



Implemented in Collaboration with the Local Government and Rural Development Department, Government of Balochistan



ASSESSMENT OF THE FOSTERING AND STRENGTHENING OF CITIZEN-STATE ENGAGEMENT: ACHIEVEMENTS, LESSONS LEARNED AND WAY FORWARD

IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS



TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PARTNER



Islamabad, Pakistan
May 2022

AUTHORS

Dr Tariq Husain, Babur Wasim Arif and Shamam Khan

REVIEWERS

Sajjad Hussain Changezi, Programme Manager, BRACE Programme, RSPN
Dr Hanan Ishaque, Research Coordinator, BRACE Programme, RSPN
Dr Sulaman Ijaz, Research Coordinator, BRACE Programme, RSPN
Muhammad Omer Farooq, Communications Officer, BRACE Programme, RSPN
Rimsha Taj, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, BRACE Programme, RSPN

FIELD RESEARCH TEAM

Mohsin Javed, Program Manager, IPOR Consulting (Pvt.) Ltd.
Hassan Tanveer, Research Associate, IPOR Consulting (Pvt.) Ltd.
Local enumerators-Local Field Team.

DATA ENTRY, PROCESSING AND ANALYSIS TEAM

Tariq Junaid, Executive Director, IPOR Consulting (Pvt.) Ltd.
Babur Wasim Arif, Analysts
Abdul Wahid, Data Manager, IPOR Consulting (Pvt.) Ltd.

PRINT & DESIGN BY

Dot Advertising, Hamza Khalid

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Study on "Assessment of the fostering and strengthening of citizen-state engagement under the BRACE Programme: Achievements, lessons learned and way forward" required extraordinary efforts and IPOR Consulting (Pvt.) Ltd. has been fortunate and proud to have a team that collectively rose to the challenge. This report is the culmination of their hard work, dedication, and determination.

The tremendous amount of data and information received as a result of this unprecedented initiative has been managed and analysed into insightful findings by Dr Tariq Husain with assistance from Babur Wasim Arif, Shamam Khan, and the Data management team of IPOR Consulting (Pvt.) Ltd. who laid the foundation for further analysis and recommendations.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks to Rural Support Programmes Network (RSPN) to commission this study to IPOR Consulting (Pvt.) Ltd. I must also thank Dr Tariq Husain, Babur Wasim Arif, and Shamam Khan for their support throughout the span of this study. I am also grateful to Mohsin Javed, Program Manager, Abdul Wahid, Data Manager, and Hassan Tanveer, Research Associate, IPOR Consulting (Pvt.) Ltd and Local Enumerators-Local Field Team for timely completion of data collection.

I would also like to extend my special thanks to European Union Delegation in Pakistan for the generous financial support for the publication of this study.

All pictures used in this publication are the property of BRACE Programme and its partners. [c] 2022 Rural Support Programmes Network (RSPN), a company set up under section 42 of the Companies Act 2017. All Rights Reserved. Licensed to the European Union under conditions.

This publication, commissioned by Rural Support Programmes Network (RSPN) with the assistance of the European Union, has been produced by IPOR Consulting (Pvt.) Ltd. The contents of this publication are sole responsibility of the authors and can in no way reflect views of the European Union.



EUROPEAN UNION

More information about European Union is available on:

 https://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/pakistan_en

 EUinPakistan

 EUpakistan

THEMATIC STUDY ON
**ASSESSMENT OF THE FOSTERING AND STRENGTHENING
OF CITIZEN-STATE ENGAGEMENT: ACHIEVEMENTS,
LESSONS LEARNED AND WAY FORWARD**
under the EU-Funded BRACE Programme

Final Report MAY 2022

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
1. INTRODUCTION TO BRACE	6
1.1. Programme Partners, Target Area and Expected Results	6
1.2. The Rural Support Programmes' Overall Approach	7
1.3. Citizen-state Engagement in BRACE	9
2. SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF ASSESSMENT	12
2.1. Summary of Requirements	12
2.2. Selection of Districts	12
2.3. Key Questions for Research and Methods of Data Collection	13
2.4. Qualitative Data Collection	14
2.5. Survey-based Quantitative Research	15
3. DEMAND ARTICULATION THROUGH COMMUNITY INSTITUTIONS	17
3.1. Identifying Local Development Needs	17
3.2. Identifying Priorities for Local-level Plans	18
3.3. Documentation and Accountability	20
3.4. Women's Inclusion in Planning	21
3.5. Summary of Findings on Demand Articulation	21
4. COMMUNITY INSTITUTIONS' ENGAGEMENT WITH STATE ACTORS	22
4.1. Engaging with Joint Development Committees	22
4.1.1. Joint Development Committee Meetings and Participation	22
4.1.2. Joint Development Committee Actions	23
4.2. Community Engagement with State Actors Outside Joint Development Committees	26
4.2.1. Engagement Facilitated by Legislators	26
4.2.2. Engagement Sought or Initiated by Line Departments	28
4.3. Explaining the Responsiveness of Joint Development Committees and Other Platforms	30
4.4. Steps Taken by BRACE to Influence Responsiveness of State Actors	33
4.5. Summary of Findings on Community Engagement with State Actors	33
5. IMPORTANCE AND REALISATION OF CITIZEN-STATE ENGAGEMENT	35
5.1. Household Perceptions of the Importance of External Institutions	35

5.2. Institutional Linkages and Gaps Reported by Households	37
5.2.1. Household Perceptions of Usefulness of Institutions	37
5.2.2. Expectations Gap: An Empirical Assessment of Trustworthiness of Institutions	41
5.3. Household Assessment of Role of Community Institutions in Linkages	44
5.4. Evidence on Quantum of Resources Obtained through Linkages	45
5.5. Summary of Findings on the Importance and Realisation of Citizen-state Engagement	47
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	49
6.1. Effectiveness of Demand Articulation by Community Institutions	49
6.2. Effectiveness of Joint Development Committees and Other Supply-side Platforms	50
6.2.1. Effectiveness in the Context of BRACE	50
6.2.2. Overall Community Expectations and Trustworthiness of Institutions	51
6.3. Measures Taken for Improving Citizen-state Engagement	51
6.4. Feasible and Non-feasible Options for Enhancing Citizen-state Engagement	52
ANNEXES	
Annex 1: Population of Balochistan, by District, 2017 Population Census and 2022 Projections	54
Annex 2: Expected Results and Activities for Citizen-State Engagement in BRACE Design	56
Annex 3: Overview of Linkages Forged by Local Support Organisations, as Reported in RSPN Study, 2021	68
Annex 4: Questions, Sub-questions and Sources of Information for the Study	71
Annex 5: Instrument for Qualitative Data Collection	79
Annex 6: Survey Questionnaire	87
Annex 7: Sample Allocation and List of LSOs included in the Assessment	106
Annex 8: Profile of Survey Respondents, by District	109
Annex 9: List of Joint Development Committee Meetings, 2019 to 2021	125
Annex 10: Examples of Union Council Development Plans	133
Annex 11: Technical Assistance Team's Response to Key Question 2	136
Annex 12: Survey Respondents' Assessment of Linkages with Various Institutions	143
Annex 13: Trust and Trustworthiness – Literature Review	161

Boxes

Box 1: Points from Section 4.3 of the BRACE Action Document	9
Box 2: Trust and trustworthiness	42

Tables

Table 1: Classification of households based on the poverty score card	8
Table 2: Key indicators of linkages in selected districts	13
Table 3: Overview of sample for household survey	16
Table 4: Number of meetings and participants of Joint District Development Committees, January 2019-December 2021	23
Table 5: Respondents' assessment of the importance and usefulness of institutions and elected representatives: comparison of responses by women and men	38
Table 6: Respondents' assessment of the importance and usefulness of institutions and elected representatives: comparison of CO members and non-members	39
Table 7: Respondents' assessment of the importance and usefulness of institutions and elected representatives: comparison by income level (up to and above the median)	40
Table 8: CO members' assessment of whether community institutions played a role in linkages	45
Table 9: Balochistan population data, by district, 2017 population census and 2022 projections	54
Table 10: Estimated value of funds accessed by local support organisations in the shape of physical infrastructure, by contributing institution (based on RSPN report)	68
Table 11: Estimated value of funds accessed by local support organisations in the shape of physical infrastructure, by sector (based on RSPN report)	69
Table 12: Estimated value of funds accessed by local support organisations in the shape of physical infrastructure, by district (based on RSPN report)	69
Table 13: Estimated value of funds accessed by local support organisations in the form of cash and services, by sector (based on RSPN report)	70
Table 14: Estimated value of funds accessed by local support organisations in the form of cash and services, by district (based on RSPN report)	70
Table 15: Sample allocation plan – details	106
Table 16: List of sample LSOs and relevant characteristics for sample selection	107
Table 17: Profile of survey respondents (summary)	109
Table 18: Mean age of survey respondents by CO membership and gender (in years), by district	111
Table 19: Marital status of survey respondents by CO membership and gender, by district	112

Table 20: Educational attainments of survey respondents by CO membership and gender, by district	114
Table 21: Survey respondents' head of household status by CO membership and gender, by district	118
Table 22: Survey respondents' employment status by CO membership and gender, by district	119
Table 23: Mean household income of survey respondents by CO membership and gender (in PKR per month), by district	121
Table 24: Median household income of survey respondents by CO membership and gender (in PKR per month), by district	122
Table 25: Survey respondents' household poverty score card status, by CO membership and gender, by district	123
Table 26: List of Joint District Development Committee meetings, January 2019 to December 2021, 9 districts	125
Table 27: List of Tehsil Joint Development Committee meetings, Kech District, June 2019 to September 2021	131
Table 28: Respondents' assessment of the importance and usefulness of institutions and elected representatives, comparison of responses by women and men, by institution	143
Table 29: Respondents' assessment of the importance and usefulness of institutions and elected representatives, comparison of CO members and non-members, by institution	148
Table 30: Respondents' assessment of the importance and usefulness of institutions and elected representatives, comparison by income level (up to and above the median level of income), by institution	153
Table 31: CO members' assessment of whether community institutions played a role in linkages with state actors, by institution	158

Abbreviations

BISP	Benazir Income Support Programme
BLGA	Balochistan Local Government Act
BRACE	Balochistan Rural Development and Community Empowerment Programme
BRDA	Balochistan Rural Development Academy
BRSP	Balochistan Rural Support Programme
CI	Community institution
CLLD	Community-led Local Development
CO	Community organisation
CRP	Community resource person
COVID-19	Coronavirus disease 2019
ER	Expected result
EU	European Union
EUD	European Union Delegation
EUR	Euros
FGD	Focus group discussion
GI	Group interview
IP	Implementing partner
JDC	Joint Development Committee
JDDC	Joint District Development Committee
KII	Key informant interview
LG&RDD	Local Government and Rural Development Department
LSO	local support organisation
MNA	Member of National Assembly
MPA	Member of provincial assembly
NADRA	National Database and Registration Authority
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NRSP	National Rural Support Programme
P&DD	Planning and Development Department
PKR	Pakistani rupees
PPHI	People's Primary Healthcare Initiative
PPS	Probability proportional to size
PSC	Poverty score card
PSDP	Public sector development programme
RSP	Rural Support Programme
RSPN	Rural Support Programmes Network
SO	Strategic objective
SWD	Social Welfare Department
TA	Technical assistance
TOR	Terms of reference
UC	Union council
VO	Village organisation
WDD	Women Development Department

Executive Summary

Introduction to the Study

This study is a wide-ranging and in-depth assessment of citizen-state engagement in the BRACE Programme. It assesses the way the community institutions (CIs) formed under BRACE, particularly the local support organisations (LSOs), have forged linkages with a variety of state institutions outside the project, the platforms and processes used in this engagement, and the outcomes achieved to the benefit of the stakeholders. It aims to identify the potential for expansion and sustainability of citizen-state engagement; provide insights and recommendations for further strengthening rural development and community empowerment; and generate recommendations for the formulation of the Community-led Local Development (CLLD) Policy framework¹ that is being developed through consultation between BRACE and the Government of Balochistan.

Citizen-state Engagement in BRACE Design

BRACE was designed with expectations of transformational change, including:

- an expectation in the National Rural Support Programme (NRSP) project

proposal that “communities working in close collaboration with government departments for planning, execution, and monitoring of developmental interventions, especially including access to public services, will lead to [increased] confidence and trust [among] local communities [for] government departments”;² and,

- an expectation in the Balochistan Rural Support Programme (BRSP) proposal that community institutions will improve access to basic social service, strengthen local governance at the grassroots, and bring “state and citizens closer to enhance the radius of trust.”³

Research Questions

IPOR and RSPN formulated 4 key questions and 16 associated sub-questions to give direction to the assessment. The key questions revolve around demand articulation, supply side mechanisms, the results of linkages, and conclusions and recommendations:

- Key question 1 (focusing on demand articulation) aims to document how village organisations (VOs) and LSOs identify local development needs, what processes

1. The policy is also being referred to as the Community-led Local Governance Policy.

2. NRSP, “Description of the Action,” 2017, p. 22. This is NRSP’s proposal for BRACE to the European Union.

3. BRSP, “Description of the Action,” 2017, p. 51 This is BRSP’s proposal for BRACE to the European Union.

they adopt for deciding priorities, how transparently this is done, and how women's priorities are reflected in their plans.

- Key question 2 (on the supply side) explores how the CIs engage with potential contributors to local development, how they interact with and benefit from joint development committees (JDCs) at the district and tehsil levels, as well as other platforms, and what explains the degree of responsiveness of the JDCs and other platforms.
- Key question 3 (focusing on results) is about the kind of assistance citizen-state engagement brought into the communities, the extent to which this matched community perceptions of their needs, the difference made by BRACE, and the role of CIs in these initiatives.
- Key question 4 seeks to consolidate the conclusions and recommendations emerging from the study, emphasizing what could be done to enhance citizen-state engagement for the well-being of the people, particularly women and the poor.

Geographical Coverage for Primary Data Collection

Qualitative data collection focused on Quetta City, Pishin, Kech, and Khuzdar Districts. It engaged 140 individuals, including 39 women, from the implementing partners, government departments, and female and male village groups, particularly the LSOs. In addition, a household survey was conducted in Kech, Khuzdar, Loralai, and Zhob Districts. The sample consisted of 1,690 respondents (851 men and 839 women), including 1,227 community organisation members and 463 non-members as

a comparison group. A comprehensive review of relevant documents is part of the methodology.

Main Conclusions

Effectiveness of Demand Articulation by Community Institutions

BRACE includes a well-defined participatory process for organised villagers to discuss their development needs and establish priorities for village development plans (VDPs) and union council development plans (UCDPs). The needs are essentially felt needs, identified based on day-to-day experiences. The priorities are established through broad-based consultation, with women included directly in Kech District and indirectly but effectively in the BRSP districts.

The LSOs have not been allowed to present their UCDPs at JDC meetings. They have, however, routinely deposited their UCDPs with the offices of the JDC chairs. In addition, the LSOs have shared their UCDPs widely with district-level line department offices, provincial legislators, and, in some cases, national legislators.

Effectiveness of Joint Development Committees

The JDCs (one pathway for citizen-state engagement) have facilitated the scrutiny of community infrastructure schemes funded through the RSPs and implemented by community institutions. However, they have had nothing to do with implementing UCDPs or their mainstreaming into the district or provincial plans and allocations of the line departments. Moreover, available evidence does not suggest that the JDCs were responsible for any improved service delivery requested by the LSOs.

The TA Team has been working with the Government of Balochistan on proposals for

improving citizen-state engagement in the directions envisaged in the BRACE Action Document. These proposals aim for changes:

- At the provincial level, through amendments to the Balochistan Local Government Act and the preparation of a Community-led Local Governance Policy; and,
- At the district level, streamlining the JDC terms of reference, seeking its notification, and testing the streamlined terms of reference in 2021 in 3 pilot districts (Pishin, Loralai, and Kech).

The provincial-level proposals have not yet been approved. However, the district-level improvements, focusing on the JDCs, have reportedly led to better coordination and information-sharing among government departments in the 3 pilot districts.

Effectiveness of Other Supply-side Platforms

LSO leaders found that, with rare exceptions, line department district offices could not respond positively to their approaches for their infrastructure priorities. The responsiveness of state actors has been influenced through two pathways other than the JDCs and direct approaches to the departments, which have not been systematically documented in BRACE:

- Some government departments are working with community institutions on non-infrastructure activities, improving access to services. This is called the second pathway in the report, and it is a process facilitated by the LSOs and the RSPs outside the JDCs. Ad hoc line department cooperation with community institutions is observed in Balochistan and other parts of Pakistan where the RSPs work. This focuses on activities built into departmental work plans

and budgets that require the cooperation of organised villagers for efficient service delivery. This is not institutionalised but may be expected to continue on a limited scale because it is mutually beneficial for the state and the citizens.

- For infrastructure development, LSOs lobbied with legislators, who lobbied with the provincial political leadership, which arranged departmental allocations. This is the third pathway, which is also taking place outside the JDCs. The LSOs consulted during the assessment have successfully obtained support from (mainly provincial) legislators for their UCDP infrastructure priorities. The legislators take cognisance of the vote bank represented by organised communities. They take LSO priorities to the highest levels of the provincial political leadership and relevant federal authorities, which include them in relevant departmental public sector development plans (PSDPs). This is the third pathway.

The factors that explain the degree of responsiveness of the JDCs and other platforms to community institutions suggest that:

- The third pathway is mutually beneficial for legislators and the communities they represent.
- The second pathway is mutually beneficial for government departments and the community institutions with which they work.
- The JDCs (the first pathway) provide opportunities for information-sharing and coordination but are not in a position to deliver improved access to services.

Overall Community Expectations and Trustworthiness of Institutions

The overall picture of the need for linkages is much bigger than what is observed in BRACE, and responsiveness by state actors to this need is highly variable. The research team calculated an “expectations gap” from survey data to assess overall responsiveness to community expectations. The gap is the percentage difference between the percentage of respondents who consider the institutions to be important and the percentage who reported that these institutions had done something useful for their households since 2018. A literature review suggests that this is an indicator of the trustworthiness of institutions and that trustworthiness is more appropriate than trust for assessing perceptions about institutions.

Based on the expectations gap, the research team’s estimates suggest that:

- Ninety-one percent of the respondents felt that federal organisations (NADRA, Ehsaas/ BISP, and the Election Commission of Pakistan) had met their expectations, which suggests that these institutions demonstrated a high level of trustworthiness.
- Seventy-two percent of the respondents felt that the RSPs had met their expectations since 2018.
- A large majority of the respondents reported that the social sector departments met their expectations to some extent, and other provincial institutions did not meet expectations.

The respondents gave high credit to community institutions for forging linkages with social sector departments and federal organisations. Many more men than women gave credit to community institutions for these linkages. The

LSOs and RSPs regularly record information on linkages (including project cost in many cases) in a form that is useful for community members and visitors who are interested in LSO performance in general. However, complete and accurate information on the priority schemes identified by the communities is available in the UCDPs, and accurate information on the priority schemes approved by the government is available in government records (typically, the PSDPs). Unfortunately, this information is not being compiled, so it is impossible to accurately assess the quantum of government resources brought to the communities through linkages.

Assessment of Options for Strengthening Citizen-State Engagement

This assessment suggests that:

- Depending on citizen-state engagement with local authorities such as the civil administration and district-level heads of departments is of limited value to the citizens as far as UCDP infrastructure priorities are concerned.
- The allocation of PSDP resources for infrastructure is done at the provincial level, and bottom-up planning and resource allocation through district plans is not permitted under the established system.

Looking ahead, one feasible option for enhancing citizen-state engagement is for the RSPs to invest in increasing the number and enhancing the capacities of LSO activists, such as those identified in this assessment, who can successfully establish linkages with elected representatives leading to infrastructure development through the PSDP. At present, there are various estimates from the RSPs and LSO

leaders about the number of leaders who have been effective in forging linkages in the way described in this assessment. The RSPs can approach the matter systematically, identify the best LSO leaders, and engage them in developing the capacity of other LSO leaders.

