can't Say	10	3.07%	9	1.52%	9	3.42%	19	8.84%	79	13.67%
Usually complain	22	6.75%	26	4.38%	25	9.51%	4	1.86%	37	6.40%
Always complain	4	1.23%	17	2.87%	5	1.90%			6	1.04%
Grand Total	665		666		666		665		666	

Total Answered	326	49.02 %	593	89.04 %	263	39.49%	215	32.33%	578	86.79%
----------------	-----	---------	-----	---------	-----	--------	-----	--------	-----	--------

As we can see, the ‘never complain’ is at above 50 percent is every sector. That is a poor sign. ‘Complain sometimes’ hovers approximately from 10 to 20 percent. ‘Usually complain’ is all below ten. And ‘always complain’ is below three percent. These are all poor signs. It could demonstrate lack of clear mechanisms to complain or lack of faith that complaining will lead to any solution. That is why it is interesting and important to look at the above table about complaint rates in comparison with the below data sets, covering complaints location, complaints medium, complaints impact, and also why respondents don’t complain.

Complaint Location

Location	Water	Water %	Power	Power %	Garbage	Garbage %	Road	Road %	Sewage	Sewage %
TSS	33	34.38%	12	5.69%	40	47.62%	23	69.70 %	59	47.97%
KMC/Ward	1	1.04%	0	0.00%	11	13.10%	3	9.09%	31	25.20%
Department - KUKL, - NEA/NO Lights, - Road Department	55	57.29%	190	90.05%			5	15.15 %	17	13.82%
Hello Sarkar	0		2	0.95%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	3.25%
Ward Level Politicians	0		0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.81%
MP Contact Office	0		0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	6	6.25%	4	1.90%	10	11.90%	1	3.03%	2	1.63%
Don't Know/Can't Say	1	1.04%	3	1.42%	1	1.19%	1	3.03%	9	7.32%
Garbage Collection Company					22	26.19%				
Total Answered	96		211		84		33		123	

The consistency here is in terms of where people do not complain. We can see that in matters of daily burdens due to infrastructure, people do not go to local-level politicians, to MP’s contact office, or hello sarkar. While people do go to KMC/Ward, TSS, and the relevant departments, the numbers are not even across the board. For example, while 90 percent of power complaints go through the NEA/No Lights, almost 70 percent of road complaints go to the TSS. We did not collect data on why this is the case, and it remains an interesting and important area to follow up on.

The team did, however, conduct interviews within the NEA. Officials listed their work as follows:

- a. To listen to complaints and resolve issues if people’s houses’ do not have electricity.

- b. To look after whether the service is working or not in the newly connected lines.
- c. To link customer with the concerned authority.
- d. To control the leakage and punish those responsible for stealing lines.
- e. To cut off the connection of those with overdue payments.

According to officials, all of the No Light branch offices within the Kathmandu Valley receive 20-25 complaints daily, with the numbers rising during the rainy season. The No Light office is empowered to repair transformers, poles, disconnected wires, and other simple errors on the basis of phoned-in complaints. Written complaints must be filed for problems of electric problems within individual houses.

There is, however, some evidence to suggest that one of the factors driving where people complain is linked to medium of complaint or ease of complaint. For example, some 82 percent of those who complain about power say they call. Co-relate this to the fact that 90 percent of complaints for power goes to the NEA/No Lights. No Lights is one of the few bodies that can be easily contacted by phone, and is good about picking up. Therefore, the most number of people comparatively (211) complained about power. While this is not a direct or sole causality, it is certainly a point worth following up on.

Complaint Medium

Complaint Medium	Water	Water %	Power	Power %	Garbage	Garbage %	Road	Road %	Sewage	Sewage %
Blank	578		457		584		631		549	
Other	3	3.41%	1	0.48%	6	7.32%	0	0.00%	1	0.85%
Don't Know/Can't Say	1	1.14%	3	1.44%	2	2.44%	5	14.29%	3	2.56%
Written complaint	11	12.50%	5	2.39%	6	7.32%	7	20.00%	15	12.82%
Complain orally	52	59.09%	13	6.22%	43	52.44%	10	28.57%	51	43.59%
Call	21	23.86%	173	82.78%	24	29.27%	11	31.43%	43	36.75%
Sms			14	6.70%	1	1.22%	2	5.71%	4	3.42%
Grand Total	666		666		666		666		666	
Total Answered	88		209		82		35		117	

As noted above, the high percentage of call-in complaints at the NEA/No Lights is an anomaly when compared to the rest of the data. Overall, calling in to complain is the second most common option, with percentages of those who call ranging from the mid-20s to the mid-30s. The option most respondents choose is, however, to personally go to the relevant office and complain orally. This reality raises many questions. Do people choose to personally go and complain because there are unaware of the call-in options and numbers? Why do they not file a written complaint while there so as to ensure that records of their grievances are kept? Is it that people go personally because they feel that no response will be forthcoming if they stick to the formalized mechanism call-in mechanism? In contrast, being personally present at the office – perhaps with others in the neighbourhood or in the company of someone with power in the ward – may increase the chances of a response.

Similar questions can be asked of the call-in option. If the departments can set up easy effective call-in numbers, will it increase the rate of complaints? Or is the No Lights example an anomaly because people call in to ask when the power will come back, rather than to complain about outages? The question also is, if a system

like no lights could be set up to work largely effectively (in terms of responsiveness in answering calls) in one department why can it not be done in others. Further, even in that department what will it take to make the system better in terms of keeping track of where complaints are coming from and how they get resolved? What is the value to having a responsive call-in number if the issue is not in fact addressed?

The latter question is a key one in a situation where the two tables below (one on the impact of complaints and the other on why people don't complain) show that there is limited faith in the responsiveness, and thus accountability, of the departments.

Interestingly, the numbers in impact of complaints section below contain a number of anomalies. For example, the percent of people who responded that there is no impact to complaining range from about 13 percent to 38 percent. That no sector in this category crossed 50 percent is a good sign. But the significant range of answers demonstrates that in general, there is no consolidated attitude within the bureaucracy in terms of responding to complaints; the responses differ across departments. Indeed, they appear to even differ within departments, with the responses for water and power, both handled by the KUKL, very different.

Complaint Impact

Complaint Impact	Water	Water %	Power	Power %	Garbage	Garbage %	Road	Road %	Sewage	Sewage %
Blanks	580		461		587		548		550	
Other	6	6.98%	23	11.22%	4	5.06%	3	2.54%	8	6.90%
No impact	33	38.37%	54	26.34%	25	31.65%	16	13.56%	25	21.55%
Don't Know/Can't Say	1	1.16%	13	6.34%	6	7.59%	84	68.64%	5	4.31%
Sent someone out, but problem unresolved	15	17.44%	33	16.10%			6	5.08%	12	10.34%
Sent someone out, there was some improvement	19	22.09%	51	24.88%	25	31.65%	3	2.54%	56	48.28%
Showed no interest at relevant office	12	13.95%	31	15.12%	19	24.05%	6	5.08%	10	8.62%
Grand Total	666		666		666		666		666	
Total Answered	86	12.91%	205	30.78%	79	11.86%	118	17.72%	116	17.42%

The most notable anomaly in this chart is, however, the fact that when talking about roads, 68 percent of respondents said they did not know if there had been any improvements after the complaint. This is a surprising

number; whether the state of the roads has or has not improved is easily evident. Therefore, following-up on why a majority of respondents would choose this answer just for roads is likely to lead to fresh insights.

Further, another interesting point for follow up is why problems cannot be resolved even when the departments send someone out to investigate. Between 10 to 20 percent of respondents chose this option across the board (except for roads as explained above). In these cases, was no change seen due to intractable technical problems? This is a possibility, for example, due to Kathmandu’s old, complex, and leaky pipe system for water supply. On the other hand, the problem could emerge from a lack of interest/incentive for the field workers to solve the problem.