Another option is for the government to institutionalise line departments' cooperation with organised communities for all such activities in which community involvement could generate mutually-beneficial results for the state and the citizens. The most feasible way of moving ahead with this is through executive orders. Decisions needed for this are matters of operational policy.

This is the conclusion of the research team based on a wide range of experiences across Pakistan.

In support of these directions, and also for documenting achievements and lessons, it would be useful for BRACE (through the RSPs) to document:

- How government departments, on an ad hoc basis, are working with community institutions on non-infrastructure activities resulting in improved access to services (the second pathway);
- How LSO leaders lobbied for their UCDP priorities with legislators, whose response led to government departments implementing infrastructure schemes resulting in improved access to services (the third pathway); and,
- Accurate information on the priority schemes identified by the communities, which is available in the UCDPs, and accurate information on the priority schemes approved by the government, which is available in government records (typically, the PSDPs).

1. Introduction to BRACE

1.1. Programme Partners, Target Areas and Expected Results

The Balochistan Rural Development and Community Empowerment Programme (BRACE) is funded mainly with a grant of EUR 45 million from the European Union (EU) and managed under the overall guidance of the Government of Balochistan (GoB) and the EU Delegation (EUD) in Pakistan. It covers parts of 10 districts of the province, namely Kech in Makran Division, Khuzdar and Washuk in Kalat Division, Jhal Magsi in Nasirabad Division, Pishin, Chaman, and Killa Abdullah in Quetta Division, and Loralai, Duki, and Zhob in Zhob Division.⁴

These districts account for 35 percent of the 2017 rural population of Balochistan (refer to Annex 1 for district-level population data). BRACE reaches approximately 300,000 rural households (2 million people) in 249 union councils. As reported in the project design documents, the estimated target population is 2.07 million (294,713 households). It is 2.26 million (343,505 households) based on the 2017 population census, assuming, as, in project design, that BRACE will organise 70 percent of the rural population in the 10 districts.

The project is being implemented during 2017-2022 by four implementing partners (IPs). The

National Rural Support Programme (NRSP)⁵ works in Kech and the Balochistan Rural Support Programme (BRSP)⁶ in the other 9 districts. The Rural Support Programmes Network (RSPN),⁷ which consists of all 10 RSPs in the country, is responsible for coordination and quality assurance. These RSPs are called implementing partners (IPs). Another IP is a European firm, DAI, which provides technical assistance (TA) to the project. It is responsible for developing government capacities and policies for bringing the state and the citizens closer to each other.

The Local Government and Rural Development Department (LG&RDD) is the EU's main counterpart from the government side. It works with the TA Team to develop policy options for the government and the capacity of local authorities. The Social Welfare and Women Development Department support the RSPs and the TA Team when required. The Finance Department has a key role in relevant policy matters. The Planning and Development Department (P&DD) chairs a high-level policy dialogue committee in which all IPs and relevant departments are represented.

The EU's support to the Government of Balochistan aims to reduce the negative impacts of socio-economic and environmental problems and develop opportunities to build and empower resilient communities through BRACE.

4. District names are spelled here in the same way as in the 2017 population census (refer to Annex 1).

5. <https://nrsp.org.pk/>.

6. <https://www.brsp.org.pk/>.

7. <http://www.rspn.org/index.php/about-us/who-we-are/>.

This is reflected in the overall objective of the programme, which is served by two strategic objectives (SOs) assigned to specific IPs:

- SO1: To empower citizens and communities and provide them with the means to implement community-driven socio-economic development interventions, an increased voice, and the capability to influence public policy decision-making through active engagement with local authorities for quality, inclusive, and equitable service delivery and civic oversight. The IPs are the BRSP, NRSP, and RSPN.
- SO2: To foster an enabling environment for strengthening the capacities of local authorities to manage and involve communities in the statutory processes of the local public sector planning, financing, and implementation process. The TA Team is the IP for this SO, and it is working on it in collaboration with the RSPs and government departments, particularly the Local Government and Rural Development Department (LG&RDD), the Social Welfare Department (SWD), and the Planning and Development Department (P&DD).

The programme's essential features, including its expected results (ERs) and activities, are spelled out in the EU's Action Document for the programme. There are 5 ERs for SO1 in the Action Document. ER1 calls for a three-tier

system of community institutions that reflects the RSPs' approach to social mobilisation and community-driven articulation of demand for local development. ER4 focuses on household-based income-generating interventions that are central to poverty graduation. Together, ER1 and ER4 represent a package of social mobilisation and poverty graduation activities that is more or less standard across the RSPs.

Building on ER1, ER2 revolves around community institutions engaged in planning with local authorities and then, as anticipated in ER3, gaining access to public services and community infrastructure.⁸ BRSP and NRSP focus on the first 4 ERs. ER5, which is the responsibility of the RSPN, calls for the implementation experiences of the RSPs under SO1 to be assessed and disseminated to inspire the design of a local development policy framework; this is a contribution to SO2, for which the TA Team has the lead role.

1.2. The Rural Support Programmes' Overall Approach

The first step for the RSPs in a given area is identifying poor households.⁹ The RSPs conduct a census of all the households for this purpose using the poverty scorecard (PSC).¹⁰ The PSC is used for classifying poor and non-poor households in the following categories:

BRSP and NRSP conducted a PSC census in 2017-18 and found that 53 percent of the households in the programme districts were poor (in the

8. Building linkages between communities and government, private and non-profit organisations is a standard feature of the RSPs' approach. In some programmes, including BRACE, planning and coordination for this purpose is formalised in agreement with relevant entities.

9. Building linkages between communities and government, private and non-profit organisations is a standard feature of the RSPs' approach. In some programmes, including BRACE, planning and coordination for this purpose is formalised in agreement with relevant entities.

PSC 0-23 category) and 16 percent extremely poor (PSC 0-11). The incidence of poverty was 42 percent in Kech and 55 percent in the BRSP districts, going up to 67 percent in Washuk. In addition to the poor, households in the transitory vulnerable category constituted 32 percent of all households, leaving only 15 percent in the non-poor and transitory non-poor categories.¹¹

The next step is to organise communities along the lines of a conceptual package, ensuring that all the poor households and a substantial portion of the non-poor are organised and capacitated for empowerment.¹² Social mobilisation, community leadership, and values represent a conceptual package common

Table 1: Classification of households based on the poverty scorecard

PSC Score	Category
PSC 0-11	Extremely poor or ultra-poor
PSC 12-18	Chronically poor
PSC 19-23	Transitory poor
PSC 24-34	Transitory vulnerable
PSC 35-40	Transitory non-poor
PSC 41-100	Non-poor

to all RSPs; this is the operational approach underlying ER1. However, each RSP initiative has its programmatic package, consisting of interventions tailored to specific projects and their context. The programmatic package

includes two kinds of interventions: those implemented directly by the RSPs (as in ER4) and goods and services obtained through linkages with the government and other service providers (ERs 2 and 3).

The conceptual package is advanced through a three-tier approach to social mobilisation. The primary tier consists of community organisations (COs), which are self-help groups of 15-25 members, each covering a small settlement, hamlet, or sub-village (called killi in Balochistan).¹³ The CO focuses on poverty reduction interventions for individual households and small community-level schemes that can be implemented and managed at that level. Approximately 65 percent of the COs in Kech and 40 percent in the 10 BRSP districts are women's COs.

Then there is the village organisation (VO), a federation of COs intended for planning and coordination at the village level. The VO membership (general body) consists of two members (preferably the president or manager or at least one) from each CO. A VO is expected to include the representatives of three to six COs, on average. Geographical proximity across sub-villages (killis) is taken into account for the formation of a VO. The VO's key function is to ensure household mobilization into COs, supportive supervision of COs, and implementation of village-level activities, including community physical infrastructure.

10. Section 1.2 is reproduced from Arif, Babur Wasim; Husain, Tariq Husain; and Khan, Shamam. 2021, Community Livelihood Enhancement through CIF, IGGs and TVET for Poor Households in the Balochistan; Islamabad: RSPN, 2021.

11. This is a tested and cost-effective tool. It is used by the Benazir Income Support Programme, Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund (PPAF), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the RSPs.

12. Data provided by RSPN in a consolidated spreadsheet containing both NRSP and BRSP data.

13. Wherever resources are available, as in BRACE, the RSPs aim to organise 70 percent of the households (including all the poor households) in every community located in a project area.

The third tier is called the local support organisation (LSO) at the union council level.¹⁴ It is a federation of all the VOs in the union council, and its membership (general body) is expected to include at least two members from each VO or at least one member from each CO. The key function of the LSO is coordination and implementation of development activities at the union council level, establishing linkages with government, donors, and other development organisations, and providing guidance and support to the VOs and COs.

Community leaders selected by the villagers play a key role at all these levels. To start with, every CO identifies two honest and sincere individuals to serve the community voluntarily as the president and the manager. Those among them who stand out for their skills and service to the community are selected by their peers for leadership positions in the VOs and LSOs. Then, the RSPs train all these leaders in social mobilisation, planning and implementing development activities, engaging government and non-government service providers, and promoting accountability through the 3 sets of community institutions (CIs) described above.

1.3. Citizen-state Engagement in BRACE

BRACE was designed with expectations of transformational change, as is apparent in its Action Document, which is the basic project design document approved by the EU (refer to Box 1). Moreover, the proposals submitted by BRSP and NRSP to the EU (called Description of the Action)¹⁵ in pursuit of the Action Document provide additional insights into what the design expected:

Box 1: Points from Section 4.3 of the BRACE Action Document

The BRACE [The Action] intervenes both on the “demand” and “supply” sides of the service delivery equation. On the demand side, the Action combines a mix of transactional and transformational social mobilisation, capacity building, mechanisms for accountability and civic oversight, creating agency and voice for the people, particularly women and excluded, to become part of the development process, economic empowerment, participative bottom-up area-based development planning, and collective action for addressing critical community productive physical infrastructure constraints, to realise welfare and governance outcomes. On the supply side, the Action fosters local governance mechanisms enabling citizens' participation in their development and governance processes through establishing a policy framework and its institutional arrangement, capacity-building of local authorities, and public finance management reform for improved and participative local governance for socio-economic development.

- There is an expectation in the NRSP proposal that “communities working in close collaboration with government departments for planning, execution, and monitoring of developmental interventions,

15. The Description of the Action documents of the RSPs are integral to design, as are the terms of reference of the TA Team.

14. The union council is the lowest level of development administration in Pakistan.

especially including access to public services, will lead to [increased] confidence and trust [among] local communities [for] government departments.”¹⁶

- The BRSP proposal expects community institutions to improve access to basic social services, strengthen local governance at the grassroots level, and bring “state and citizens closer to enhance the radius of trust.”¹⁷ In addition, BRSP expects that capacity-building interventions “will empower community institutions to have the ability to identify and prioritise their development needs through a democratic decision-making process and to articulate and negotiate with the relevant authorities and other development actors.”

The expected results and programme activities aiming at transformational change in citizen-state engagement have been articulated under both SO1 and SO2 in the design documents. For SO1, the following activities are described under four expected results (see Annex 2 for details, which are taken from the BRSP proposal, except as indicated otherwise):

Expected Result 1

- Support for the establishment of Joint Development Committees (JDCs) at the district and tehsil level;
- Meetings of JDCs;
- Training of local government, district line department officials, and LSO representatives on participatory development planning;

Expected Result 2

- Preparation of household, village, and union council development plans;
- Coordination and consolidation of the development plans and strategy at the district level;
- Adoption and notification of district development plans by JDCs;

Expected Result 3

- Community needs to be identified for basic infrastructure in the village and union council development plans;
- Sharing of information about infrastructure projects with the JDCs and local authorities and consensus building on priority needs;
- Approval of infrastructure projects by JDCs;

Expected Result 4

- Stakeholder meetings/workshops on union council and district development plans and implementation strategies for ensuring accountability;
- Training on Balochistan Local Government Act (BLGA) 2010 to elected representatives of local governments;
- Training on planning and development to union council Secretaries, Development Officers, Assistant Directors, and Chief Officers of LG&RDD;
- Training of elected Chairman and Vice Chairman on local government finance and budgets, and finance and accounts;

16. NRSP, “Description of the Action,” 2017, p. 22. This is NRSP’s proposal for BRACE to the European Union.

17. BRSP, “Description of the Action,” 2017, p. 51 This is BRSP’s proposal for BRACE to the European Union.

- Training of Chairman and Vice Chairman on planning and development under BLGA 2010; and,
- Training the Chairman and Vice Chairman on local government general powers and enforcement, rules, bye-laws, and procedures.
- ER2 (SO2): Local governments/authorities have improved capacities to become “developmental,” mobilise their resources to reach out to communities, and systematically involve them in planning, co-resourcing, and managing local development activities.
- ER3 (SO2): Balochistan Rural Development Academy (BRDA) has acquired the necessary capacity to deliver a comprehensive capacity-building programme on community-led development and local governance and build the capacities of local authorities to reach out to communities, and systematically involve them in planning, co-resourcing and managing local development activities

In addition, there are three expected results under SO2 on which the TA Team is working in pursuit of transformational change:

- ER1 (SO2): A dedicated policy framework, public financial management (PFM) reform strategy, and action policy to deliver economic, environmental, and social outcomes in a process involving the local authorities and communities and its institutional arrangements for community-led development and participation in local governance processes for effective service delivery in partnership with local authorities are developed.

18. The remaining 5 activities listed below are not in NRSP's Description of Action. Moreover, NRSP has "capacity building of local government and line departments on participative community development approaches" in place of the second bullet here.

2. Scope And Methodology

2.1. Summary of Requirements

This is a wide-ranging and in-depth assessment of citizen-state engagement in the BRACE Programme. Its TOR called for assessing how the CIs formed under BRACE, particularly the union council-level LSOs, has forged linkages with various institutions outside the project, the platforms and processes used in this engagement, and the outcomes achieved to the benefit of the stakeholders. The focus is on linkages with state actors, including elected and administrative institutions of the provincial and federal governments. It may be noted that Balochistan has not elected local bodies since 2018 (that is, during the entire implementation period of BRACE).

The assessment includes references to a previous RSPN report on the BRSP districts that indicated that LSOs had formed a large number of linkages with various sources of external support. However, unlike the RSPN report, the assessment is not aimed at generating comprehensive project-wide data on the prevalence and quantum of linkages. Instead, it is intended to document and analyse these linkages in selected districts and LSOs, triangulate information across diverse stakeholder groups, and, based on robust findings, suggest a strategic and pragmatic way forward.

The forward-looking part of the assessment is expected to identify the potential for expansion and sustainability of citizen-state engagement; provide insights and recommendations for further strengthening rural development and community

empowerment; and generate recommendations for the formulation of the Community-led Local Development (CLLD) policy framework that is being developed through consultation between the GoB and the BRACE TA team. The research team, however, was not provided drafts of the CLLD or any of the proposals for changes in laws and administrative arrangements.

2.2. Selection of Districts

Qualitative data collection focused on Quetta City, Pishin, Kech, and Khuzdar Districts. Quetta is the seat of the provincial government and the headquarters of BRSP. Kech is the only BRACE district where NRSP is working. Pishin and Khuzdar were part of the EU-funded predecessor project, the Balochistan Community Development Programme, which was initiated in December 2013. The LSOs in these districts and Kech are better-established and more active in forging linkages than in most of the other districts included in BRACE. These LSOs are not “average” or “typical” LSOs but more mature and more active LSOs led by experienced and innovative activists.

The survey for the assessment was conducted in Kech, Khuzdar, Loralai, and Zhob Districts, which were selected in view of the following considerations (summarised in Table 2, with supporting data in Annex 3 from a study on linkages conducted by RSPN):¹⁹

19. According to an informal communication from RSPN, this study covered approximately half the LSOs in BRSP districts. Its other limitations are discussed in the assessment report under key question 3.

- Information on linkages is not available for Kech, but it represents a distinct part of Balochistan and is the only BRACE district in which NRSP is the IP.
- The remaining 3 districts account for more than 70 percent of the beneficiaries and more than 60 percent of the estimated value of linkages reported for the 9 BRSP districts.
- They also cover a wide range of outcomes associated with linkages; for example:
 - Khuzdar accounts for a large proportion of the infrastructure (hard component) beneficiaries and Zhob a small proportion;
 - The value of infrastructure acquired through linkages is PKR 5,118 per beneficiary in Zhob and only PKR 469 in Loralai; and,
- Loralai alone accounts for 31 percent of the estimated value of services and cash grants (the soft component) obtained through linkages.
- Taken as a group, the 4 districts reflect the ethnolinguistic diversity and key aspects of poverty in Balochistan.²⁰

2.3. Key Questions for Research and Methods of Data Collection

The assessment addresses 4 key questions, and 16 associated sub-questions developed to respond adequately to the TOR (the details are

Table 2: Key indicators of linkages in selected districts

Division and District	Linkages for Physical Infrastructure			Linkages for Cash Grants and Services		
	Share in Total:		Value of Linkages in PKR per Beneficiary	Share in Total:		Value of Linkages in PKR per Beneficiary
	Number of Beneficiaries	Estimated Value of Linkages		Number of Beneficiaries	Estimated Value of Linkages	
Makran						
Kech	Information not available					
Kalat						
Khuzdar	37%	28%	1,525	26%	22%	115
Zhob						
Loralai	27%	6%	469	18%	31%	236
Zhob	11%	29%	5,118	26%	0%	0
Total, 3 districts^a	75%	63%		70%	53%	

Source: Azizi, Mohammad Ali; Shahzad, Khurram; and Achakzai, Akbar Khan. 2021. *The Power of Social Capital: A Report on Local Support Organisations (LSOs) Fostering Development Linkages with Government and Non-Government Agencies in the BRACE Programme Districts of BRSP*. Islamabad: RSPN, April 2021.

Note: This is the share of the 3 districts out of the 9 BRSP districts for which information is available in the source cited here.

²⁰ Khuzdar scores 0.285 on the Multidimensional Poverty Index, Loralai 0.320 and Zhob 0.514 [Planning Commission of Pakistan, United Nations Development Programme Pakistan and Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative, Multidimensional Poverty in Pakistan, 2015, Islamabad (Annex 3, Table 3.0), available at <http://www.pk.undp.org/content/dam/pakistan/docs/MPI/Multidimensional%20Poverty%20in%20Pakistan.pdf>].

in Annex 4). The key questions revolve around demand articulation, supply side mechanisms, the results of linkages, and conclusions and recommendations:

- Key question 1 (focusing on demand articulation) aims to document how VOs and LSOs identify local development needs, what processes they adopt for deciding priorities, how transparently this is done, and how women's priorities are reflected in their plans.
- Key question 2 (on the supply side) explores how the CIs engage with potential contributors to local development, how they interact with and benefit from joint development committees (JDCs) at the district and tehsil levels, as well as other platforms, and what explains the degree of responsiveness of the JDCs and other platforms.
- Key question 3 (focusing on results) is about the kind of assistance citizen-state engagement brought into the communities, the extent to which this matched community perceptions of their needs, the difference made by BRACE, and the role of CIs in these initiatives.
- Key question 4 seeks to consolidate the conclusions and recommendations emerging from the study, emphasizing what could be done to enhance citizen-state engagement for the well-being of the people, particularly women and the poor.

The methods and sources of information used to address the research questions are identified in Annex 4. They include:

- Review of secondary information based on BRACE design documents, monitoring reports, and a variety of documents

contributed by the IPs and LSOs during fieldwork;

- Rigorous quantitative analysis (including tests of statistical significance) based on data collected through a household sample survey of male and female members and non-members of COs; and,
- Robust qualitative analysis based on key informant interviews (KIIs), group interviews, and village-level focus group discussions (FGDs).