That respondents feel the relevant service providers have limited interest in solving their problems is evident from the chart below on why people don’t complain. Between about 45 to 60 percent of respondents say they do not complain because no impact will emerge from the complaint. The next most common response – with about 17 to 29 percent of respondents choosing it – was that they did not know where to complain. The notable numbers, which suggest that along with staging interventions to improve the existing complaints mechanism, there is also a need to disseminate information on how to access them.

No Complaint Causes

Reason	Water	Water %	Power	Power %	Garbage	Garbage %	Road	Road %	Sewage	Sewage %
Blanks	451		310		499		499		332	
Other	28	13.02 %	54	15.17%	18	10.78%	35	20.96 %	54	16.17%
Don't know where to complain	38	17.67 %	67	18.82%	48	28.74%	32	19.16 %	80	23.95%
Will have no impact	130	60.47 %	194	54.49%	74	44.31%	74	44.31 %	162	48.50%
Don't Know/Can't Say	6	2.79%	12	3.37%	15	8.98%	12	7.19%	14	4.19%
No time to complain	13	6.05%	29	8.15%	12	7.19%	14	8.38%	24	7.19%
Grand Total	666		666		666		666		666	
Total Answered	215	32.28 %	356	53.45%	167	25.08%	167	25.08 %	334	50.15%

The GoN has made prominent efforts to listen to grievances in recent years, for example through the highly promoted Hello Sarkar tool. While a direct line to the PMO is a useful idea, we can see that citizens sensibly seek to go to the relevant department for day-to-day technical problems. This makes sense as it is these departments which are responsible for the sectors; even the PMO would have to redirect these complaints to the departments, and it would consequently be overburdened with calls. But limited attention, as well as publicity, has been done on how to access these core departments. This is much-needed work. Possible response pathways and ways forward for complaints have been highlighted in the final section.

IX. Tol Sudhar Samitis

Better understanding the role of these associations in neighbourhoods in the absence of elected local representatives was among the key goals of this project. Indeed, the mapping exercise was premised on the hypothesis that there may be differences in the quantity or quality of issues in TSS versus non-TSS area. Because of our very small sample size, it is impossible to answer this question comprehensively. On the one hand, the survey responses suggest that there are no dramatic differences in service delivery quality between the two areas. On the other hand, there is an overall positive feeling towards the TSS. This section has data on what percentage of respondents are active in the TSSs, whether the TSSs function as solution facilitators, how effective they are in the former role, why certain respondents are inactive, and whether respondents in the non-TSS areas think a TSS would be useful to them.

A brief overview of the legal history of the TSS has already been provided above. Two additional points about the ground realities of the TSS must be made. First, though many TSS did form and work in the early 2000s, many formally registered starting in 2006/7. We can assume that this increase in being recognized by the state was a function of a. the relative sense of safety in engaging in public life that emerged after the end of the conflict b. the gap felt at the local level due to lack of elected representatives in the transitional period. Second, though we are talking about TSSs as a single category here, it is important to remember that one TSS is very different from the next. For example, all of the four TSS we worked with were dramatically different from each other. Each of the TSSs has their own model for memberships, elections, raising funds, and how they operate.

Should this lack of standardization be viewed positively or negatively? On the one hand, the degree of difference seen seems to suggest that the LSGA does not have adequate or clear practices outlined. Such weaknesses can be particularly damaging when it comes to guidelines around how executive positions are filled and how monitoring takes place. The latter is an especially pertinent point when the LSGA allows for, and there is widespread practice of, financial agreements between the KMC and TSSs to undertake infrastructural interventions. On the other hand, the lack of rigid regulations mediating all aspects of the operations is positive; it allows for flexibility and adaptation according to local dynamics and realities on the ground.

Some key, comparative points below:

1. **Politics:** Some TSSs are essentially outposts of political parties, and operate as the all-party mechanism did. Many TSS office bearers have ambitious to be elected when the next local elections take place. In the absence of elected government, this is a way for them to be seen and continue to have influence. This is also linked to money as the very political TSSs evidently (ie, the size of their buildings) have access to more funds than can be raised through membership dues and other nominal fees. Both of the politicized TSSs we worked with had built/were building considerable structures. But this is not the case across the board. Some of the TSSs we worked with were far from politicized. In fact, they actively sought to remain distant from party politics as an institution.
2. **Membership:** In most TSSs, one must own property to be considered a full member. Renters have no role/say in the TSS. This seems a huge problem in a city like Kathmandu where there are so many renters. Additionally, a review of the policy where membership is by household, with no consideration of individuals is a practice requiring review. There is ample evident to suggest that household membership without consideration of individuals usually concentrates power in the hands of the eldest/most active male in the household. This is a matter of concern in nuclear as well as joint families.
3. **Powers of coercion:** Where do TSSs get their legitimacy and powers of coercion from? While there are provisions for elections, they do not take place regularly. Even when elections are held, the process can be messy. For example, we attended the AGM of a TSS where elections were also supposed to be held. The current executive board, advisors, and other important players wanted to go for a consensus candidate over elections. However, with divisions along party political lines, they were unable to agree

on a consensus candidate. No decision was taken at the AGM. Later, through closed-door negotiations, they were able to put together a temporary executive committee. This is, however, the case in the larger, more politicized areas. In the smaller, less politicized areas, the TSS gain legitimacy due to the general perspective that it is there to work for the neighbourhood. While many are willing to pay, gentle naming/shaming is another way of putting pressure on those unwilling to contribute.

4. **Accountability and Transparency:** TSSs raise funds from their members, from other outside donors, and also get money as part of 80/20 or 70/30 deals to build infrastructure, mostly roads. The mechanisms to monitor these funds are not transparent. The scope for corruption and kickbacks in the construction sector is immense, of which there is ample proof. How these bodies can be made more accountable is a key issue that must be addressed.
5. **Inclusion:** Overall, the TSSs are not very inclusive. As in Nepali politics, the key players are almost always upper caste men. There is a sense that women must be included through reservations, but these are largely token positions. For example, in the election of one TSS, there was a pressure group of women saying a woman should be made president. The response from the leading male players was that a woman would not be able to handle everything as the TSS was also constructing a building at the time. Similarly, the inclusion of the working class or sensitivity to caste is generally lacking even in advisory roles. Most advisors are retired professionals and bureaucrats, and thus carry notable social prestige.

These problems within the TSSs must be considered and paid attention to. It is, however, also important to look at the positives of the TSSs. First, in the absence of elected officials, the TSSs are the only institution specifically geared towards organizing and advocacy at the neighbourhood level. Even after local elections take place, there should and will be spaces for such institutions. The greatest value of the TSSs is their potential to function as a platform around which participatory decision-making can take place. Though there are many inefficiencies, they already play this role to some extent. For example, one TSS has been lobbying and negotiating with state representatives from political parties to the bureaucracy about planned drain sizes along the Rudramati River. If the ability of the TSSs to undertake similar work in a more inclusive, transparent and systematic manner can be improved, it would have a notable impact on participatory decision making.

It is, therefore, a positive sign that involvement in the TSSs appears to be noteworthy. As the table below shows, between about 17 to 31 percent of respondents said they are active in the TSS. A follow-up question to this asked people how they were active. Responses ranged from attending AGMs and other meetings, consulting regularly with TSS members, voting, and standing for elections. Regardless of what activity respondents engaged in, that this number feel ownership of the body is a positive sign.