2.4. Qualitative Data Collection

Qualitative research was based on purposive sampling to ensure triangulation across stakeholder groups (identified below), leading to robust findings and conclusions. It focused on sub-questions identified for this purpose in Annex 4, where it can be seen how qualitative information contributed directly to the first 3 key questions and 10 of the 12 sub-questions for which primary data collection was undertaken. The fourth key question depends on its answers to the first three questions, meaning that qualitative information contributes to it indirectly. The instrument for qualitative data collection covering specific stakeholders is presented in Annex 5.

Based on the instrument and the sources of information identified in Annex 4, qualitative data collection covered 140 individuals, including 39 women, with the following breakdown:

- 46 (including 12 female) RSP staff in the field, district, regional, and head office positions;
- 10 members of the TA Team, including virtual interaction with 5;
- 24 government officials (including 3 women), most of whom are JDC members; and,

- 60 LSO general body members (including 24 women).

Qualitative research captures the diversity, but its findings are not representative of and generalisable for a population. It is based on purposive sampling to ensure triangulation across stakeholder groups leading to robust findings and conclusions. In the present study, information obtained from qualitative primary data collection methods has also been validated regarding RSP records, LSO documents, and the minutes of JDC meetings.

2.5. Survey-based Quantitative Research

The household survey contributes directly to answers for key questions 3 and 3 of its sub-questions, as shown in Annex 4, and indirectly but substantively to the fourth key question. The comprehensive survey questionnaire developed in consultation with RSPN during the inception phase is presented in Annex 6.

Sample Design and Size. District and LSO selection was made purposively, followed by a multi-stage stratified cluster sampling design. District selection criteria have been explained above. Then 20 LSOs were selected (5 per district) in consultation with RSPN, keeping in mind the security situation, distance, and the number and diversity of interventions accessed through linkages in each LSO. The selected LSO and relevant information are described in Annex 7 and are estimated to include 307 soft and 112 hard interventions. The following sources of information were used in the process:

- The list of UCs and LSOs provided by RSPN indicates the security situation in each union council and its distance from district headquarters;

- The list of hard and soft linkage interventions in each LSO provided by RSPN (based on the linkages mentioned above report); and,
- Additional information provided by RSPN for Kech along the preceding points.

The design aimed at a sample size of 300 CO members for each of the sampled districts, with a total of 1,200 CO members and a sample size of 120 non-CO members per district, for a total of 480 non-CO members as a comparison group. The total sample, therefore, was planned to include 1,680 respondents.

Target Population and Sampling Frame. The list of LSOs is used as the sampling frame at the first stage of the sampling for the selection of sampling clusters/primary sampling units. At the second stage of the sampling, the list of COs (within selected LSOs at the first stage of sampling) along with the number of male and female CO members was used as the sampling frame for the selection of COs through random sampling using some inclusion and exclusion criterion based on the number of male and female CO members. Finally, at the third stage of the sampling, the list of households (for COs selected at the second stage of sampling) and information about whether the household is a CO member or not were used as the sampling frame for selecting CO members and non-CO members.

The sample consisted of 1,690 respondents (851 men and 839 women), including 1,227 CO members and 463 non-members as a comparison group (see Table 3). The demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the sample are reported in several tables in Annex 8, the first of which is a summary table. The statistics suggest that:

- The non-CO members in the sample are younger and better educated than the CO

members, and fewer are married and heads of household.

- However, the average income of both groups was reported to be approximately PKR 15,500 per month, and the median income was PKR 13,000 per month,²¹ with women reporting significantly lower income in both groups.
- In Kech, 15 percent of the CO members and 20 percent of the non-members were at or below the median income level. The proportions were 67 and 66 percent in Khuzdar, 71 and 70 percent in Loralai, and 48 and 46 percent in Zhob.
- Among CO members, 52 percent are reportedly in the poor category (PSC 0-23), based on the 2017-18 RSP census, and 48

percent are non-poor (PSC 24-100). Among non-members, however, 99 percent of the respondents did not know their PSC level. Thus, comparisons across income groups for key question 3 are made between groups of respondents up to and above the median income rather than between poor and non-poor respondents.

Table 3: Overview of sample for the household survey

District	CO Members								
	Household Income Below or Equal to Median Income			Household Income More than Median Income			Total		
	Male	Female	Both	Male	Female	Both	Male	Female	Both
Kech	25	21	46	114	140	254	139	161	300
Khuzdar	109	88	197	42	54	96	151	142	293
Loralai	71	152	223	87	6	93	158	158	316
Zhob	56	97	153	102	63	165	158	160	318
Total	261	358	619	345	263	608	606	621	1,227
	Non-CO Members								
Kech	14	9	23	44	49	93	58	58	116
Khuzdar	47	36	83	15	28	43	62	64	126
Loralai	28	47	75	31	1	32	59	48	107
Zhob	18	35	53	48	13	61	66	48	114
Total	107	127	234	138	91	229	245	218	463
	Overall								
Kech	39	30	69	158	189	347	197	219	416
Khuzdar	156	124	280	57	82	139	213	206	419
Loralai	99	199	298	118	7	125	217	206	423
Zhob	74	132	206	150	76	226	224	208	432
Total	368	485	853	483	354	837	851	839	1,690

21. By definition, half the sample lies at or below the median level and half above it.

3. Demand Articulation Through Community Institutions (CIs)

Key Question 1: How do the community institutions (CIs) – village organisations (VOs) and local support organisations (LSOs) – decide on engaging institutions other than the BRACE IPs to help them? To what extent is this inclusive and transparent?

3.1. Identifying Local Development Needs

Sub-question 1.1: How do VOs and LSOs identify local development needs? To what extent are their ideas coming from felt needs, group discussions, community awareness toolkit (CAT) sessions, various forms of media, and other sources?

NRSP staff in Kech District described how they engaged with COs, starting with a series of meetings in which community members received information about planning for income generation, community infrastructure, and linkages with development actors other than NRSP. Next, communities started assessing their needs, what was available to them and what was lacking. Then NRSP started CAT sessions. During the process, community members interacted with elected representatives and gained exposure through various public service announcements and advertisements.

Female and male general body members of the Mirani LSO (Nodiz Union Council) and the Shorma LSO (Solband Union Council) in the Kech District noted that community members have monthly meetings to discuss several issues, including those relating to agriculture and unemployment. The women also have informal discussions, for example, when they get together for embroidery sessions. They are particularly interested in local schools' drinking water supply and problems. However, the only government people who come to the area are officers from the federal Ehsaas Programme. The last visit is every three months to check on school enrolment in connection with the Ehsaas conditional cash transfer for school enrolment.

The male general body members of the Zalan LSO (Kamalzai Union Council) in the Pishin District informed the research team that they get information from all kinds of media sources and exchange views in their CO meetings. They know what their issues are because they experience them on a day-to-day basis. For example, they knew they needed drinking water supply schemes and had a primary school in the village, not a high school. Children had to walk 6 kilometers to the high school, so they talked to their elders, who went to lobby with the Education Department. The construction of a

high school started in 2017, and so far, it is only a middle school (up to grade 8).

A women's group in Kamalzai noted that they looked at women-specific issues such as the availability of a lady doctor in the government hospital in Kamalzai, and community needs for clean drinking water, so that they do not have to depend on dirty ponds. In addition, they look to male family members and community resource persons (CRPs) to learn about the opportunities for government assistance, such as immunisation.

The male executive committee members of the Sachaan LSO (Garuk Union Council) in Khuzdar District also invoked felt needs: "we know what is going on in our area, we know what the problems are." Members of the provincial assembly (MPAs) do not come here. The area does get visits from officials of the National Database and Registration Authority (NADRA) and the Election Commission of Pakistan. However, nobody else comes and offers anything. LSO leaders must go to each department where they need help; they help in 10 percent of the cases. The women here mentioned that BRSP arranged a visit by the Secretary of the Women Development Department and a representative from the Khuzdar women's center.

The male general body members of the Gawarakh LSO (Abinoghay Union Council) in Khuzdar District said that in earlier times, people would discuss their problems informally, talking to each other while sitting around a fire. Then the radio arrived, and now there are social media. They talk informally after Friday prayers while having tea together. They know their problems, such as drinking water supply, health and

education issues, thefts, and local fights. Elected representatives visit only during elections. LSO leaders requested NADRA and the Election Commission of Pakistan officials to visit the area, and they came.

The women in this location reported that CAT sessions discussed health, hygiene, and other issues and increased their awareness. In addition, they get information from male family members, who reportedly get it through social media messages and contacts in the cities. The CRPs also communicate important information to the women, for example, about the government's plans for vaccination for the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19).

3.2. Identifying Priorities for Local-level Plans

Sub-question 1.2: Through what process do VOs and LSOs decide local priorities and prepare village development plans (VDPs), union council development plans (UCDPs) and other initiatives? How long does the process last and how frequently and where do interactions take place?

BRSP head office staff described the VDP process to the research team, which included the following main points:²²

- Before the VOs met, the COs that constitute the VO passed resolutions identifying their priorities, which they handed over to the CRPs, who took them to the BRSP field unit, which gave them to the VO president, after which the time and venue for the VDP meeting were agreed among all concerned.

22. The NRSP process in Kech District is essentially similar but may differ in some ways. For example, there are mixed male-female LSOs in Kech, where women and men plan together rather than separately.

- The VDP has two parts; a needs assessment and a five-year action plan. The latter includes all CO priorities discussed initially at the CO level. These cover all sectors of interest to the communities.
- The VDP process included consultation among the VO general body and CO members. BRSP facilitated the process.
- BRSP insisted that at least 70 percent of CO members attend the meeting at which the VDP was finalised. As a result, BRSP staff and CRPs were also present at this meeting. In addition, some stakeholders from outside the VO were also present.
- This was typically a half-day meeting held at a convenient location such as a mosque, school, a baithak (private meeting place), or in the open air.
- Villagers established their priorities through voting or show of hands. Up to 4 BRSPs and CRPs typically attended and facilitated this event, partly by organising a pair-wise ranking of priorities.
- The same exercise was done separately for women,²³ who did a needs assessment and identified their priorities in a resolution they sent to the VO (before its VDP meeting) through the BRSP field team.
- Women's priorities were added to the VDP if they were not already included in it by the men.

The UCDP process, according to BRSP, entailed discussion by 4 VO representatives from each of the VOs in the union council (generally, there are 6-7 VOs per LSO or union council). Participants

established priorities after pair-wise ranking facilitated by BRSP staff. External stakeholders, including union council secretaries and government officials, were invited to the discussion. The final event generally consumed less than one day and sometimes more time.

The president of the Zalan LSO (Kamalzai Union Council) in the Pishin District confirmed that community members sat together as described above to discuss their VDPs (3 of them in this LSO). They were joined by BRSP staff and the local union council secretary. The deliberations included village mapping on paper, placed on the ground for all to see and discuss. Women raised specific issues related to health, which the male VO members included in the VDP priorities. The formal discussion took 2 hours. The president observed that elected representatives know very well how much government resources are available for the area in each sector and department. However, before the VDPs were prepared, the representatives would tell the government what they wanted for the area, without talking to the villagers.

A women's group in this location informed the research team that women look to the female CRP to document their priorities and look to the LSO president to include them in the VDP. The female CRP writes up women's priorities as a resolution, which she forwards to the BRSP field team, from where it goes to the LSO president.

The president of the Sachaan LSO (Garuk Union Council) in Khuzdar District remarked that detailed consultation for the VDP took place over 2-3 days, spread over a while, before people from his village assembled for a final session of 2-3 hours, which included BRSP staff and the union

23. Except in Jhal Magsi and Kech Districts, where cultural norms allow men and women to meet in one place.

council secretary. All CO members participated in their VDP process. The main priority they identified was drinking water, which was also the women's main priority. The women's group informed the research team that women hold regular CO meetings, and their priorities are noted in resolutions by the CRP.

The president of the Gawarakh LSO (Abinoghay Union Council) in Khuzdar District informed the research team that the COs passed resolutions in which they identified their priorities and forwarded these resolutions to the respective VOs for discussion during the VDP process. The CO resolutions went to the CRPs, who took them to the BRSP field office, from where the social organisers took them to the VO presidents. Typically, each VO received resolutions from 4-5 COs. Then villagers assembled for a final discussion on the VDP, together with BRSP staff. They did pair-wise ranking to establish priorities, which took them one full day.

A women's group in the same location told the research team that they held CO and village-level meetings in 2018 and developed a chart showing their priorities in 2018 with the help of BRSP. They did pair-wise ranking to establish their priorities for the VDP. Heated discussions reportedly took place among the women on their priorities: married women wanted a hospital in the area, girls wanted good schools, and skilled women wanted vocational centers in the area for women.

In Kech District, the president of the Turbat Tehsil LSO network explained that the COs held their meetings, established their priorities, and sent resolutions to their respective VOs for discussion in the VDP process. The VDP process took up to 2-3 days, and the VOs invited external stakeholders to it, including the elders, local political leaders, and the pesh imam (the main

prayer leader). Women were reportedly part of the entire process.

As president of the Mirani LSO (Nodiz Union Council), the same gentleman further explained in his village that each 3-4 or more COs are associated with each VO. All the COs prepared their resolutions, established their priorities, and gave them to the CRPs, who took them to a VO meeting to discuss the VDP. The VDP discussion process took 4-5 hours, and BRSP staff facilitated it.

After that, he took the VDP to the LSO meeting to discuss the UCDP. In addition to LSO members, this meeting included three pesh imams, local notables from the union council, and local teachers and doctors. The meeting discussed 10 VDPs, each presented by 4 VO representatives (2 female and 2 male), so there were 40 community leaders at this meeting. Each VO read out their VDP priorities, and there was voting and pair-wise ranking to establish UCDP priorities. The meeting started at 9.30 in the morning and ended at 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

In the Sachaan LSO (Garuk Union Council) in Khuzdar District, a discussion on UCDP priorities took place over 2-3 days, after which the LSO took 2-3 hours to finalise the UCDP, according to the LSO president. The Gawarakh LSO (Abinoghay Union Council) in Khuzdar District includes 9 VOs, and its UCDP process took 2 days, according to the LSO president. The process included the union council secretary, local notables, 2 pesh imams, 2 local doctors, and some local teachers.

3.3. Documentation and Accountability

Sub-question 1.3: To what extent are proceedings and decisions documented? Is documentation open to inspection by

community members and BRACE staff? How frequently is it inspected, and what kind of interaction takes place for this purpose?

The VDP, by all accounts, is documented in a booklet, which is available in the respective VOs but not given to women in the BRSP districts. The same is the case for UCDPs. Three examples of UCDPs in standard format have been inserted in Annex 10.

3.4. Women's Inclusion in Planning

Sub-question 1.4: In what ways are women consulted in these processes, and are their priorities reflected in the VDPs and UCDPs? What obstacles do they face, how do they aim to overcome them, and with what result?

Women's participation in the local planning process has been described above. The main point is that women and men sit together in Kech District to discuss and decide their priorities, whereas women's participation is indirect in Pishin and Khuzdar. In the latter, women sit together separately from the men to decide their priorities, which the CRPs convey to the presidents of the male VOs and LSOs for inclusion in the VDPs and UCDPs. Women in these districts were reportedly not well-informed about the final shape of the plans. While low female literacy may be one reason for this, it is not a reason for withholding or restricting women's access to the plans, which, if available to women, could be conveyed in essence or detail to them by those village girls and women and male family members who can read these documents.

3.5. Summary of Findings on Demand Articulation

Communities identified their needs in multiple ways, which included interaction

with the RSPs, formal community meetings, exposure to public service announcements, the information provided by the CRPs, and informal interaction among groups of men and women. They also had some exposure to government and elected officials visiting their communities. Women also received information from male family members. Villagers' awareness of their needs was based mainly on their day-to-day experiences.

The process of identifying priorities started in CO meetings. The priorities of multiple COs within a VO were communicated to the VO, which prepared the VDP, which has two parts, a needs assessment and a five-year action plan. The latter includes all CO priorities. Facilitated by RSP staff, the VDP process entailed consultation among the VO general body and CO members. Some stakeholders from outside the VO were also present. Villagers established their priorities through voting or show of hands, using pair-wise ranking of priorities. The same exercise was done separately for women. Women's priorities were added to the VDP if they were not already included in it by the men.

VO leaders met at the union council (LSO) level to prepare the UCDP. They brought their VDPs to this forum. External stakeholders participated in the discussion, including union council secretaries, government officials, and local notables. Participants established priorities after pair-wise ranking facilitated by RSP staff. Where women were secluded, the female CRP documented their priorities, and women looked to the LSO president to include their priorities in the VDP. The VDP is documented in a booklet, available in the respective VOs but not given to women in the BRSP districts. The same is the case for UCDPs.

4. Community Institutions’ Engagement With State Actors

Key Question 2: How do the CIs engage with potential contributors to local development, particularly state actors (including elected representatives and federal and provincial government organisations)? To what extent are the potential contributors responsive, and what factors influence this?

4.1. Engaging with Joint Development Committees

Sub-question 2.1: To what extent and how frequently do the CIs present their plans to joint development committees (JDCs) at the district and tehsil levels? What kind of responses have they got from the JDCs? Where have these responses led them?

4.1.1. Joint Development Committee Meetings and Participation

Relevant parts of the BRACE design, as

- The establishment of JDCs at the district and tehsil level;
- Quarterly meetings of the JDCs;
- The presentation of VDPs and UCDPs at JDC meetings;
- approval of infrastructure projects by JDCs;
- Consolidation of UCDPs at the district level; and,

- Mainstreaming the resulting district development plans in the provincial government’s annual Public Sector Development Plan (PSDP) process.

Joint District Development Committees (JDDCs) exist in all 9 BRACE districts, and they held 70 meetings between January 2019 and December 2021. The average number of meetings per year per district during the three years was 2.6. The average in 2021 was 3 meetings per district. The average attendance per meeting during 2019-2021 was 20, increasing to 23 in 2021. In addition, there were tehsil JDCs in Kech District, which met 22 times between June 2019 and September 2021 with an average attendance of 14 (refer to list of meetings in Annex 9).

The line departments and RSPs attended 100 percent of the JDDC meetings, the TA Team 82 percent (100 percent since September 2019), and the LSOs reportedly 59 percent (refer to the summary in Table 4 and list of meetings in Annex 9). Minutes of the meetings and discussion with the IPs suggest that although all the line departments notified as JDC members participated in JDC meetings, many of them did so through junior-level officers rather than their district or tehsil heads of department.

Table 4: Number of meetings and participants of Joint District Development Committees, January 2019-December 2021

Year	No. of:		Participation								No. of Meetings in Which Minutes Signed By:			
	Districts	Meetings	Number of Participants	Number of Meetings in Which Organisations Present							Chair	RSP	TA Team	All Participants
				Line Departments	RSP	TA	LSOs	NGOs	PPHI	Media				
2019	9	21	411	21	21	8	14	17	4	4	16	6	0	3
2020	9	22	399	22	22	22	12	18	3	1	16	4	0	4
2021	9	27	612	27	27	27	15	19	6	5	25	2	1	2
All 3 Years	70	1,422	70	70	57	41	54	13	10	57	12	1	9	
Percentage of meetings				100	100	81	59	77	19	14	81	17	1	13

Source: Data provided by DAI Human Dynamics Technical Assistance Team.

Other groups of participants included non-governmental organisations (NGOs), the People's Primary Healthcare Initiative (PPHI)²⁴ and the media. Different JDDCs adopted different practices when it came to signing the minutes of JDDC meetings, as indicated in Table 4. The line departments, NRSP, TA Team, LSOs and NGOs attended all the tehsil JDC meetings in Kech District, while the PPHI was not included (details in Annex 9).