People Active in TSS

Tol	Yes	Yes %	No	No %	Don't Know/Can't Say	Grand Total
Kumarigal					3	45
GyanBhairavYuva Club			1		1	48
RudraMarg	21	31.34%	43	64.18%	2	67
Shantinagar	37	19.37%	150	78.53%	3	191
ShastriMarg	8	28.57%	19	67.86%	1	28
Saraswatinagar	49	17.07%	215	74.91%	20	287
Grand Total	115	17.27%	428	64.26%	30	666

A strong sense of community ownership of the TSS, even among those who are not active, is necessary for the body to enjoy widespread legitimacy. Ownership/legitimacy can be acquired in a number of ways. One way, of course, is to speak about the TSS as a space for community, where previously alienated neighbours can come

together. In our work, this feeling came through strongly only in the Shastri Marg TSS, which covers both a small (42 households) and a relatively homogenous (in terms of caste and class makeup) area. It was also one of the TSSs which was most adamant to avoid any suggestion of being politicized or associated with non-profits. For most other TSSs, which were significantly larger (from 150 to 1500 member households), sense of community was not highlighted. Rather, the focus was on collective action to improve and maintain infrastructure, mediate with and lobby bodies on behalf of the area and individual residents when necessary, and solve disputes that arise between residents.

From this, we can assume that most TSSs derive legitimacy from their ability to make concrete and visible interventions in their neighbourhoods. The TSSs also understand this; the larger TSSs with the ability to mobilize money, and usually close ties to the political parties, immediately built large structures. These structures serve as the office of the TSS, with one TSS even keeping regular office hours. Additionally, these buildings – usually with a temple at the entrance – also serve as a community space for events. A special area is cordoned off for families to keep *kiriya* in, when they are fulfilling the 13 days of death rituals for loved ones. These concrete structures physically demonstrate the power of the TSS, and serve as a daily visible reminder of the body’s ability to mobilize money and other less tangible resources. While the buildings are important in giving legitimacy to the TSS, this visibility must also be reinforced by an ability to intervene effectively in infrastructure projects. Keeping this in mind, we asked respondents whether their TSSs was active as a solution facilitator and how effective its facilitation tended to be as presented in the following two tables.

TSS as Solution Facilitator

Tol	Never	Never %	Sometimes	Sometimes%	Helped Owner	Owner %
Kumarigal						
Gyan Bhairav Yuva Club			1			
Rudra Marg	12	17.91%	23	34.33%	3	4.48%
Shantinagar	86	45.03%	40	20.94%	6	3.14%
Shastri Marg	3	10.71%	3	10.71%	5	17.86%
Saraswatinagar	82	28.57%	100	34.84%	9	3.14%
Grand Total	183		167		23	

The data reinforces our earlier point about the variable characters, abilities, and working models of the different TSSs. By looking just at the above table, it is impossible to make generalizations about the (in) ability of TSSs to effectively facilitate solutions in their neighbourhoods. This is also the case with the chart below, where respondents ranked the quality of facilitation. For example, while 50 percent of respondents said Shastri Marg TSS was ‘good’ at facilitation, only about four percent of Shantinagar residents felt their TSS was ‘good’. Many factors affect these ratings including size of TSS (with less proximity and dissemination of information on activities in larger, more heterogeneous areas), income levels and political affiliations.

Facilitation Rating

Tol	Very Good	Very Good %	Poor	Poor %	Good	Good %	Average	Average %	Total Answered
Kumarigal									0
Gyan Bhairav Yuva Club							1		1
Rudra Marg	9	21.43%	1	2.38%	22	52.38%	10	23.81%	42
Shantinagar	3	6.25%			14	36.5%	29	60.42%	48

Shastri Marg	6	30.00%			10	50.00%	4	20.00%	20
Saraswatinagar	9	6.57%	4	2.92%	54	39.42%	68	49.64%	137

While the above tables look at the extent and nature of involvement of those who are active in the TSS, it is also important to look at the motivations of those who are not active. The table immediately below notes the reasons a percentage of respondents are not active in the TSS. In all the neighbourhoods, the lack of time to be involved appears as a notable reason for non-involvement. Because the active TSSs have regular meetings, office hours, discussions, lobbying, and other events, involvement is time-consuming. Because the positions are unpaid, it is likely that lower-income individuals and families are unable to be involved fully. Indeed, we see that in many cases the TSS leadership comprises of retired professionals and bureaucrats as advisors and office bearers.