4.1.2. Joint Development Committee Actions

Infrastructure schemes identified as community priorities and approved by BRSP and NRSP for community implementation are the important intervention of BRACE and are

reviewed in JDC meetings. According to BRSP and NRSP staff, these schemes are reviewed by all concerned to ensure no duplication between BRACE-funded and government schemes. TA Team and JDC members interviewed by the research team confirmed the scrutiny of proposed BRACE schemes as standard practice. This, however, is a time-consuming activity that is not undertaken in JDC meetings but outside these meetings. For example, only one JDC member (in Kech District) could recall an instance of possible duplication that required coordination between the IP and a government department. Additional instances, however, are mentioned in the minutes of the Kech JDDC meetings.

24. Billed as a form of public-private partnership, the PPHI is a national initiative launched in 2005. In Balochistan, it is implemented through an autonomous non-profit company established by the Government of Balochistan, which was handed over the basic health units and certain other facilities (most of which are established at the union council level) that were previously managed by the Health Department, together with the budget for these facilities and their personnel. This is expected to allow the PPHI the flexibility to respond to local needs without being constrained by bureaucratic procedures and, thereby, improve service delivery.

BRSP head office and district-level staff informed the research team that there are time constraints and the UCDPs are not presented in JDDC meetings. Four leaders of three tehsil LSO networks informed the research team that their UCDPs were not discussed in the JDDC. Still, they deposited them with the clerical staff of the respective deputy commissioners (in Pishin and Khuzdar) and assistant commissioners (in Kech). The leaders of the Zalan LSO (Kamalzai Union Council) in Pishin District said they gave one copy each of the UCDPs to the deputy commissioner, the Assistant Director of LG&RDD, their member of the provincial assembly (MPA). The Additional Chief Secretary, P&DD. NRSP staff in Turbat, informed the research team that LSOs give one copy of each UCDP to relevant departments and the tehsil JDC.

In addition to articulating their priorities through the UCDPs, LSO leaders also bring up issues in the JDCs on an ad hoc basis. This was observed by LSO leaders as well as RSP staff, the TA Team, and government JDC members. For example, according to the TA Team's response to sub-question 2.1 (included in Annex 11):

Generally, acute community issues are raised in the JDDC by the CI [community institution] representatives. The administration's response is very positive in most cases. Line departments are sometimes skeptical towards communities as their gaps are raised in the JDDC, and they do not want to discuss that in the JDDC in front of all. During the assignment, 6 JDDC meetings were attended, where it was observed that issues raised by communities were taken well. Some of the long-standing

issues of service delivery were resolved. The response also depends on the nature of the issue.

The TA Team notes that the responsiveness of the JDDC depends, among other things, on the interest taken by the chair, who is a deputy commissioner in most cases. According to BRSP head office managers, follow-up on issues raised by LSOs in JDC meetings varies from one chairperson to another. Nevertheless, they observed that 50 percent of the chairpersons have effectively addressed such issues. They believed that the deputy commissioners could use their powers, including administrative powers such as suspending a line department officer or withholding salary, to "pull up" line departments.

BRSP staff in Khuzdar District reported that LSOs raise issues in JDDC meetings, the deputy commissioner gives instructions to relevant line departments, minutes are taken, and follow-up and compliance are reported regularly. They noted that these are mostly "small issues" and claimed that there is 100 percent compliance with the deputy commissioner's instructions. The TA Team members in Khuzdar confirmed that "minor issues" are raised, the deputy commissioner gives approximately 4-5 instructions per meeting to address them, and there is follow-up reflected in the minutes. In the process, the department concerned looks at its budget and decides what can or cannot be done. However, the TA Team did not know what proportion of issues was resolved, as they do not keep a record of compliance leading to resolution through the minutes of JDDC meetings.

The research team reviewed 47 sets of minutes of the district meetings- and tehsil-level JDCs provided by the TA Team. The TA Team in Khuzdar gave the research team 7 sets of minutes of the Khuzdar JDDC. The research team found no reference to issues raised by LSOs and no instructions by the chair to line departments to improve service delivery in these minutes. The concluding section of the minutes (“Action Points”) does not include any action required from the line departments, other than an occasional note on participation in ceremonies.

The TA Team in Pishin District gave the research team 10 sets of minutes of the JDDC. However, the research team did not find any discussion of issues raised by LSOs in these minutes, and there are no instructions given by the chair (the deputy commissioner) to line departments to address such issues.

The TA Team in Kech gave the research team 13 sets of minutes of the JDDC. The research team observed that:

- For the meeting on 29 September 2021, the “Decisions” section says that the Livestock Department will collaborate with LSOs and provide support for livestock vaccination and treatment whenever they need and contact the Livestock Department. The Education Department will ensure the availability of teachers in 4 schools. There is no record of compliance with these decisions.

- There is no instruction to line departments on any matter raised by the LSOs in any other meeting of the Kech JDDC.

The Kech TA Team also provided copies of 17 sets of minutes of tehsil JDC meetings. The “Decisions” sections of 4 of these minutes call for the Education Department to ensure the availability of teachers in a few schools.²⁵ In addition, decisions taken in 2 meetings call for the Livestock Department to support the beneficiaries of income-generating grants for livestock vaccination through linkages with LSOs.²⁶ There is no record of compliance with these decisions. There is no instruction to line departments on any matter raised by LSOs in any other meeting of these JDC meetings.

The general secretary and president of a tehsil LSO network reported that their executive committee members take local issues to relevant government departments. If the matter is not resolved at the departmental level, they ask the network leaders for help and take the issue to the JDDC. The deputy commissioner tells the department concerned to resolve the issue. Sometimes, department officials get upset that LSO leaders have complained about them. In general, the JDDC cannot resolve issues, as illustrated below.

The general secretary and the president had brought 5 important issues to the attention of the JDDC, 2 of which concerned schools, one was about irrigation, one about the employment of local people in vaccination campaigns, and one about the lack of medicines at the local

25. All of these tehsil JDC meetings took place in September 2021 – Buleda and Turbat on 24 September 2021, and Dasht and Tump on 27 September 2021.

26. Both these meetings – one each for Buleda and Turbat – took place on 24 September 2021.

civil dispensary. Only the last mentioned was addressed because the government had already approved upgrading the civil dispensary to a basic health unit that the PPHI would manage.

The district deputy commissioner told the research team that he refers issues to relevant line departments, with follow-up in fortnightly meetings with the departments, but “cannot do much to persuade or push” the departments. An official member of the Kech JDDC observed that the chair, the Divisional Director of LG&RDD, does not have the authority to instruct other departments. The chair informed the research team that there had been no discussion on any aspect of service delivery by the line departments.

4.2. Community Engagement with State Actors Outside Joint Development Committees

Sub-question 2.2: To what extent and how frequently do the CIs present their plans to other platforms for engaging state actors? What kind of responses have they gotten from these platforms? Where have these responses led them?

4.2.1. Engagement Facilitated by Legislators

The TA Team informed the research time that “At present in the BRACE Districts, the interaction between CIs [community institutions] and other [District] stakeholders is mostly facilitated by RSPs and rarely the community leads or contacts on its initiative the political leadership for resolving their priority needs/issues”

[statement included in Annex 11]. The research team met some of the most active LSO leaders, who are also leaders of tehsil and district LSO networks. They realised from previous experience or after attending JDDC meetings that they should approach other government and NGO platforms directly to obtain funding for their priority UCDP schemes. How they took forward their priorities, as reported by them and the IPs, is illustrated below and includes reports of engagement with political leaders.

Two leaders of a tehsil LSO network reported giving copies of their UCDPs to individual departments and various NGOs. Then, they took their priorities to their MPA, who did not show any interest because he considered one of the LSO leaders a political rival. Nevertheless, they managed to get schemes worth PKR 280 million approved in the fiscal year 2018-2019 by approaching the brother of a former provincial minister. He was then working as an adviser to the chief minister.

The BRSP district team in Pishin informed the research team that some UCDP priorities were included in the LG&RDD’s PSDP. A drinking water supply scheme among them is a striking example of coordination. What might be called component cost-sharing:²⁷ BRSP and the beneficiary communities contributed the cost of solar power and pipes, LG&RDD provided the water tank (through a contractor, according to procedures), and the Public Health Engineering Department engaged a contractor for the boring and for installing a tubewell. However, the LSO exhibited a chart (refer to Figure 1) in which the right-hand column is called “Contribution

27. The term “component sharing” was used in the Orangi Pilot Project in Karachi, where the households were responsible for installing sanitary latrines, the lane organisation was responsible for underground sewerage lines in the lanes, and the municipality provided the main disposals.

Figure 1: Component-cost sharing in a drinking water supply scheme in Pishin District

S.No	Description	Estimated Cost (100%) Rs.	Contribution of GOS (100%)	
			Rs.	Rs.
A. Material				
1	Solar PV Module (6 Grids) 600W, 24 volts, 18Amps, 1200gms (2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 or 25 or 26 or 27 or 28 or 29 or 30 or 31 or 32 or 33 or 34 or 35 or 36 or 37 or 38 or 39 or 40 or 41 or 42 or 43 or 44 or 45 or 46 or 47 or 48 or 49 or 50 or 51 or 52 or 53 or 54 or 55 or 56 or 57 or 58 or 59 or 60 or 61 or 62 or 63 or 64 or 65 or 66 or 67 or 68 or 69 or 70 or 71 or 72 or 73 or 74 or 75 or 76 or 77 or 78 or 79 or 80 or 81 or 82 or 83 or 84 or 85 or 86 or 87 or 88 or 89 or 90 or 91 or 92 or 93 or 94 or 95 or 96 or 97 or 98 or 99 or 100)	1,687,500	44,500	1,643,000
	Solar Water Pump Inverter 2000W, 24V, 80Amps, 2700gms	155,000	-	155,000
	Pipes (PVC) 1/2" dia, 100m	200,000	125,000	75,000
	Various fittings, valves, etc.	250,000	-	250,000
	Electric wire 2.5mm	250,000	162,500	87,500
	Electric wire / Connection wire	80,000	80,000	-
	1/2" Pipe 100m	200,000	-	200,000
	Electric wire for wiring connection	20,000	-	20,000
	UPVC Pipe 1/2"	18,000	-	18,000
	Accessories	58,000	-	58,000
	Transportation of water system	20,000	20,000	-
	Manhole Frames, Flushing Gate, Change Chamber accessories, etc.	300,000	-	300,000
	Installation of water system	20,000	20,000	-
	Water Quality Test	8,000	8,000	-
	Sign Board	20,000	-	20,000
	Sub Total	2,867,500	400,000	2,467,500
	Total (A+B)	2,867,500	400,000	2,467,500

of EU,” and the contributions of government departments are not acknowledged. The scheme is based on a standard design, which was discussed and adopted jointly by the organisations concerned.²⁸

The Zalan LSO leaders in Pishin reported that they persuaded the Assistant Director, LG&RDD, to include the above-mentioned water tank in the PSDP at PKR 4 million. They also approached the local representative of their MPA, who got their priority scheme for karez extension included in the Irrigation Department’s PSDP at the cost of PKR 5 million. Moreover, their civil dispensary was upgraded to a basic health unit, which the PPHI manages.

The Sachaan LSO (Garuk Union Council) president in Khuzdar District is also the president of the tehsil and district LSO networks. He reported the following efforts and outcomes regarding the LSO’s UCDP priorities:

- He went with 2 other leaders to their MPA, who recommended 5 drinking water schemes for inclusion in the PSDP (each costing PKR 4.2 million and benefitting 70-80 households) at a total cost of PKR 21 million.
- For the tubewell, he then contacted the Member of National Assembly (MNA), who got PKR 4.2 million included in the PSDP of the Public Health Engineering Department.
- The MNA also used his influence to provide a grid station for power supply, a federal subject.
- The LSO leaders approached the chief minister for the inclusion of a dam with a budget of PKR 210 million in a World Bank-assisted project.

The president of the Gawarakh LSO (Abinoghay Union Council) in Khuzdar District, who is also the president of the tehsil LSO network and general secretary of the district LSO network, reported several successful linkages, all of them achieved by working with 2 different MPAs from 2 different parties before and after the 2018 elections, and an adviser to the chief minister. The successes he reported are:

- The current MPA recommended:
 - 3 link roads with a total budget of PKR 74.6 million for inclusion in the PSDP of the

28. BRSP head office managers informed the research team that there are many examples of component-cost sharing for drinking water supply schemes that entail cooperation between BRSP and the Public Health Engineering Department, and sometimes the LG&RDD, as well.

Communication and Works Department of the provincial government;

- a park for inclusion in the same department's PSDP at the cost of more than PKR 10 million, taken from the Chief Minister's Fund;
- 4 drinking water supply schemes for inclusion in the PSDP of the Public Health Engineering Department at a total cost of PKR 22 million; and,
- 5 transformers with transmission lines (cost not known) provided through the Quetta Electric Supply Company, a federal government dispensation.
- The previous MPA recommended:
 - A stadium for inclusion in the PSDP of the Communication and Works Department at a cost of PKR 10 million;
 - A veterinary hospital (cost not known); and,
 - An embroidery centre for inclusion in the PSDP of the Social Welfare Department (cost not known).

Together with his colleagues, the president of the Mirani LSO (Nodiz Union Council) in Kech District, who is also the president of the tehsil LSO network, narrated how they pursued their UCDP priorities. He first took the UCDP to the offices of the deputy commissioner and assistant commissioner, PPHI, and the LG&RD, Social Welfare, Health, Education, Agriculture, Irrigation, and Livestock Departments, as well as the MPA. Some departments said, "we will see," and others said, "we will consider."

The MPA told the LSO president to maintain contact with his representative in the village and convey LSO priorities to him. For the fiscal

year 2019-20, the LSO leaders identified several priorities, which the MPA included in the PSDP of various departments: 3 drinking water schemes, and the construction of a school library, examination hall, and examination hall and latrines. In addition, the civil dispensary was upgraded to a basic health unit. For 2021-22, the MPAs representative called the LSO president and asked for priority schemes. This led to the inclusion of a scheme to construct 4 additional rooms for the high school.

The leaders of the Shorma LSO (Solband Union Council) in Kech District reported similar experiences of support from the MPA, working through his representative in the village. The MPA facilitated school improvement, including the provision of latrine and furniture and construction of a boundary wall for a girls' school, 2 additional rooms for a boys' school, and a line road and library.

4.2.2. Engagement Sought or Initiated by Line Departments

Two female Education Department officials in one district noted that they have repeatedly informed the JDDC that girls' schools desperately need water and washrooms and expected help from BRSP, but BRSP has not been helpful. They also reported that theft of school property is a big problem in their area, for which they need community help, and that parent-teacher committees are not functional or effective, which also calls for community intervention.

A Health Department official in one district noted a trust deficit regarding vaccination, and he had been facing this problem in his area of responsibility. So, he asked BRSP to help organise awareness sessions for measles-rubella vaccination in schools. BRSP organised

the sessions through community institutions and social organisers, and the Health Department staff conducted them.

Livestock Department officials in the same district also explained how much their work depends on community involvement. BRSP staff added that the Livestock Department is regularly involved in livestock vaccination when livestock is being given to community members. In addition, the Forest Department regularly provides saplings free of cost to community institutions during the annual plantation drives. In Agriculture Extension, however, there is not much cooperation.

The Director General of the Balochistan Charities Registration and Regulation Authority, a new directorate of the Social Welfare Department, informed the research team that approximately 3,500 organisations had been registered with the Social Welfare Department before the new authority came into being. This authority was established under the Balochistan Charities Act 2019, which requires fresh registration under this act with authority. Approximately 600 organisations have been registered so far. The authority does not have offices at the district level, where it works through the existing offices of the Social Welfare Department.

Officials of the Social Welfare Department in Pishin District observed that LSOs come to them for help with registration. They help the LSOs complete their paperwork and upload the documents required for registration by the Balochistan Charities Registration and Regulation Authority. They also provide LSOs the certificates required by persons with disability to obtain government assistance for caregiving, a large amount of which is available for Pishin. The department's deputy director in

Kech District reported that he had registered 17 of the 35 LSOs in the district as well as 6 VOs.

A former Deputy Director of Agriculture Extension, now in another directorate, remarked that they are supposed to provide technical assistance and advice to farmers on all aspects of agriculture, but the problem is that they cannot link up with individual farmers as they have only 2 field staff at the level of the union council. So, he decided to hold field days in selected villages in cooperation with the COs, VOs, and LSOs for 20-30 farmers at a time. Senior district-level staff would also attend these events. In addition, LSO members in the same districts narrated how they cooperated with Agriculture Extension in controlling locust infestation: they collected money for labour and diesel for the spray machine from the villagers, and the directorate gave them the pesticide-free of cost, with which they sprayed the affected area for 2 weeks.

A sub-divisional officer of the Irrigation Department in Kech District observed that he tries to accommodate LSO priorities in his department's PSDP. In narrating the details, he highlighted the importance of something called the Prime Minister's Sustainable Development Goals Programme, which is a block allocation placed at the disposal of the Cabinet Division for each ruling party member of the National Assembly (MNA) by the Federal Government, to be allocated for schemes identified by the MNA concerned. The programme was given this name to make it look like a programme for achieving Agenda 2030, which is associated with the Sustainable Development Goals, after the Supreme Court of Pakistan in 2017 declared it illegal for the prime minister to make discretionary grants to federal legislators. There was an allocation of PKR 30 billion for the

fiscal year 2017-18, and funds were earmarked for key constituencies leading up to the 2018 elections.²⁹ Under the successor prime minister, who is no longer in power, the 2018-19 allocation for the programme was PKR 24 billion.³⁰

The MNA in Kech, affiliated with the previous prime minister, had reportedly asked some of the line departments to recommend schemes for funding through the above-mentioned mechanism, also known locally as a special fund. The Irrigation Department officer reported that he had recommended 40 LSO priority schemes for the rehabilitation and restoration of karezes in the Tump Tehsil of Kech for inclusion in the department's PSDP for 2021-22.

The section on "Recommendation Points" in the minutes of the Pishin JDDC of 24 November 2020 noted that:

- The district health officer requested to link CRPs and LSOs in the interventions of the Health Department, especially for polio and routine vaccination. The chair directed that a meeting be held in this connection.
- The divisional forest officer requested the support of LSOs in tree plantation. It was agreed that the LSOs would provide such support, for which a joint planning meeting will be held before the plantation campaign.
- Follow-up was not reported in the minutes.

The section on "Recommendation Points" in the minutes of the Pishin JDDC of 25 June 2021 includes the point:

The DHO [District Health Officer] Pishin requested to link the CRPs and LSOs in the health interventions and to support the health department in the COVID-19 interventions and information dissemination. The Health Department also requested the support of BRSP in polio and routine immunisation. The chair directed to hold a joint meeting in this regard. [Follow-up was not reported in the minutes.]

4.3. Explaining the Responsiveness of Joint Development Committees and Other Platforms

Sub-question 2.3: What factors explain the degree of responsiveness of the JDCs and other platforms at which the CIs present their local priorities? To what extent are these factors related to the policies of the institutions and the interests of the actors represented in these platforms?

Three pathways for establishing citizen-state linkages were observed by the research team and described in this chapter:

- The JDCs, originating in the BRACE design, represent the first pathway and have been the subject of the greatest attention given by the IPs and their designated BRACE partners among the government departments. The JDCs have facilitated the scrutiny of community infrastructure schemes funded through the RSPs and implemented by community institutions. However, they

29. Shahzad Paracha, "Rs 2,526 million released under PM's SDG programme," Pakistan Today, 25 October 2017 (<https://profit.pakistantoday.com.pk/2017/10/25/rs2526-million-released-under-pms-sdg-program/>).