The table below also reinforces our earlier point about the problematic dichotomy of renters vs owners. The majority of those stating they were 'not included' comprise of renters. Because they are not allowed membership in the TSSs, they neither feel ownership of the area nor are they seen to have rights to opinions by the owners. As a result, they abdicate all responsibility to home owners. Such disenfranchisement of renters will become increasingly more problematic as Kathmandu grows. As many homes and areas become increasingly occupied by renters, it will be difficult to ask them to seek solutions to local problems when the locality does not acknowledge their ownership of the area.

Causes Behind Non-involvement

Tol	TSS Not Active	No Time	No Time %	Not Included	Not Included %	Political Influence	Political Influence %	Don't Know/ Can't Say	Other	Total
Kumarigal										
Gyan Bhairav Yuva Club									1	1
Rudra Marg		13	30.23%	4	9.30%			9	17	43
Shantinagar	9.46%	51	34.46%	37	25.00%	17	11.49%	24	5	148
Shastri Marg		4	20.00%	8	40.00%			3	5	20
Saraswatinagar	7.14%	78	34.82%	23	10.27%	10	4.46%	63	34	224

On the matter of political influence of the TSS, the survey findings support our observations and interview data. There is limited direct party influence over the Rudra Marg and Shastri Marg TSS. Meanwhile, there are some concerns over this in Shantinagar and Saraswatinagar, with the former particularly politicized. From all of the data above, it is evident that respondents feel only somewhat positive about the TSSs. More work needs to be done before something more substantive can be said about the TSS mechanism.

While the above charts dealt with the four areas around TSSs, the chart below represents people's perceptions on the need for a TSS in the two areas which do not currently have them. We can see that there is above 50 percent support for the TSSs. The comparatively smaller enthusiasm for them in Kumarigal can likely be attributed to the fact that the area does in fact have a TSS which has become dormant recently. Meanwhile, in Gyan Bhairav over 77 percent of respondents think having a TSS would help their neighbourhood.

Would a TSS Help?

Tol	Yes	Yes %	No	No%	Don't Know/Can't Say	Total Answered
Kumarigal	24	55.81%	11	25.58%	7	43
GyanBhairavYuva Club	34	77.27%	1	2.27%	9	44

X. Response Pathways: Looking Ahead

A key question this project sought to delve into was an attempt to map which services are most lacking according to citizens. While answers will no doubt vary in different parts of Kathmandu, that these six infrastructure issues are problems across the city is undeniable. On the other hand, another question for the project was to better understand the significant challenges to departments, the KMC, and the wards on the supply side. While the problems are entrenched, there is much activity in all these sectors, with significant attempts to address the bottlenecks. Based on both the rankings and responses from bureaucrats, further in-depth work in any of the following four areas would be of immense value.

Water: With pipes to bring water from the long-pending Melamchi project being laid in the Valley, there will be much activity in this sector in the next two years. If Melamchi is in fact a success, it will not merely increase the flow of water to the Valley. One of the goals of the Melamchi project is also to replace the out-of-date and inefficient water grid in the city. Interventions in this work are much needed, and could serve as a model in setting up water grids in Nepal's other, growing urban centers.

Garbage: It is evident through the survey and interviews that there has been a massive privatization of garbage collection across the city. This privatization has happened in an ad hoc and unregulated manner to date. Much needed work could be done on the rumoured, imminent public-private partnership model for garbage collection. Such a policy would benefit if influenced by on-the-ground feedback around rates, reliability, and issues faced in the current set-up.

Sewage: Plans are currently underway to lay drains along both sides of a number of rivers in Kathmandu. Alongside, early-stage discussions on setting up filtration plants are also underway. Research, advocacy, and concrete intervention in this process at the early stage would be valuable in ensuring a solid foundation on which to carry forward this long-term work.

While such sector-specific work is valuable, these large-scale infrastructure efforts are likely to span at least three years, with some ranging 10 years. Consequently, time-bound, project-based work in these areas is unlikely to yield the desired effects. Consequently, in building upon this pilot project in the coming year, GalliGalli has identified three areas where substantive work is possible through a short burst of intensive work. The three areas are as follows.

Complaints:

As discussed above, complaints mechanisms can serve as proxy indicators for the nature and extent of the relationship between citizens and the state. There are two aspects to this relationship. First, it should be easy for people to complain. Second, clear systems to record all complaints, including what follow-up actions were taken, must be kept. The issue of complaints can of course be researched at all levels from the TSS to the ward. But because most people seem to be complaining to the relevant departments when it comes to infrastructure, it makes sense to focus attention there. This also allows for the work to be comparative, looking into at least two of the following departments – KUKL, Roads, NEA, and KMC.

Any study of this area should look in depth into the technology, bureaucratic chain of command, and procedures around complaints in the different departments. Alongside, the effort should also be monitoring the attitudes of

the staff to complaints, how they are trained/taught/told to deal with complaints, and what consequences staff face for not recording/addressing complaints. Subsequently, a comparison of the demand (how people complaint) and the supply (how the complaints are treated) will allow us to make concrete suggestions on how to intervene in the complaints system from both the demand and supply side of the chain. To make the data more accessible, we could spatially map the flow of complaints for each sector/department (as we have done with this survey).

While such action-based research into the regular complaints system is important, at this current juncture an additional component of monitoring post-earthquake complaints will be critical. Knowing as we do that the regular mechanisms are weak and inefficient, how the crisis set-up will function is an important question. By doing rapid, time-bound work to compare the two, we would aim to especially influence the earthquake complaints/information mechanisms, which will need to be operational for at least a year.

Towards the end of the above work, GalliGalli can we set up a pilot in collaboration with a particular department where we ourselves advertise and man the help desk/call center. While commitment and will would be needed from the department, a brief pilot in KUKL or the Road Department would be invaluable. In addition to manning their call centers, we could also set up online feedback forms, and sms systems to gauge which mediums are most popular. Once we have a sense of the kinds of issues being reported and the mechanisms through which reports come, we could suggest improvement or new response mechanisms.

Participatory decision-making

This pilot project has highlighted starkly for us the need to make national and city-wide decisions around large-scale infrastructure more participatory from the start. Repeatedly, we saw evidence of residents learning about disruptive, long-term work such as the digging of roads and the laying of new pipes only because of the noise. Some of these activities are part of longer-term city-wide infrastructure that will remain in place for decades. Surely participatory discussions, information dissemination, and decision-making are essential to make such work successful.

There is a need to tackle this issue from the policy and political levels as well as by tweaking practices on the ground. After a period of intensive observations and research, the end goal would be to influence the manner in which participatory processes are structured when it comes to decisions around large scale infrastructure. As GalliGalli already has the base knowledge about local politics, and the contacts to work collaboratively, we could work with particular TSSs and wards over the long term to implement innovative participatory practices.

Further interventions with TSSs.

Whatever their weaknesses, it is evident that TSSs are legally recognized existing structures, many with notable roots in their communities. More attention should therefore be paid to how TSS executives acquire their positions, what monitoring and accountability mechanisms are in place, and their roles and duties. Furthermore, innovative ideas to consistently tie the localized issues raised by the TSSs to broader development plans are needed. The ability of the TSSs to advocate for their areas will improve if media and the broader public pay attention to them. More in-depth work as well as expansion from the current three wards to approximately 6-10 wards in the valley could lead to interesting results. A key focus of any such work would have to be connecting the TSSs to each other as well bringing the work of the TSSs to public attention.