30. Tariq Butt, "Rs 24 bn allocation for MPs' uplift schemes 'illegal'," The News (daily), 8 March 2019 (<https://www.thenews.com.pk/print/440992-rs24-bn-allocation-for-mps-uplift-schemes-illegal>).

have had nothing to do with implementing UCDDPs or their mainstreaming into the district or provincial plans and allocations of the line departments. Moreover, the documentary evidence shared with the research team does not suggest that the JDCs were responsible for any improved service delivery requested by the LSOs.

- LSO leaders had little success persuading line departments directly to include their priority infrastructure schemes in departmental PSDPs. However, several line department officials, including those responsible for social welfare, health, agriculture, forestry, livestock, and irrigation, expressed interest in working with community institutions on non-infrastructure activities, and most of them managed to do so, facilitated by the LSOs and the RSPs. This is the second pathway.
- LSO linkages with provincial (and some national) legislators have been a vibrant source of support for UCDDP priorities. While local elected representatives remained absent from the scene since 2018,³¹ community activists went to their provincial and national assembly representatives, who obtained high-level (including the chief minister's and Federal Government) approvals to deliver projects through the PSDP allocations of various provincial departments and nationally-mandated electricity and gas utilities. This is the third pathway.

As indicated above and in Annex 11, some of the IP staff, including BRSP and TA Team members, attribute the responsiveness of JDCs to

personal factors, mainly the personal interest of the chair (the deputy commissioner, in most districts, and the LG&RDD Divisional Director in Kech District). The TA Team in Kech District offered a broader perspective by observing that state actors' and community representatives' policies, resources and interests influence citizen-state engagement.

The TA Team (see Annex 11) expressed the view that the responsiveness of potential contributors to community priorities is inhibited by the lack of "legal cover" for the community institutions. The TA Team supported this view in Kech District. Community institutions must register under the Balochistan Charities Act 2019, allowing them to operate as legal entities and open bank accounts. It is also correct that community institutions such as the LSOs are not yet recognised in the Balochistan Local Government Act. The fact, however, is that lack of "legal cover" of community institutions has not prevented line departments from cooperating directly with LSOs and VOs, where it was considered useful, or implementing PSDP-funded infrastructure projects to respond to UCDDP priorities at the behest of legislators and the provincial political leadership.

Moreover, as noted above in this chapter, the chair of one JDDC (a deputy commissioner) observed that he could not influence the actions of line departments, and another official commented that the LG&RDD in Kech does not have any authority over the other departments. These are matters of established policy that are understood in Balochistan and the rest of the country: the district-level staff of line departments report to and obtain

31. Local government elections were last held in Balochistan in 2013 and the elected representatives completed their term in 2018. In the absence of elected local government representatives since 2018, provincial civil service officers have been designated as administrators of local government institutions.

instructions from their provincial secretaries and other Quetta-based functionaries, not the civil administration, which the deputy commissioners and assistant commissioners manage. The idea (shared by BRSP head office staff) that deputy commissioners can use punitive powers to ensure compliance by line departments is not consistent with standard civil service behaviour.

Judging by the evidence presented in this chapter, line departments engage with community institutions because several line departments have certain activities built into their work plans and budgets that require the cooperation of organised villagers for efficient service delivery. For example:³²

- The agriculture department needs to reach many farmers to provide advice and assistance efficiently on a routine (seasonal) basis and for special purposes (forexample, controlling locust infestation).
- The livestock department cannot reach many individual villagers on its own and regularly needs community institutions for livestock vaccination.
- The health department needs community institutions to increase awareness for some purposes, reach villagers for its regular immunisation campaigns, and deal with emergencies such as COVID-19.
- The education department would benefit from active community involvement in enrolment campaigns and solve location-specific problems identified above.

- Organised communities help the forest department meet its targets through tree plantation campaigns.
- Organised communities facilitate NADRA, the Election Commission of Pakistan, and the Ehsaas programme in gaining access to many eligible people and potential beneficiaries of the Ehsaas programme.

Line departments include UCDP infrastructure priorities in their PSDP because they are evidently told to do so by the province's political leadership at the request of legislators representing the communities served by the LSOs. The legislators have been responding to the LSOs because the LSOs have pursued them systematically, and the legislators see the value of responding to organised communities and the vote banks they represent. Whether this kind of engagement will continue once local elected representatives are back in place is discussed in Chapter 6.

The factors discussed above that explain the degree of responsiveness of the JDCs and other platforms to community institutions suggest that:

- The third pathway is mutually beneficial for legislators and the communities they represent.
- The second pathway is mutually beneficial for government departments and the community institutions with which they work.
- The JDCs (the first pathway) provide opportunities for information-sharing and coordination but are evidently unable to arrange improved access to services.

32. These are not just isolated examples from a few districts of Balochistan but part of a pattern of citizen-state engagement observed over the years in various parts of the country where the RSPs have been working.

4.4. Steps Taken by BRACE to Influence Responsiveness of State Actors

Sub-question 2.4: What steps have BRACE (including the TA Team) and the CIs taken to influence the responsiveness of the JDCs and other platforms and the institutional policies they follow? To what effect? What factors have facilitated and inhibited change?

The TA Team has been working with the Government of Balochistan on several proposals for improving citizen-state engagement in the directions envisaged in the BRACE Action Document. The TA Team has described these proposals in a note reproduced in Annex 11. They aim for changes:

- At the provincial level, through amendments to the Balochistan Local Government Act and preparation of a Community-led Local Governance Policy; and,
- At the district level by streamlining the JDC terms of reference, seeking its notification, and testing the streamlined terms of reference in 2021 in 3 pilot districts (Pishin, Loralai, and Kech).

The documents that contain the details of the provincial-level proposals are evidently in draft form and under discussion by relevant departments and decision makers; they were not shared with the research team. Moreover, the proposals have not been approved for implementation, and their contribution to the effectiveness of citizen-state engagement cannot be assessed at this time.

The district-level improvements facilitated by the TA Team – and their effects – are described

in Annex 11. The effects reportedly include better coordination and information-sharing among government departments in the 3 pilot districts. These improvements have focused on the JDCs, one of the three pathways for citizen-state engagement (the JDCs) observed during this assessment.

In addition, as described in Section 4.3, the responsiveness of state actors has been influenced through two other pathways:

- Some of the government departments are working with community institutions on non-infrastructure activities. This is called the second pathway above, and it is a process facilitated by the LSOs and the RSPs outside the JDCs.
- For infrastructure development, LSOs lobbied with legislators, who lobbied with the provincial political leadership, which arranged departmental allocations. This is the third pathway, which is also taking place outside the JDCs.

4.5. Summary of Findings on Community Engagement with State Actors

The JDCs represent one of the pathways for citizen-state engagement in BRACE. JDDCs exist in all 9 BRACE districts and held 70 meetings between January 2019 and December 2021, with an average attendance of 20 persons per meeting, increasing to 23 in 2021. In addition, there were tehsil JDCs in Kech District, which met 22 times between June 2019 and September 2021 with an average attendance of 14.

The evidence reviewed above, including the minutes of 47 JDC meetings, suggests that:

- LSOs did not present their UCDPs at JDC meetings because of time constraints.
- The scrutiny of BRACE-funded community infrastructure schemes took place through inter-departmental coordination outside JDC meetings and was approved by the JDC chair.
- The minutes of 7 meetings in Kech (6 of them for tehsil JDCs) reflected concerns for improved service delivery by line departments, particularly in education and livestock matters. However, the minutes did not report on compliance with the decisions taken at these meetings.

The TA Team worked with the provincial and district governments to improve citizen-state engagement. The provincial-level proposals have not yet been approved. However, the district-level improvements, focusing on the JDCs, have reportedly led to better coordination and information-sharing among government departments in the 3 pilot districts.

The LSOs reported that they routinely deposited their UCDPs with the offices of the JDC chairs and shared them widely with district-level line department offices, provincial legislators, and, in some cases, national legislators. However, with rare exceptions, the district-level offices of

line departments did not respond positively to approaches by the LSOs for their infrastructure priorities.

However, several line departments and federal organisations, including NADRA, Ehsaas/BISP and those responsible for health, social welfare, agriculture, forestry, and livestock, worked with community institutions on non-infrastructure activities. This process, called the second pathway above, was facilitated by the LSOs and the RSPs. It is one way of improving the responsiveness of government organisations to community needs and priorities. These organisations evidently find that cooperation with community institutions leads to more efficient service delivery and greater capacity for meeting their objectives.

In addition, LSO leaders found a third pathway for pursuing their infrastructure priorities by making state actors more responsive. They realised that district-level officials could not respond to their priorities and instead focused on provincial and national assembly members from their areas. The legislators took cognisance of the vote bank represented by organised communities, took LSO priorities to the highest levels of the provincial political leadership and relevant federal authorities, which included them in relevant departmental PSDPs.

5. Importance And Realisation of Citizen-State Engagement

Key Question 3: What kind of assistance has citizen-state engagement brought into the communities (e.g., physical infrastructure, cash and services)? To what extent does this match community perceptions of the need for engaging with external institutions?

5.1. Household Perceptions of the Importance of External Institutions

Sub-question 3.1: What is the pattern of community perceptions of the need for engaging with external institutions for their wellbeing? In what ways do these perceptions differ between CO members and non-members, women and men, and across income groups?

The survey questionnaire (Annex 6) asked respondents to name the departments, institutions (including for-profit and non-profit entities), and elected representatives that they thought were important for the well-being of their household. The enumerators were told not to prompt the respondents. Multiple answers were allowed, for which the questionnaire provided a list of more than 60 entities and

sectors in 10 categories (in addition to “other”), spanning provincial and federal institutions and all the sectors that may be of interest to the villagers of Balochistan.

The list of entities included:³³

- The civil administration, police, and courts: assistant commissioner (AC), deputy commissioner (DC), commissioner, police, and courts;
- Elected representatives: senator, MNA, MPA, district or municipal councillor, and union council (UC) councillor;
- Provincial line departments – social sectors: education – primary and secondary education, education – higher education, education – polytechnic education, health – Expanded Programme on Immunisation (EPI) and preventive healthcare, health – basic health units, health – secondary healthcare (tehsil and district headquarters hospitals), health – rehabilitation services, drinking water – public health engineering, drinking water – local government and rural development (LG&RDD), social welfare, women development, and population welfare;

33. Specific services provided by some of these institutions were included in the questionnaire to assist villagers to identify services and institutions considered important for their wellbeing.

- Provincial line departments – Infrastructure: LG&RDD, communication, physical planning and housing, power – electricity, power – gas, urban planning and development, and union council;
 - Provincial line departments – agriculture and natural resources: agriculture, irrigation, livestock, forestry, and fisheries;
 - Provincial line departments – other productive sectors: industries, human resources, minerals, food, and tourism;
 - Provincial line departments – other sectors: environment, sports, information technology, and culture;
 - Federal organisations/ programmes: NADRA, Ehsaas/Benazir Income Support Programme (BISP), and Election Commission of Pakistan;
 - Commercial institutions: banks, other for-profit companies/entities, shopkeepers, moneylenders, and middlemen; and,
 - Non-profit organisations: Rural Support Programmes, COs, VOs, and LSOs.³⁴
- The research team compared the responses of women and men, CO members and non-members, and respondents up to and above the median income level. The comparisons are summarised in Table 5 (for women and men), Table 6 (for CO members and non-members), and Table 7 (by income level), with organisation-specific details in Annex 12. In terms of the overall sample (refer to Table 5 and to Table 28 of Annex 12 for organisation-specific information):
- Most respondents consider the external entities important for household well-being are the RSPs (identified by 64 percent) and NADRA, a federal organisation (identified by 57 percent). In addition, the Ehsaas/BISP federal programme was considered important by 42 percent.
 - Seventy-three percent of the respondents identified the social sector departments (as a group) as being important for their wellbeing. In addition, approximately half the respondents identified primary and secondary education, and tehsil and district headquarters hospitals, as important institutions.
 - Forty percent of the respondents identified civil administration, police, and courts as important institutions. Police were important for 35 percent and civil administration for 24 percent.
 - Thirty-five percent identified elected representatives as important institutions. MPAs were important for 26 percent, MNAs for 19 percent, and local body councillors at various levels for 11-12 percent of the respondents.
 - Thirty-five percent identified the departments responsible for agriculture and natural resources as important institutions for household wellbeing, with agriculture (28 percent), irrigation (17 percent), and livestock (16 percent) leading the list.
 - Thirty-four percent identified infrastructure-related organisations as important institutions, with electricity (31

34. The COs, VOs and LSOs are not considered external institutions in this analysis.

percent) and gas suppliers (14 percent) leading the list.

- Commercial institutions were considered important by 30 percent of respondents considered commercial institutions important, with shopkeepers (27 percent) leading the list.

There are several statistically significant differences in perception between men and women, CO members and non-members, and those with low- and high-income levels. However, the differences between CO members and non-members and across income levels are, by and large, small [refer to Table 6 and Table 7, and Table 29 and Table 30 of Annex 12 for organisation-specific information].

The largest and most striking differences between men and women are that [refer to Table 5 and Table 28 of Annex 12 for organisation-specific information]:

- Many more women than men consider infrastructure-related organisations important for their households, largely because of the greater importance women give to the provision of electricity and gas.
- Many more women than men consider the organisations responsible for agriculture and natural resources important.
- Many more women than men consider commercial institutions important, largely because of women's greater importance to shopkeepers.

- Many more men than women consider the federal organisations and programmes important, largely because of the greater importance men give to NADRA.

5.2. Institutional Linkages and Gaps Reported by Households

Sub-question 3.2: What is the observed pattern of linkages in terms of the institutions and actors that have contributed to the wellbeing of the communities? To what extent is it consistent with community perceptions of the need for engaging with external institutions?

5.2.1. Household Perceptions of Usefulness of Institutions

For the first part of the sub-question, the survey questionnaire asked respondents to name the departments, institutions (including for-profit and non-profit entities), and elected representatives that had done something useful for them or their household members since 2018 (when BRACE started). However, the enumerators were told not to prompt the respondents in this regard.

Table 5: Respondents' assessment of the importance and usefulness of institutions and elected representatives: comparison of responses by women and men

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives	(A) Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.				(B) Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative has done something useful for you or other members of your household?				Expectations Gap: (A) minus (B) as Percentage of (A)				
	Percentage of Respondents				Percentage of (A)				Percentage of (A)				
	Male	Female	Sig.	Both	Male	Female	Sig.	Both	Male	Female	Sig.	Both	Sig.
Civil Administration and Courts	37	44	***	40	14	13		14	61	70	***	66	***
Elected Representatives	33	37	*	35	14	11	**	13	56	71	***	64	***
Provincial Line Departments - Social Sectors	77	69	***	73	58	41	***	49	25	41	***	32	***
Provincial Line Departments - Infrastructure	20	48	***	34	6	9	**	7	70	82	***	79	***
Provincial Line Departments - Agriculture and Natural Resources	26	44	***	35	12	9	**	10	54	80	***	70	***
Provincial Line Departments - Other Productive Sectors	7	24	***	16	6	4	*	5	18	84	*	69	***
Provincial Line Departments - Other Sectors	3	24	***	14	2	5	***	3	44	81	*	77	***
Federal Organisations/ Programmes	73	59	***	66	67	52	***	60	7	11	**	9	***
Commercial Institutions	21	39	***	30	16	12	**	14	24	70	***	54	***
Non-Profit Organisations	68	68		68	59	49	***	54	14	28	***	21	***

The asterisks indicate the statistical level of significance of the difference between the respective column percentages for a two-sided Z-test – three asterisks for 1 percent level of significance, two for 5 percent and one for 10 percent. Three asterisks (1 percent) represent the highest level of significance.

Table 6: Respondents' assessment of the importance and usefulness of institutions and elected representatives: comparison of CO members and non-members

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives	(A) Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.						(B) Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or something useful for you or other members of your household?						Expectations Gap: (A) minus (B) as Percentage of (A)					
	Percentage of Respondents						Percentage of (A)						Percentage of (A)					
	CO Member	Non-Member	Sig.	Both	CO Member	Non-Member	Sig.	Both	CO Member	Non-Member	Sig.	Both	CO Member	Non-Member	Sig.	Both	Sig.	
Civil Administration and Courts	40	41		40	15	**	14	63	11	***	14	63	73	***	66	***		
Elected Representatives	35	35		35	14	***	13	59	8	***	13	59	78	***	64	***		
Provincial Line Departments - Social Sectors	76	65	***	73	52	***	49	32	42	***	49	32	35	***	32	***		
Provincial Line Departments - Infrastructure	37	26	***	34	9	***	7	76	3	***	7	76	88	***	79	***		
Provincial Line Departments - Agriculture and Natural Resources	36	32		35	11	**	10	68	8	**	10	68	76	***	70	***		
Provincial Line Departments - Other Productive Sectors	15	16		16	5		5	68	4	***	5	68	73	***	69	***		
Provincial Line Departments - Other Sectors	14	13		14	4	*	3	74	2	*	3	74	85	***	77	***		
Federal Organisations/ Programmes	68	59	***	66	64	***	60	6	47	***	60	6	20	**	9	***		
Commercial Institutions	31	26	**	30	15	**	14	53	12	***	14	53	55	***	54	***		
Non-Profit Organisations	74	51	***	68	63	***	54	16	31	***	54	16	40	***	21	***		

The asterisks indicate the statistical level of significance of the difference between the respective column percentages for a two-sided Z-test – three asterisks for 1 percent level of significance, two for 5 percent and one for 10 percent. Three asterisks (1 percent) represent the highest level of significance.

Table 7: Respondents' assessment of the importance and usefulness of institutions and elected representatives: comparison by income level (up to and above the median)

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives	(A) Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.		(B) Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative has done something useful for you or other members of your household?					Expectations Gap: (A) minus (B) as Percentage of (A)				
	Percentage of Respondents						Percentage of (A)					
	Up to Median	Above Median	Sig.	Both	Up to Median	Above Median	Sig.	Both	Up to Median	Above Median	Sig.	Both
Civil Administration and Courts	44	37	***	40	13	14	14	70	61	***	66	***
Elected Representatives	39	31	***	35	15	10	13	61	68	***	64	***
Provincial Line Departments - Social Sectors	72	74		73	46	53	49	35	29	***	32	***
Provincial Line Departments - Infrastructure	34	34		34	5	9	7	85	73	***	79	***
Provincial Line Departments - Agriculture and Natural Resources	36	34		35	9	12	10	74	65	***	70	***
Provincial Line Departments - Other Productive Sectors	17	15		16	5	5	5	70	68	***	69	***
Provincial Line Departments - Other Sectors	17	11	***	14	5	1	3	71	86	***	77	***
Federal Organisations/ Programmes	66	66		66	55	64	60	16	2	***	9	***
Commercial Institutions	36	24	***	30	17	11	14	53	55	***	54	***
Non-Profit Organisations	72	63	***	68	54	54	54	25	16	***	21	***

The asterisks indicate the statistical level of significance of the difference between the respective column percentages for a two-sided Z-test – three asterisks for 1 percent level of significance, two for 5 percent and one for 10 percent. Three asterisks (1 percent) represent the highest level of significance.

Large proportions of respondents identified three groups of external institutions that had done something useful for them or their households since 2018 (refer to Table 5 and the tables in Annex 12 for organisation-specific information):

- Sixty percent reported that federal programmes and organisations had been useful. Forty-six percent of the respondents (51 percent of the CO members and 33 percent of the non-members) had found NADRA useful, and 28 percent were Ehsaas/BISP.
- Forty-nine percent had found provincial social sector departments (as a group) useful. Approximately one-fourth said that primary and secondary education, tehsil and district headquarters hospitals, had done something useful for their households. The proportion was somewhat higher for CO members compared with non-members.
- Excluding community institutions from the group of non-profit organisations (as they are not external institutions), 46 percent of the respondents (and 54 percent of the CO members) found the RSPs to be useful.