Annex

Annex

List of interviewees

Ashok Thapa	Secretary	Gyan Bhairav Yuva Club	Sept 10 2014	33
Raju Bhai Bajracharya	Chairperson	Dillibazar Tol Sudhar Samiti	Sept 14, 2014	33
Babu Krishna Pathak	Ward Secretary	K.M.C Ward No.33	Oct 14, 2014	33
Rohit Giri	Chairperson	Rudra Marg Tol Sudhar Samiti	Sept 19, 2014	33
Niraj Raj Satyal	Political Representative	Nepali Congress	Dec 27, 2014	33
Parthibeshwor Timilsina	Advisor	Sastri Marg Upabhokta Samiti		33
Krishna Prasad Uprety	Vice-Chairperson	Charghare Tinchule Nirman Samiti	Nov 14, 2014	6
Yuvraj Khanal	Administrative Head	Ward No 6 Office	Jan 23, 2015	6
Bhola Nepal	Secretary	Sangam Tol Sudhar Samiti	Nov 3, 2014	6
Haribol Bogati and Punya Lochan Acharya	Chairperson and Secretary respectively	Saraswotnagar Sudhar Sangh	Oct 25, 2014	6
Buddhi Gambhir Thapa	Former chairperson	Shantinagar UpabhoktaSamiti	Nov 3, 2014	6
Rudra Bahadur Baraili	Chairperson	Shantinagar Upabhokta Samiti		
Laxmi Shrestha	Political Representative	Ward No 6	March 9, 2015	6
Shaligram Pudasaini	Chairperson	Kumarigal Baudhadwar Tol Sudhar Samiti	Nov 25, 2014	6
Devendra Basnet	Secretary	Baudha Fulbari Tathagat Tol Sudhar Samiti	Nov 24, 2014	6
Mohan Gautam	Chief	Rameshwor Phuyal Contact Office	March 7, 2015	6
Bir Bahadur Gurung	Chairperson	Bulbule Danda Upabhokta Samiti	Oct 12, 2014	7
Milan Kharel	Chairperson	Bulbule Tole Sudhar Samiti	Oct 16, 2014	7
Krishna Mani Bhattra	Chairperson	Gangahiti Tole Sudhar Samiti	Sept 19, 2014	7
Rekha Khatiwada	Secretary	Naari Jagaran Abhiyan	Sept 24, 2014	7
Sangita Dulal	Secretary	Paneku Tol Sudhar Samiti	Nov 24, 2014	7
Bimala Koirala	Secretary	K.M.C Ward No.7	Feb 5, 2015	7
Rohit Poudel	Head	Gagan Thapa's Contact Office	Dec 27, 2014	7

List of Sukul Bahas Events

Sukul Bahas on Challenges in Maintaining Clean and Beautiful Roads in Kathmandu

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ctFZMgbaFDA> Speakers: Hari Kunwar and Keshav Prasad Ghimire

Sukul Bahas on Problems in Public Vehicles and Measures to Address this Problem

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vnw7mMSP--Q> Speakers: Saroj Sitaula, Mukti K.C and Basanta Panta

Sukul Bahas on Haphazard Road digging <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8SlhyW8KFLs> Speakers:

Chandralal Nakarmi, Dhan B. Shrestha, Prabhat Kumar Jha and Himesh Anand Vaidhya

Sukul Bahas on The Causes of Gas Scarcity and Measures to Address this Problem

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RIQJjAoH9gI> Speakers: Ratnesh Sashi and Chandra Thapa

Sukul Bahas on Cleaning the Rivers of Kathmandu <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6Y7H3yXdr0E>
Speakers: Lilamandi Paudel, Narayan Prasad Regmi, Tej Raj Bhatta, Purna Bhakta Tandukar and Chandralal Nakarmi

Sukul Bahas on Challenges in Garbage Management <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qeYz3W0WejY>
Speakers: Hari Kunwar and Govinda Kharel