Respondents reported that other organisations had been less useful in terms of their wellbeing:

- Fourteen percent of the respondents said that the civil administration (for 2 percent of the respondents), police (for 10 percent), and courts (for 2 percent) had done something useful for them.
- Thirteen percent said that elected representatives had done something useful

for them. The proportion was 8 percent for MPAs (10 percent among CO members and 5 percent among non-members), 3 percent for union council representatives, and 1 percent each for MNAs and district or municipal councillors.

- Ten percent of the respondents said the departments responsible for agriculture and natural resources had done something useful.
- Seven percent said that infrastructure-related organisations had done something useful.
- Twelve percent reported the shopkeepers had been useful.

5.2.2. Expectations Gap: An Empirical Assessment of Trustworthiness of Institutions

There are two points of departure for focusing on the second part of sub-question 3.2. One is deconstructing and comparing the BRSP and NRSP Descriptions of the Action, as highlighted above in Section 1.3. This suggests that:³⁵

- BRSP and NRSP expect a close collaboration between community institutions and other development actors, particularly government departments. This kind of collaboration has been assessed in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4.
- Both expect that this collaboration will increase villagers' access to basic services. This is documented in Chapter 4.
- As a result of collaboration and increased access to services, BRSP and

35. The BRSP Description of the Action also refers to the importance of community institutions in strengthening social cohesion, promoting tolerance and respect for diversity, and strengthening local governance at the grassroots. These concepts, however, are outside the scope of this assignment.

NRSP anticipate that government and communities will come closer to each other. One indicator of “coming closer” is the extent of linkages assessed in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4.

- In the process, NRSP expects communities to have greater confidence and trust in government departments. BRSP expects that the process would “enhance the radius of trust”. However, there is no definition of “trust” and “radius of trust” in any of the BRACE documents.
- According to the BRSP Description of the Action, however, the “radius of trust” is enhanced when the state and citizens come closer to each other, which is the same perspective as in the first three bullet points addressed in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4.

However, there is another point of departure for shedding light on trust: the literature review in Annex 13. Among the leading scholars cited in the annex, Margaret Levi says, “Trust is not one thing and does not have one source. It has a variety of forms and causes.”³⁶ Moreover, scholars such as Levi, Hardin, and O’Neill have emphasised the difference between trust and trustworthiness (for example, refer to Box 2). As the philosopher, Onora O’Neill summed it up in a talk, “Trust is the response. Trustworthiness is what we have to judge”.³⁷ “More trust is not an intelligent aim in this life. Intelligently placed and intelligently refused trust is the proper aim,” she adds.

Box 2: Trust and trustworthiness

Many discussions of trust run trust and trustworthiness together, with claims about trust that might well apply to trustworthiness but that seem off the mark for trust.

Surprisingly, much of the literature on trust hardly mentions trustworthiness even though much of it is primarily about trustworthiness, not about trust ...

[T]rust can finally be stupid and, when it seemingly justifies action or inaction, even culpable. Merely trusting per se obviously need not help in managing complexity well – it could lead to dismal results, including quick destruction.

Source: Hardin, Russell. 1996. “Trustworthiness,” in *Ethics*, Volume 107, Issue 1 (October 1996), 26-42, available at <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2382242>.

Levi observes, “Only persons can trust or be trusting, but trustworthiness can attach to individuals or institutions.” When people “say they trust an institution, they are declaring a belief that, on average, agents will prove trustworthy.” The World Development Report 2017 also included an in-depth discussion of trust.³⁸ It says, “This Report defines trust as the probability that an actor assigns to other actors of delivering on their commitment, conditional on their past behaviour. In the game theory literature, this is known as reputation”

36. Levi, Margaret. 2003. “A State of Trust,” available at <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.452.7186&rep=rep1&type=pdf>, published in Braithwaite, Valerie and Levi, Margaret (eds.), *Trust and Governance*; New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2003 [see <https://www.russellsage.org/publications/trust-and-governance-1>].

37. O’Neill, Onora. 2013. “What we don’t understand about trust,” June 2013 video available at https://www.ted.com/talks/onora_o_neill_what_we_don_t_understand_about_trust, transcript: https://www.ted.com/talks/onora_o_neill_what_we_don_t_understand_about_trust/transcript#t-575008.

38. World Bank. 2017. *World Development Report 2017: Governance and the Law*; Washington, DC: World Bank [<http://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/wdr2017>].

and “Trust in institutions stems from delivering on commitments.” Thus, delivering on commitment seems to be central to trust. Russell Hardin also talks about commitment and reputation in connection with trust.³⁹

O’Neill points out that opinion polls ask respondents about trust in generic terms, whereas an average person asked about trusting somebody would begin by saying, “To do what?” Relevant large-sample surveys conducted in Pakistan also suffer from the problem that the questions they ask about trust and satisfaction are generic (and sometimes open to different interpretations by enumerators and respondents). By design, the questionnaire used in this assignment avoided the general practice of asking respondents about their trust in external institutions in an abstract manner. It focused, instead, on asking whether specific institutions delivered something useful to the respondents within a specific period.

Based on this question and the preceding one about the importance of specific institutions to the respondent household’s wellbeing, the research team calculated an “expectations gap” from survey data. The gap is the percentage difference between the percentage of respondents who consider the institutions to be important and the percentage who reported that these institutions had done something useful for their households since 2018. Respondents don’t need detailed knowledge about the institutions they are commenting on. Levi asserted, “Although a reasonable belief that the trustee will act consistently with the truster’s interests depends on knowledge of

the trustee, this can but need not be a detailed personal knowledge.”

Thus, the expectations gap reported in Table 5, Table 6, and Table 7 (with organisation-specific information in Annex 12) is an indicator of the trustworthiness of institutions. It depends on whether the institutions the respondents considered important for their wellbeing delivered something useful to the respondents since 2018. Given the resource constraints, it must be acknowledged that state institutions make very few explicit commitments to specific groups of people. At the same time, it also needs to be acknowledged that villagers have a legitimate expectation that institutions that affect their wellbeing will do something useful for them over four years. This may be viewed as an empirical interpretation of the social contract.

Subject to this background on concepts and empirics, the highlights indicated by the expectations gap are:

- The smallest expectations gap recorded through the survey – 9 percent – is for the group of 3 federal organisations/programmes. This signifies that 91 percent of the respondents felt that these organisations had met their expectations in some way during 2018-2022. This suggests that these institutions demonstrated a high level of trustworthiness. On the other hand, the smallest expectations gap for an individual institution in this category was recorded for NADRA (19 percent).

39. Hardin, Russell. 1996. “Trustworthiness,” in *Ethics*, Volume 107, Issue 1 (October 1996), 26-42, available at <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2382242>.

- The next smallest gap of 28 percent was associated with the RSPs, meaning that 72 percent of the respondents felt that the RSPs had met their expectations in some way since 2018.
- The smallest expectations gap among provincial organisations was 32 percent for the social sector departments, suggesting that these departments met some of the expectations of 68 percent of the respondents. There are, however, large differences across this group (refer to Table 28 of Annex 12): the gap is very large for higher education and relatively small for basic education and preventive healthcare.
- The expectations gap for other provincial organisations ranged from 64 to 79 percent. This suggests that these institutions did not meet the expectations of most respondents during 2018-2022. Among those with the largest expectations gap were the civil administration, MNAs, district or municipal councillors, and organisations responsible for infrastructure. However, the agriculture and natural resources departments fared better than them.

5.3. Household Assessment of Role of Community Institutions in Linkages

Sub-question 3.4: To what extent do community members (women and men, poor and non-poor) recognise the role of the CIs in the citizen-state initiatives observed in their communities?

CO members were asked in the survey to identify the institutions for which community institutions (COs, VOs, and LSOs) had created access through linkages. The respondents gave a high level of credit to CIs for forging linkages with social sector departments (40 percent of CO members) and federal organisations (48 percent of CO members) (refer to Table 8). Many more men than women gave credit to community institutions for these linkages. Approximately 20 percent of the CO members reported that their CIs had established linkages for primary and secondary education and access to government hospitals at the tehsil and district levels (Annex 12).

Very few CO members gave credit to CIs for establishing linkages with other institutions, the highest proportion (7 percent each) being for linkages with MPAs and with LG&RDD for drinking water supply, followed by linkages for EPI and preventive healthcare (6 percent), and then agriculture (5 percent). These and other institution-specific numbers are reported in Annex 12.

Table 8: CO members' assessment of whether community institutions played a role in linkages

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives with Which Respondents Reported Linkages	Percentage of Respondents Answering in the Affirmative						
	All CO Members	Male	Female	Sig.	Up to Median Income	Above Median Income	Sig.
Civil Administration and Courts	7	8	6		9	5	**
Elected Representatives	10	12	8	**	12	8	**
Provincial Line Departments - Social Sectors	40	47	32	***	37	43	**
Provincial Line Departments - Infrastructure	7	6	8		5	9	**
Provincial Line Departments - Agriculture and Natural Resources	6	9	4	***	5	7	
Provincial Line Departments - Other Productive Sectors	3	4	2	**	3	3	
Provincial Line Departments - Other Sectors	2	1	4	**	4	1	***
Federal Organisations/ Programmes	48	59	38	***	42	55	***
Commercial Institutions	11	14	8	***	13	9	**

The asterisks indicate the statistical level of significance of the difference between the respective column percentages for a two-sided Z-test – three asterisks for 1 percent level of significance, two for 5 percent, and one for 10 percent. Three asterisks (1 percent) represent the highest level of significance.

5.4. Evidence on Quantum of Resources Obtained through Linkages

Sub-question 3.3: What evidence is available on the quantum of resources brought into the communities and the number of beneficiaries of linkages (CO members and non-members, women and men, poor and non-poor)?

The report prepared by BRSP and RSPN in 2020-21 observed that linkages had brought physical

infrastructure, services and cash grants (for social protection) to the communities. The contributing institutions and actors include elected representatives, provincial government departments, specialised federal government organisations and programmes, United Nations agencies, non-profit organisations, and, in at least one case, a for-profit private company.⁴⁰ However, a large proportion of the LSOs in the 9 BRSP districts did not respond to the study

40. Azizi, Mohammad Ali; Shahzad, Khurram; and Achakzai, Akbar Khan. 2021. The Power of Social Capital: A Report on Local Support Organisations (LSOs) Fostering Development Linkages with Government and Non-Government Agencies in the BRACE Programme Districts of BRSP. Islamabad: RSPN, April 2021.

instrument, and the study did not cover Kech District, where the NRSP is the IP.

Estimates provided in the report suggest that LSOs forged linkages that brought in physical infrastructure valued at PKR 1,344.6 million in the 9 districts where BRSP is working and PKR 56.2 million in services and cash grants for social protection (an overview is given in Annex 3). The report estimated that the infrastructure has 675,000 beneficiaries and services and social protection 420,000. The provincial government accounted for 50 percent of the value contributed through infrastructure, and elected representatives contributed 30 percent. Social protection (Federal Government Ehsaas/BISP cash grants provided to the poor during the COVID-19 pandemic) accounted for 95 percent of the cash and services brought in through the reported linkages.

In the report (refer to Annex 3), 34 percent of the value of linkages is attributed to the Chief Minister's Fund, elected representatives, and the Government of Balochistan, for which the implementing departments are unknown. The research team also reviewed the spreadsheet used for tabulating data from the study instrument and arriving at the numbers reported above and in Annex 3. The team found similar information in the records of the LSOs it visited during fieldwork (see Figure 2, which shows charts put up by 3 LSOs). The first column of the charts, from right to left, is for "Problem" in one case and "Project" in 2 cases. The second column is for "Source" and the third one for "Help" in one case and "Cooperation" in 2 cases. The entries under "Project" include

descriptions such as "tree plantation," "provision of transformer," "provision of computers for schools," "agriculture," "water supply scheme," "cleaning of spring and karez" and "water tank." The "Source" column mentions BRSP, various donors, and the MPA in one case. In some LSOs (but not in these charts) the cost of projects is also shown, and the government department responsible for implementing a project is also identified.

Figure 2: LSO charts describing linkages



This is useful information for community members and visitors who are interested in LSO performance in general. However, it is insufficient to compile accurate information on citizen-state linkages. For example, accurate information on the priority schemes identified by the communities is available in the UCDPs, and accurate information on the priority schemes approved by the government is available in government records (typically, the PSDPs). This was confirmed in discussions with RSP managers, TA

Team members, and government officials. This information, however, is not being collected and compiled. Without this information, it is impossible to accurately assess the quantum of resources brought to the communities through linkages.

5.5. Summary of Findings on the Importance and Realisation of Citizen-state Engagement

Most respondents consider the external entities important for household wellbeing are the RSPs and NADRA. Seventy-three percent of the respondents identified the social sector departments (as a group) as being important for their wellbeing. Forty percent of the respondents identified civil administration, police, and courts as important institutions. Thirty-five percent identified elected representatives and the departments responsible for agriculture and natural resources as important institutions, and approximately the same proportion identified infrastructure-related organisations in this category.

Many more women than men considered the infrastructure-related organisations and the organisations responsible for agriculture and natural resources important for their households. On the other hand, many more men than women consider the federal organisations and programmes (NADRA and Ehsaas/BISP) to be important.

Large proportions of respondents identified three groups of external institutions that had done something useful for them or their households since 2018: federal programmes

and organisations (NADRA and Ehsaas/BISP, in particular); provincial social sector departments; and the RSPs. However, other organisations had been much less useful regarding the respondents' wellbeing. These include the civil administration, elected representatives, and various provincial departments.

As envisaged in the BRSP and NRSP Description of the Action documents, collaboration and increased access to services bring the government and communities closer. One indicator of "coming closer" is the extent of linkages assessed in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4. Another quantitative indicator based on survey data is the expectations gap assessed in this chapter. A literature review suggests that this is an indicator of the trustworthiness of institutions and that trustworthiness is more appropriate than trust for assessing perceptions about institutions.

This indicator signifies that 91 percent of the respondents felt that the group of 3 federal organisations/programmes had met their expectations in some way since 2018. This suggests that these institutions demonstrated a high level of trustworthiness. A similar result emerged for the RSPs, with 72 percent of the respondents assessing that the RSPs had met their expectations in some way since 2018. A large majority of the respondents reported that the social sector departments met their expectations to some extent, and other provincial institutions did not meet expectations.

The respondents gave high credit to community institutions for forging linkages with social sector departments and federal organisations. Many more men than women gave credit to community institutions for these linkages. Approximately 20 percent of the CO members reported that their CIs had established linkages for primary and secondary education and access to government hospitals at the tehsil and district levels.

Accurate information on the priority schemes identified by the communities is available in the UCDPs, and accurate information on the priority schemes approved by the government is available in government records (typically, the PSDPs). This information, however, is not being collected and compiled. Without this information, assessing the quantum of resources brought to the communities through linkages is impossible.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

Key Question 4: How successfully have the BRACE IPs, CIs and government institutions generated synergy⁴¹ through citizen-state engagement,⁴² and what could be done to further enhance it?⁴³

6.1. Effectiveness of Demand Articulation by Community Institutions

Sub-question 4.1: How effectively have the CIs articulated local needs to potential contributors to community wellbeing (other than BRACE)? What factors have facilitated or hindered them?

As described in Chapter 3, BRACE includes a well-defined participatory process for organised villagers to discuss their development needs and establish priorities for VDPs and UCDPs. The needs are essentially felt needs, identified based on day-to-day experiences. The priorities were established through broad-based consultation, with women included directly in Kech District and indirectly but effectively in the BRSP districts. The RSPs facilitated community

institutions and women's participation at every step of the planning processes. However, there may be some limitations in communicating local plans to women in some districts. During their planning, Vos and LSOs engaged stakeholders such as union council secretaries, religious leaders, teachers, doctors, and other local notables. Evidently, community leaders view these stakeholders as contributors to community wellbeing.

The LSOs were not allowed to present their UCDPs at JDC meetings. This is said to be a lack of time at these meetings. The LSOs, however, routinely deposited their UCDPs with the offices of the JDC chairs. The LSOs shared their UCDPs widely with district-level line department offices and provincial legislators and, in some cases, with national legislators. The local representatives of provincial legislators facilitated linkages between the legislators and the LSOs. In addition, provincial and national legislators communicated LSO infrastructure priorities to the political leadership and, through this channel, to the line departments for inclusion in their PSDP allocations.

-
41. According to the Collins English Dictionary (available at <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/synergy>), "If there is synergy between two or more organisations or groups, they are more successful when they work together than when they work separately."
42. The expectations associated with citizen-state engagement are described in the BRACE Action Document (Section 4.2, expected results 1, 2, 3 and 8 of strategic objective 1, and expected results 1, 2 and 3 of strategic objective 2) and elaborated in the BRACE Programme Implementation Manual (available at <http://www.rspn.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/PIM-for-BRACE-English-4.1-V.pdf>), sections 1.3.17, 1.3.18 and 2.1 to 2.4. They are also reflected in proposals developed by the TA Team for discussion with GoB pursuant to strategic objective 2.
43. "Enhance" means "to improve the quality, amount or strength of something" (Cambridge English Dictionary, available at <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/enhance>).

6.2. Effectiveness of Joint Development Committees and Other Supply-side Platforms

Sub-question 4.2: To what extent have the JDCs and other supply-side platforms responded to the needs articulated by the CIs? What factors have facilitated or hindered them?

6.2.1. Effectiveness in the Context of BRACE

The JDCs represent one of the pathways for citizen-state engagement in BRACE. As documented in Chapter 4, the JDCs facilitated the scrutiny of community infrastructure schemes funded through the RSPs and implemented by community institutions. However, they have had nothing to do with implementing UCDPs or their mainstreaming into the district or provincial plans and allocations of the line departments. Moreover, the documentary evidence shared with the research team does not suggest that the JDCs were responsible for any improved service delivery requested by the LSOs. The main reason for the JDC's lack of effectiveness is that it is not the relevant forum for decisions regarding planning, financing, and implementation through the line departments. It is not so authorised by government policies and practices prevailing throughout the country.

With rare exceptions, the district-level offices of line departments did not respond positively to direct approaches by the LSOs for their infrastructure priorities. This is because the district-level offices work within the annual work plans and budgets approved at the provincial level by their secretaries, subject to budgets approved by the provincial cabinet and the legislature. Therefore, it is not generally possible for district-level heads of line departments

to respond to direct community requests or even to instructions or requests from the civil administration and legislators. However, in the two cases observed in which line departments responded positively, an officer of LG&RDD made an effort to include a community priority scheme in the following year's PSDP, and an irrigation official accessed funds made available by a member of the national assembly, which are outside the PSDP.

However, several line departments and federal organisations worked with community institutions on non-infrastructure activities. This process, called the second pathway in this report, was facilitated by the LSOs and the RSPs. It is one way of improving the responsiveness of government organisations to community needs and priorities. These organisations evidently find that cooperation with community institutions leads to more efficient service delivery and greater capacity for meeting their objectives. In other words, this is a mutually-beneficial arrangement between communities and government organisations.

In addition, the LSOs consulted during the assessment successfully obtained support from [mainly provincial] legislators for their UCDP infrastructure priorities. The legislators, evidently, took cognisance of the vote bank represented by organised communities. As such, they took LSO priorities to the highest levels of the provincial political leadership and relevant federal authorities, which included them in relevant departmental PSDPs. This is the third pathway for citizen-state engagement, and it has worked for community infrastructure development as a response to the community's articulation of its priorities.

6.2.2. Overall Community Expectations and Trustworthiness of Institutions

As described in Chapter 5, the overall picture of the need for linkages is much bigger than what is observed in BRACE, and responsiveness by state actors to this need is highly variable. The household survey for this assessment covered more than 60 entities and sectors at the provincial and federal levels. Survey findings suggest that:

- Most of the respondents consider NADRA and community institutions to be important for their household wellbeing.
- Seventy-three of the respondents identified the social sector departments (as a group) as important for their wellbeing, with approximately half the respondents identifying primary and secondary education and tehsil and district headquarters as important.
- Forty percent of the respondents identified civil administration, police, and courts as important institutions.
- Thirty-five percent identified the departments responsible for agriculture and natural resources as important, with agriculture, irrigation, and livestock leading the list.
- Thirty-four percent identified infrastructure-related organisations as important institutions, with electricity and gas leading the list.

As envisaged in the BRSP and NRSP Description of the Action documents, collaboration and increased access to services bring the government and communities closer. One indicator of “coming closer” is the extent of linkages assessed in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4. Another quantitative indicator based on

survey data is the expectations gap assessed in Chapter 5. A literature review suggests that this is an indicator of the trustworthiness of institutions and that trustworthiness is more appropriate than trust for assessing perceptions about institutions.

Based on the expectations gap, the research team’s estimates suggest that:

- Ninety-one percent of the respondents felt that federal organisations (NADRA, Ehsaas/BISP, and the Election Commission of Pakistan) had met their expectations, which suggests that these institutions demonstrated a high level of trustworthiness.
- Seventy-two percent of the respondents felt that the RSPs had met their expectations since 2018.
- A large majority of the respondents reported that the social sector departments met their expectations to some extent, and other provincial institutions did not meet expectations.

The respondents gave a high level of credit to community institutions for forging linkages with social sector departments and federal organisations. Many more men than women gave credit to their community institutions for these linkages. Information is not being compiled to assess the quantum of resources brought to the communities through linkages.

6.3. Measures Taken for Improving Citizen-state Engagement

Sub-question 4.3: What measures taken by the CIs, BRACE IPs and other stakeholders have led to improved citizen-state engagement over time? Is this engagement sustainable where it should be? Why?

The TA Team worked with the provincial and district governments to improve citizen-state engagement. The provincial-level proposals have not yet been approved. The district-level improvements, focusing on the JDCs, have reportedly led to better coordination and information-sharing among government departments in the 3 pilot districts. The JDCs represent one pathway for citizen-state engagement that depends on BRACE. The JDCs are not a standard feature of civil administration or inter-departmental coordination and can be expected to end with the end of BRACE, unless policy decisions are taken for their sustainability.

As documented above, the responsiveness of state actors has been influenced through two other pathways, which have not been systematically documented in BRACE:

- Some of the government departments are working with community institutions on non-infrastructure activities. This is called the second pathway above, and it is a process facilitated by the LSOs and the RSPs outside the JDCs.
- For infrastructure development, LSOs lobbied with legislators, who lobbied with the provincial political leadership, which arranged departmental allocations. This is the third pathway, which is also taking place outside the JDCs.

Ad hoc line department cooperation with community institutions is observed in Balochistan and other parts of Pakistan where the RSPs work. As explained in Chapter 4, this focuses on activities built into departmental work plans and budgets that require the cooperation of organised villagers for efficient

service delivery. This is not institutionalised but may be expected to continue on a limited scale because it is mutually beneficial for the state and the citizens.

Local elected representatives have not been seen in Balochistan since 2018, and LSOs have established mutually-beneficial linkages with provincial and national legislators. The question is whether this engagement will continue once local elected representatives are back in place. In the research team's opinion, the answer is in the affirmative. The reason is that local governance and development in Balochistan and other provinces are decisively controlled by provincial legislators and the provincially-controlled line departments. At least two generations of provincial political leaders have demonstrated a firm resolve not to empower elected local government. There is no evidence that this will change in the foreseeable future.

6.4. Feasible and Non-feasible Options for Enhancing Citizen-state Engagement

Sub-question 4.4: Based on this assessment as well as evidence from elsewhere, what can be done to enhance citizen-state engagement for the wellbeing of the people, particularly women and the poor?

In terms of conclusions, this assessment suggests that:

- Depending on citizen-state engagement with local authorities such as the civil administration and district-level heads of the department is of limited value to the citizens as far as UCDP infrastructure priorities are concerned.

- The allocation of PSDP resources for infrastructure is done at the provincial level, and bottom-up planning and resource allocation through district plans is not permitted under the established system.

Looking ahead, the assessment suggests that the two most feasible options for enhancing citizen-state engagement are:

- The RSPs should invest in increasing the number and enhancing the capacities of LSO activists, such as those identified in this assessment, who can successfully establish linkages with elected representatives leading to infrastructure development through the PSDP.
- The government should institutionalise line departments' cooperation with organised communities for all such activities in which community involvement could generate mutually-beneficial results for the state and the citizens. The most feasible way of moving ahead with this is through executive orders.

In support of these directions, and also for documenting achievements and lessons, it would be useful for BRACE to document:

- How government departments, on an ad hoc basis, are working with community institutions on non-infrastructure activities resulting in improved access to services (the second pathway);
- How LSO leaders lobbied for their UCDP priorities with legislators, whose response led to government departments implementing infrastructure schemes resulting in improved access to services (the third pathway); and,
- Accurate information on the priority schemes identified by the communities, which is available in the UCDPs, and accurate information on the priority schemes approved by the government, which is available in government records (typically, the PSDPs).

Annex 1: Population of Balochistan, by District, 2017 Population Census and 2022 Projections

Table 9: Balochistan population data, by district, 2017 population census and 2022 projections

Division	No.	District	Data from the 2017 Population Census						Projections for 2022			Share in Rural Population
			Number of Households		Population		Household Size		Overall Population	Rural Areas		
			Total	Rural	Total	Rural	Overall	Rural		Population	Households	
Kalat	1	Awaran	18,094	13,881	121,680	87,436	6.7	6.3	122,595	85,960	13,647	0.8%
	2	Kalat	55,497	45,654	412,232	339,774	7.4	7.4	476,268	388,377	52,185	3.6%
	3	Kharan	24,035	18,370	156,152	111,497	6.5	6.1	177,017	126,395	20,825	1.2%
	4	Khuzdar	120,405	81,296	802,207	525,071	6.7	6.5	952,310	614,932	95,209	5.7%
	5	Lasbela	93,165	53,904	574,292	295,048	6.2	5.5	673,555	333,006	60,839	3.1%
Makran	6	Mastung	38,801	33,781	266,461	231,332	6.9	6.8	309,502	271,053	39,581	2.5%
	7	Washuk	31,540	27,517	176,206	154,334	5.6	5.6	199,361	176,411	31,453	1.6%
	8	Gwadar	39,922	17,275	263,514	101,915	6.6	5.9	288,950	106,796	18,102	1.0%
	9	Kech	138,403	91,658	909,116	606,980	6.6	6.6	1,118,364	727,894	109,917	6.7%
	10	Panjgur	42,628	31,590	316,385	236,061	7.4	7.5	342,519	247,366	33,103	2.3%
Nasirabad	11	Jaffarabad	79,273	56,023	513,813	355,808	6.5	6.4	596,229	406,705	64,037	3.7%
	12	Jhal Magsti	25,047	23,791	149,225	141,400	6.0	5.9	161,710	154,137	25,934	1.4%
	13	Kachhi	30,140	25,868	237,030	202,598	7.9	7.8	248,013	211,461	27,000	1.9%
	14	Nasirabad	66,681	53,999	490,538	393,947	7.4	7.3	587,973	466,080	63,886	4.3%
	15	Sohbatpur	30,523	28,359	200,538	187,671	6.6	6.6	219,787	205,281	31,020	1.9%

16	Chagai	31,081	29,060	226,008	209,689	7.3	7.2	276,696	259,938	36,024	2.4%
	Killa Abdullah	97,210	77,919	757,578	608,236	7.8	7.8	920,381	740,724	94,892	6.8%
18	Nushki	22,662	17,023	178,796	132,410	7.9	7.8	209,395	154,246	19,830	1.4%
19	Pishin	128,080	102,304	736,481	593,339	5.8	5.8	878,094	694,210	119,696	6.4%
20	Quetta	276,711	148,093	2,275,699	1,274,494	8.2	8.6	3,021,056	2,048,856	238,072	18.8%
21	Dera Bugti	46,585	32,312	312,603	213,302	6.7	6.6	360,637	239,454	36,274	2.2%
22	Harnai	17,353	13,031	97,017	72,463	5.6	5.6	103,183	75,933	13,655	0.7%
23	Kohlu	26,827	24,676	214,350	196,924	8.0	8.0	261,920	241,785	30,297	2.2%
24	Lehri	18,651	16,143	118,046	101,438	6.3	6.3	127,294	109,278	17,391	1.0%
25	Sibi	20,228	11,278	135,572	71,145	6.7	6.3	145,403	76,004	12,048	0.7%
26	Ziarat	28,999	28,308	160,422	157,016	5.5	5.5	192,101	187,388	33,784	1.7%
27	Barikhan	26,041	24,347	171,556	159,380	6.6	6.5	195,906	182,090	27,816	1.7%
28	Killa Saifullah	53,478	43,574	342,814	280,071	6.4	6.4	398,381	320,134	49,807	2.9%
29	Loralai	55,876	47,143	397,400	332,462	7.1	7.1	448,745	372,677	52,845	3.4%
30	Musakhel	24,826	22,728	167,017	152,879	6.7	6.7	176,931	162,034	24,089	1.5%
31	Sherani	21,213	21,213	153,116	153,116	7.2	7.2	180,540	180,540	25,012	1.7%
32	Zhob	45,962	39,094	310,544	264,296	6.8	6.8	351,695	306,838	45,387	2.8%
Balochistan		1,775,937	1,301,212	12,344,408	8,943,532	7.0	6.9	14,722,509	10,873,984	1,563,657	100.0%
BRACE Districts		642,523	490,722	4,238,757	3,226,118	6.5	6.5	5,030,660	3,787,823	575,333	35%

Source: Government of Pakistan, 2017. Population Census, 2017, Final Results, National Results. Islamabad: Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Planning Development and Special Initiatives, Pakistan Bureau of Statistics. Available at: https://www.pbs.gov.pk/sites/default/files/population_census/National.pdf. Projections are based on the intercensal population growth rates reported in the census.

Annex 2: Expected Results and Activities for Citizen-State Engagement in BRACE Design

Source: BRSP Description of Action, except where otherwise stated.

Expected Result 1: Establishment and empowerment of a three-tiered participative system of federated Community Organisations (COs) at community, village and UC levels capable of development needs identification & prioritisation, development planning, resource mobilisation, and execution, and operation & maintenance of community infrastructures.

To achieve this result, the BRSP's action will implement a mix of transactional and transformational mobilisation processes that build peoples' capacity and confidence – particularly for the poor and excluded – to participate in their governance actively.

Relevant Activities

1. Joint District Development Committees

Joint District Development Committees (JDDCs) with the membership of local governments/ authorities and community representatives will be formed at the district level to institutionalise and sustain the bottom-up community-led development processes into the mainstream formal development planning and budgeting processes. They will also serve as a forum to plan, implement and monitor local development plans. JDDCs will convene quarterly meetings to serve as a forum to plan, implement and monitor local development initiatives. After the formation of LSOs at the UC level, they will be asked to nominate their representatives District level coordination with the elected representatives and local authorities. Similarly, meetings will be

held with the District Government to nominate its representatives (including officials and elected representatives) to establish JDDCs. The government and community representatives will then form JDDCs at the District level. These committees will meet once a quarter to discuss the village and UC level development plans prepared by the LSOs, progress, and status of programme interventions, and the district government plans and implementation. BRSP's programme staff will act as facilitators for organizing these meetings. The Term of References (ToRs) shall be finalised and approved by the provincial government, and the concerned provincial departments shall notify the committees to ensure formal arrangements.

Elaboration in DoA

Activity 1.14: Support to establish Joint District Development Committees (JDDCs) at District level.

[NRSP DoA says: Support to establish joint development committees at Tehsil and District level]

Output: 7 Joint District Development Committees (JDDCs) established and working at programme Districts.

JDDCs for local authorities, elected representatives, and CI members at the District level are foreseen under the action.

The three-tier community institutions can work more effectively with the support of and in collaboration with the elected representatives and local authorities. For this, government officials at the local level and the community representatives (office bearers of the COs/ VO/LSOs) need to understand each other's

functions. It is, therefore important to create effective communication channels between the government and community leaders to help the government understand the benefits of listening to the needs and priorities of the community. A critical factor in this process is the sustained ability of communities to interact with the government and advocate for equitable allocation of public resources. Such relationships can help open channels to the district and provincial policy levels. Therefore, capacity building of government officials and the joint working committee mechanism is proposed to create a bridge and provide a platform for the community institutions and district / Tehsil level government to interact with each other, share development plans and finalize them according to the local needs.

The Programme staff at the Field Unit and District levels will work with the LSOs and District / Tehsil government to help establish JDDCs. In addition, the Programme staff will start interacting and sharing the progress of the Programme interventions with the District Government right from the program's onset to bring them on board. However, the JDDCs will be established in the first year of the Programme implementation in existing BCDP districts, and the remaining 3 will be formed in the second year of the programme implementation.

Activity 1.15: Meetings of joint development committees at the district level.

Output: 98 JDDCs' meetings were conducted quarterly.

The JDDCs will conduct meetings every three months. The LSO representatives, government officials, elected local council members, and BRSP staff will attend these meetings. During the meetings, main agenda items will be shared, including the VDPs and UCDPs, the progress of

the Programme interventions, and the district government plans and implementation status. This forum will also provide an opportunity for the LSOs' representatives to review the government plans and discuss strategies to improve access to public sector social services. Representatives from other NGOs may also be invited to share their plans (on a case-to-case basis).

2. Training and Sensitisation of Government Officials and Elected Representatives

Training and sensitisation of government line departments, local government officials, and elected representatives will take place, as well as the representatives of CIs (VOs/LSOs) and the BRSP's staff to promote social mobilisation and increase understating of participatory local development processes. This will help improve the working of Joint District Development Committees, better understand the government officials and representatives on CDD, and increase community members' participation in the development process.

Elaboration in DoA

Activity 1.16: Training of local government, district line department officials, and LSO representatives on participatory development planning.

Output: 272 persons participate in a capacity-building programme for government officials / elected representatives and community members.

One of the key foci of the action is to promote creative interactions and partnerships between organised communities, relevant government line departments, and lower tiers of the local government system. The action also focuses on strengthening the capacities of senior officials and elected local body representatives through

learning exposures to plan and supervise inclusive development with the involvement of organised communities at local levels. To promote creative interactions and partnerships between organised communities, relevant government line departments, and lower tiers of the local government system, it is also important to develop the capacity, knowledge, and skills of field staff and officials of relevant line departments. This will be achieved through training, knowledge exchange, and learning exposures.

BRSP will work with the District Government and line departments to select government officials / local elected representatives for the capacity-building programme. A series of training [2-3 days duration] and an exposure visit to other Programme districts will be conducted. Selected LSO representatives will also attend these training. This will build the capacity of the government officials/elected representatives to better understand the three-tier social mobilisation process, Programme interventions, and the local level development process through the LSO / VOs. These events will be rolled out in the 2nd year of the Program and continue for four years.

Expected Result 2: Increased capacity of citizens, communities, and marginalised groups, particularly women, to assert their rights and hold local authorities accountable by engaging them in joint participatory development planning and execution for a more relevant and efficient public service delivery.

Relevant Activities

Under this result, BRSP fostered communities, elected representatives, and local authorities will be supported to jointly undertake development planning through a participatory

needs identification and prioritisation process to establish Village Development Plans (VDPs) and Union Council Development Plans (UCDPs), to be consolidated at district level to apprise the GoB's Annual District Development Planning (ADDP), and for resource mobilisation advocacy, relevant and effective service delivery, and to serve as a joint social-accountability framework. This will be achieved through the following sets of activities:

1. Preparation of District Development Strategy (DDS) & Plans, conducting participative needs identification and prioritisation at community, village, and UC levels to define the estimated cost of VDPs and UCDPs along with implementation and resource mobilisation strategies, consolidation of planning at the district level and building consensus through wider stakeholders' consultations to develop a DDS and Plan, adoption and notification of the DDS and Plan as the main development reference document. The Policy Framework Technical Assistance will consolidate the DDS & Plans from the planning by RSPs at the village (VDPs) and UC (UCDP) levels.
2. Advocacy for mainstreaming DDS and Plan in the formal District Annual Development Planning processes. The aforementioned plans will also serve as the development blueprints for the respective tiers of the local governments for informed debates at the councils. In addition, BRSP will organise regular joint dialogues between communities, local authorities, and members of the provincial and national parliaments to inform development planning and implementation progress at UCs and Districts levels.
3. BRSP will adopt the social accountability tools with the technical support of RSPN to

enable rural organised communities to track the implementation of development projects and programmes in targeted districts by the local public authorities. The social accountability tools include community scorecards, social audits, citizen report cards, and citizen satisfaction surveys.

Elaboration in DoA

Preparation of District Development Strategy & Plans:

The BRDCEP will support and facilitate the target communities and local authorities to jointly undertake spatial development planning through a participatory needs identification and prioritisation process to establish VDPs and UCDPs, to be consolidated at the district level to apprise the GoB's Annual District Development Planning and for resource mobilisation advocacy, relevant and effective service delivery, and to serve as a joint social accountability framework. In addition, efforts will be made to leverage and mobilise at least 10% of the development plans' resources from other sources.

External consultant services will be acquired to facilitate the process at the district level, developing district development strategy and action plans by integrating the plans developed by the community at the village and UC levels. These plans will provide a short to a medium-term framework for development investment in the UC/district, which will assist the LSO to mobilise at least 10% of the development plans resources mobilised from other sources than the government for the prioritised activities, as well as help the government and other development agencies to create synergies and coordinated efforts avoiding duplication of efforts.

Local Government is considered the 3rd tier of Government and the 1st interface between the citizens and the State. The journey of elected local

governments is not very consistent in Pakistan. Balochistan is no exception to these infrequent trends. Local governments, if allowed to work in an enabling environment, can help restore the citizen's trust in the state institutions and open the window for development. Under a structured and consultative process, the BRDCEP will assist the BRDA in developing a comprehensive but customized training course/curriculum based on the role and responsibilities of different tiers of local governments. The government of Balochistan does not have the sufficient technical capacity and financial resources to orient and train the elected Chairman, Vice Chairman, Mayor, and Deputy Mayor, and newly elected local government representatives at the lowest level of governance tier i.e., the Union Council.

The activities will be implemented in such a way that they ultimately contribute to the Government of Balochistan's commitment to its citizens by vesting the local bodies with financial, administrative, and political authority for improving the effectiveness of the local government system through building capacities of the elected representatives.

Activity 2.1: Prepare household, village and UC Development Plans.

Output: 247,956 MIPs, 2,685 VDPs, 211 UCDPs & 7 District Development Plans along-with resource mobilisation strategies developed.

In the RSP's social mobilisation methodology, household planning (MIP), CO plans community organisation level, VO plans at the village level, and LSO plans UC level to address their collective needs. The principle is that such plans should normally be based on the assumption that the work can be done on a self-help basis with internal and external resource mobilisation. Therefore, the programme will

work with the COs, VO, LSOs, LSONs, and local government to conduct assessments to identify and prioritise community needs at three levels. This process will use various assessment tools, including community mapping (to identify existing resources and gaps), and focus group discussions on triangulating information about community needs. Based on the inputs from activities under Result 1.1, each VO/LSO will be assisted in developing medium-term Village Development Plans (VDPs), UCDP, and District Development Plans for five years. On average, each UC will develop 14 VDPs for the census villages, and in total, there will be 7 District Development Plans/strategies, 211 UCDPs, and 2685 VDPs developed over the project's life. The piloting in 211 UCs and implementation of the 211 schemes under this proposed action will therefore create a demonstration effect and a tool for lobbying and advocacy to fund the VDPs and UCDPs.

The UC will be the basic development unit for the allocation of resources. However, funds for community-based development investment interventions will be prioritized and allocated based on VDPs and UCDPs jointly prioritized and finalized by communities in consultation with the local government and involvement of other stakeholders, like the private sector and development agencies, through the Tehsil level JDCs regularly. To demonstrate the utility and effectiveness of the participatory planning and interactions between communities and the local government through and joint development of VDPs and UCDPs, the action will fund (providing sub-grants ranging between € 1,000 to 20,000) up to 211 prioritized community infrastructure projects, including such as water supply schemes, rehabilitation of primary schools or health units, the vocational training center for women, community center, village library, etc. based on existing BRSP's practice against

the prioritized targets of VDP and UCDP at community, village and UC levels. CIs will be the recipient of these grants as beneficiary organizations. Gradually, over years 2 and 3 of the project, through demonstration of success stories, it is expected that these pilot projects will be leveraged to encourage the local government and other development partners to match similar numbers in the UCs and/or contribute to the project costs.

Activity 2.2: Coordination and consolidation of the development plans and strategy at district level.

Output: 7 district development plans consolidated at the district level.

In the current scenario of public sector financing projects, it is challenging for the government to allocate resources to fund the plans. However, it is hoped that as the local government system is in place, resource allocation to fund the VDPs and UCDPs will be made. Besides, BRSP will work with the LSOs and the government to find resources from various donors and development agencies and through public-private partnerships to fund the plans' priorities at local levels. During action, 7 district development plans along-with resource mobilisation strategies will be prepared and presented to GoB for resource allocation and addressing community needs.

Activity 2.3: Adoption and notification of district development plans by the JDDCs.

Output: 7 district development plans adopted and notified by the JDDCs.

BRSP and LSO networks at the district level will closely coordinate with the district councils and local authorities to adopt and formally notify the developed district development strategy and plans, which will formally be presented to the JDDCs for adoption and notification. In

addition, these plans will be communicated to the provincial level through regular government processes and procedures to apprise the GoB's Annual District Development Planning and resource mobilisation.

Expected Result 3: Improved communities' access, particularly women and marginalised groups, to quality public services and benefit from climate-resilient community infrastructures and productive assets planned, implemented, and maintained jointly with local authorities.

Relevant Activities

The BRDCEP will improve basic community infrastructure and productive assets and services delivered to the targeted communities to be identified through the community, village, and union council development planning under ER 1.2. These community physical infrastructure schemes will be built, managed, and maintained by the communities with the support of elected representatives and local authorities. They may include, but are not limited to, WASH, education, health, link roads, street pavements, irrigation channels, disaster protection measures, alternate/renewable energy provision, or any other infrastructure needs identified and prioritised by the organised communities through a structured participative and inclusive development planning process. To avoid duplication and to sustain community-government relations, the local/district government officials and elected council members will also be engaged during the planning phase. This will be achieved through consensus-building on needs to be addressed on a priority basis, establishing a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with communities and local authorities, technical training for community-based Project Management, Audit, and Operation & Maintenance (O&M)

Committees, preparing technical, financial, and environmental feasibilities, projectisation, approvals by the JDDCs, initiation and completion of community infrastructures, organisation of O&M mechanisms. The community institutions, in collaboration with public services, whereby BRSP will play a catalytic/facilitation role, will undertake the aforementioned activities.

Elaboration in DoA

Activity 3.1: Community needs identified for basic infrastructure in the VDPs and UCDPs.

Output: 211 infrastructure projects identified in the programme area and implementation started.

In the RSP's social mobilisation methodology, COs plan at community level, VO's plan interventions at the village level and LSOs plan at UC levels to address their collective needs. The principle is that such plans should normally be based on the assumption that the work can be done on a self-help basis with internal and external resource mobilisation. The programme will work with the COs, VO's, LSOs, and local government to conduct assessments to identify and prioritise community infrastructure needs at three levels. This process will use various assessment tools, including community mapping (to identify existing resources and gaps), and focus group discussions on triangulating information about community needs. Based on the inputs from activities under Result 1.1, each VO/LSO will be assisted in developing medium-term VDPs and UCDP for five years. On average, each UC will develop VDP for the census villages, and in total UCDPs will be 211, and 2685 VDPs will be developed over the project's life. These plans will provide a short- to medium-term framework for development investment in the UC, which will assist the LSO to mobilise timely resources for the prioritised activities and help the

government and other development agencies create synergies and coordinated efforts avoiding duplication of efforts.

In the current scenario of public sector financing projects, it is challenging for the government to allocate resources to fund the plans. However, it is hoped that the local government system will efficiently allocate resources to fund the VDPs and UCDPs consolidated at the District level. Besides, BRSP will work with the LSOs, LSOs Networks, and the government to find resources from various donors and development agencies and through public-private partnerships to fund plans' priorities at local levels. The piloting in 211 UCs and implementation of the 211 projects under this proposed action will therefore create a demonstration effect and a tool for lobbying and advocacy to fund the VDPs and UCDPs.

The UC will be the basic development unit for allocation of resources, however funds for community-based development investment projects will be prioritized and allocated based on VDPs and UCDPs jointly prioritized and finalized by communities in consultation with the local government and involvement of other stakeholders, like the private sector and development agencies, through the Tehsil level JDCs regularly. This will be done in consultation with all VOs. Once finalized, these plans will be shared at the Tehsil and District level in JDCs. This is expected to improve district-level planning and avoid any overlapping government investment in infrastructure projects. Projects will be selected for funding based on the eligibility criteria mentioned on the previous page. This activity links with the expected Result-3, through which COs/VOs/LSOs will be supported for the construction of different community infrastructure projects.

To demonstrate the utility and effectiveness of the participatory planning and interactions

between communities and the local government through JDCs and joint development of VDPs and UCDPs, the action will fund (providing sub-grants ranging between € 1,000 to 20,000) up to 211 prioritized community infrastructure projects including such as water supply scheme, rehabilitation of primary school or a health unit, vocational training centre for women, community centre, village library, Alternate/Renewable energy project etc. based on existing BRSP's practice against the prioritized targets of VDPs and UCDPs at community, village and UC levels. CIs will be the recipient of these grants as beneficiary organizations. Gradually, over years 3 and 4 of the project, through demonstration of success stories, it is expected that these pilot projects will be leveraged to encourage the local government and other development partners to match similar numbers in the UCs and/or contribute to the project costs. Any infrastructure projects will be implemented only after an inclusive participatory prioritization process with communities, and thus the projects to be implemented will depend upon the outcomes of that decision-making exercise.

Where possible, LAs will also be integrated into the project planning to ensure that the decision-making process facilitated among COs/VOs/LSOs is in line with governmental standards; establishing cooperation between the LAs and communities will also serve as another step to build relationships between communities and authorities that will be necessary for sustained collaboration on development initiatives in the future.

Activity 3.3: Sharing of information about infrastructure projects with the JDDCs and LAs and consensus building on priority needs.

The final list of infrastructure projects will also be shared with the local government at

Tehsil and District level and in the meetings of JDDCs comprising of government officials and elected representatives. This will be done not only to inform the government about the ongoing progress, but also to avoid any duplication of efforts and in some cases to seek government support in further extension of these schemes and linking them up with the public sector infrastructure projects.

Activity 3.5: Approval by JDDC of the infrastructure projects.

For each of the targeted districts there will be JDDCs. These committees will be responsible for technical and compliance scrutiny, and ultimately, final selection of the projects for their respective District that will be recommended for funding as a result of feasibility process under activity 1.3.2. The committee will comprise of the BRSP District Managers and Officers, at least three LSO/VO/CO representatives from each Tehsil, representative of the LGRDD, GoB and where relevant representatives of the concerned GoB's Line Departments, and any other member as may be deemed necessary. Each CPI proposal will have to be presented and defended by the respective applicant who will be assisted by the BRSP's technical feasibility/survey staff. The respective BRSP's District Office will provide the necessary support to its respective JDDCs.

The criteria for selection of projects will be based on, i) relevance and urgency of the need identified, ii) equity considerations, iii) impact, iv) realistic budget, nature of intervention (i.e. assessment if the project will be manageable by the applicant community, and iv) sustainability of the project beyond the project life. BRSP will procure services and materials to design and implement the projects, undertake feasibility

studies, and monitor and ensure post project sustainability mechanisms are in place. If there are any flaws in the project design, it is sent back to HO for review and improvement.

Expected Result 8: Improved capacity of elected members, local government authorities' staff, and officials of the line departments to involve communities in planning, co-resourcing and managing local development activities:

Relevant Activities

To achieve this result BRSP will facilitate opportunities for structured exchanges between Local Governments (LGs) and communities in order to create mutual trust define local development priorities and concrete modalities enabling the involvement of communities at all stages of local development processes. This will start with engaging LGs and Local Authorities (LAs) in UCDPs process at UC level and then consolidating the UCDPs at district level for district development plans and strategies. In addition local government authorities' staff, and officials of the line departments will be sensitised, orientated and trained to involve communities in planning, co-resourcing and managing local development activities", BRSP will impart training and conduct exposure visits to enhance capacity of elected local council members at the Union Council, municipality and district level; In addition capacity building of local government authorities' staff will be done to involve communities in planning, co-resourcing and managing local development planning, execution and operation / maintenance of the development activities. The action also focuses on strengthening the capacities of local government/administration officials and elected representatives through learning

exposures to plan and supervise inclusive development with the involvement of organised communities at local levels. The capacity enhancement of elected members of local councils is linked to their roles and responsibilities under BLGA-2010, and subsequent local development policies of the Balochistan LG&RD department, their engagement with provincial institutions, line departments, communities, roles and responsibilities, devolution of PSDP funds, accountability for Public Sector Development Plan's (PSDP) development spending, reporting, etc. In short it is meant to develop the capacity of elected local councils to play their due role as expected of them to deliver improved public and social services delivery at grass root level. The Government of Balochistan's Rural Development Academy is mandated to build the capacities of the government staff and local bodies elected representative. This overall action will assist the Academy in playing a more effective and relevant role, in general, and more specifically in support of the policy framework for community-led development and community empowerment through introduction of specialised courses on social mobilisation and participative community-driven local development approaches, and for integrating such topics in its core civil servants' training curriculum. This will be achieved through developing linkages with European local government associations/networks and training institutions for tapping technical resources and capacity-building, providing technical inputs for designing course modules, introduction of new approaches to transfer of knowledge, providing support for production of manuals, organisation of exposure visits for the local government staff, elected local bodies representatives and community leaders.

Elaboration in DoA

Activity 8.1. Organise and facilitate stakeholder meetings/workshops to inform & update about UCs and District development plans and devise implementation strategies with ensuring accountability.

Output: 112 Advocacy workshops/joint communities – LA meetings held for mainstreaming development plans in Annual Development Plan (ADP) process.

In conflict-ridden societies, it is important that social mobilisation is an inclusive process. It builds cohesiveness and harmony within communities by focusing on the common denominators within the community. Stakeholders' workshops, negotiation and consensus building will be important elements of the social mobilisation strategy. As some stakeholders may not like to speak in the presence of others, workshops can be arranged over a period of time at different locations involving different groups. The important point is that everyone has been listened to, and his/her point of view incorporated into the planning process. These meetings will be needs based. The meetings/workshops will be held at tehsil and District levels. At the District level, it will include local government departments and line agencies, non-government organisations and the private sector. It will be a people-centered advocacy approach that will enable communities to interact with the stakeholders to give voice to their issues, and seek their buy-in for the model they will be part of through this intervention.

The programme will work with the COs, VO, LSOs, LSOs Networks and local government, to conduct assessments to identify and prioritise

community needs at three levels. This process will make use of a range of assessment tools including community mapping (to identify existing resources and gaps), and focus group discussions to triangulate information about community needs. Based on the inputs from activities under Result 1.1, each VO/LSO will be assisted to develop medium term VDPs, UCDP and District Development Plans (DDP) for a five-year period. Where possible, LAs will also be integrated into the project planning to ensure that the decision-making process facilitated among COs/VOs/LSOs is in line with governmental standards; establishing cooperation between the LAs and communities will also serve as another step to build relationships between communities and authorities that will be necessary for sustained collaboration on development initiatives in the future.

To apprise the GoB's Annual District Development Planning, and for resource mobilisation advocacy, relevant and effective service delivery mechanism, and to serve as a joint social-accountability framework following set of activities will be undertaken to achieve the result and contribute to the overall objective of the programme:

- BRSP will facilitate and support organizing advocacy workshops at district and tehsil level. The VOs and LSOs will lead the process and all stakeholders will be invited to participate in these events to discuss the already prepared VDPs and UCDPs under below activity 1.3.1.
- Elected representatives from the area will be sensitized and made aware of the project interventions and efforts will be

made to integrate the VDPs and UCDPs into district development strategy and action plans. This forum will help communities voice their rights and influence pro-poor policies and development. It will also be recognition of their achievements. Moreover, the events will provide visibility to the model and facilitate the buy-in of government and other stakeholders.

Activity 8.2. Deliver training on Balochistan Local Government Act (BLGA) 2010 to elected representatives of local governments.

Output: 2500 elected representatives trained or oriented on BLGA-2010 in target districts.

District Master Trainers already trained under BCDP will impart the training to the local council members at provincial, designated district cluster/divisional and or district level. The training will have tentatively the following themes and it will be 2-3 days duration.

- Overview of Local Government Concept, Constitutional protection and legal framework as provided under the BLGA 2010;
- Definitions and composition of local area and constitution of local governments under Balochistan LGA;
- Three tier Local Government system, Union Council, Municipal Committees and Corporations and District/City District Government and Council;
- Powers and Functions of different Tiers of Local Government;
- Introduction to area-based participatory planning;

Activity 8.3. Deliver training on planning and development to UC Secretaries, Development Officers, Assistant Directors and Chief Officers of staff of LGRDD

Output: 200 participants trained in 10 events of 5 days each at provincial, cluster, division or district level.

A training of all mentioned cadre of staff of LGRDD in target districts will be imparted training on planning and development in light of BLGA 2010.

- Introduction to Balochistan Public Sector Development Programme (PSDP)
- Local Councils Grants Committee and Fiscal Transfer (Composition and functions of LCGC);
- Budget preparation and Understanding Local Revenue Generation Schedule;
- Legal proceedings of introducing/ adjusting local revenues; Collection of local revenues;
- Public Financial Management and Taxation; (Local Funds; Public Accounts; Budgeting; Auditing);
- Planning and development processes and procedures.

Activity 8.4. Deliver training of elected Chairman and Vice Chairman on Local Government Finance and Budgets, and Finance and Accounts.

Output: 300 participants trained in 15 events of 2 days each at provincial, cluster, division or district level.

A training of all elected Chairmen, Vice Chairmen of all three tiers of local government system will be imparted said training and the following thematic areas will be covered

under this category of training:

- Introduction to Balochistan Public Sector Development Programme (PSDP)
- Local Councils Grants Committee and Fiscal Transfer (Composition and functions of LCGC);
- Budget preparation and Understanding Local Revenue Generation Schedule;
- Legal proceedings of introducing/ adjusting local revenues; Collection of local revenues;
- Public Financial Management and Taxation; (Local Funds; Public Accounts; Budgeting; Auditing);

Activity 8.5. Deliver training of Chairman and Vice Chairman on planning and development under BLGA 2010.

Output: 300 participants trained in 15 events of 2 days each at provincial, cluster, division or district level.

Building capacity of elected local bodies particularly that of Chairman, Vice Chairman to plan and manage development is considered one of the major requirements for good local governance and local development in Balochistan and Pakistan. Elected local councils chairman and vice chairman will be imparted training to enhance their capacity on planning and development. The following thematic areas will be covered under this category of training:

- Local Government Development Strategies and Development Plans and needs prioritization
- Development Vision, approval forums and procedure for development schemes under the BLGA 2010

- Participatory development practices
- Role and mandate of Local Government Commission
- Relations between the Government and local governments
- Supervision of Local Governments;
- Provincial Framework for local governments

Activity 8.6. Deliver training of Chairman and Vice Chairman on Local Government General Powers and Enforcement, Rules, Bylaws and Procedures.

Output: 300 participants trained in 15 events of 2 days each at provincial, cluster, division or district level.

It is of utmost importance that elected local council members are aware of their general powers so that they can play their due role and responsibilities entrusted upon them. This training will enhance their understanding

and knowledge regarding their main roles and responsibilities besides other functions expected of them. The training sessions will cover the following important thematic areas and will enhance the knowledge, understanding and skills of target members:

- Rules of Business and other rules
- Bye-laws
- Government instructions, notifications and circulates
- Guidelines and planning manuals
- Revenue and Patwar System and the role of local government representatives,
- Local Government General Powers and Enforcement
- Anti-Encroachment rules and procedure
- Implementation of municipal laws

Annex 3: Overview of Linkages Forged by Local Support Organisations, as Reported in RSPN Study, 2021

Source: Azizi, Mohammad Ali; Shahzad, Khurram; and Achakzai, Akbar Khan. 2021. The Power of Social Capital: A Report on Local Support Organisations (LSOs) Fostering Development Linkages with Government and Non-Government Agencies in the BRACE Programme Districts of BRSP. Islamabad: RSPN, April 2021.

Table 10: Estimated value of funds accessed by local support organisations in the shape of physical infrastructure, by contributing institution (based on RSPN report)

Contributing Institutions and Actors	Estimated Value (PKR mn)	Share in Total
Elected Representatives		30%
Chief Minister's Funds	110.0	8%
Members of National/Provincial Assemblies	257.7	19%
Elected Local Body Representatives	40.9	3%
Government of Balochistan		50%
Government of Balochistan	54.7	4%
Health Department	257.1	19%
Education Department	190.6	14%
Buildings and Roads Department	37.1	3%
Agriculture Department	14.8	1%
Energy Department	1.7	0%
Irrigation Department	97.4	7%
Local Government and Rural Development Department	27.3	2%
Federal Government		3%
Water and Power Development Authority	43.0	3%
United Nations Agencies		5%
WFP, FAO, UNICEF	63.2	5%
Non-Profit Organisations		8%
BRSP	67.6	5%
Non-governmental Organisations	39.9	3%
Others		3%
Community Self-Help	27.7	2%
Others	13.9	1%
Grand Total	1,344.6	100%

Table 11: Estimated value of funds accessed by local support organisations in the shape of physical infrastructure, by sector (based on RSPN report)

Sector	Total Beneficiaries	Share in Total	Estimated Value (PKR mn)	Share in Total	Rank	PKR per Beneficiary
Agriculture/Livestock	52,411	8%	227.9	17%	2	4,347
Communication Infrastructure	86,547	13%	156.2	12%	4	1,805
Community/Village Development	51,785	8%	68.5	5%	6	1,323
Drinking Water	222,820	33%	253.0	19%	7	1,135
Education	31,533	5%	290.4	22%	1	9,209
Electricity	31,803	5%	46.6	3%	5	1,464
Environment/Climate Change	84,663	13%	254.8	19%	3	3,009
Health	113,787	17%	47.2	4%	8	415
Grand Total	675,349	100%	1,344.6	100%		1,991

Table 12: Estimated value of funds accessed by local support organisations in the shape of physical infrastructure, by district (based on RSPN report)

Division and District	No. of LSOs	Male Beneficiaries	Female Beneficiaries	Total Beneficiaries	Share in Total	Est. Value (PKR mn)	Share in Total	PKR per Beneficiary
Makran								
Kech		Information not available						
Kalat								
Khuzdar	22	172,582	76,054	248,636	37%	379.2	28%	1,525
Washuk	4	6,182	5,170	11,352	2%	65.0	5%	5,729
Nasirabad								
Jhal Magsi	5	3,967	5,335	9,302	1%	3.1	0%	337
Quetta								
Pishin	11	43,320	52,708	96,028	14%	238.5	18%	2,484
Killa Abdullah	8	12,316	11,199	23,515	3%	89.7	7%	3,815
Zhob								
Loralai	6	73,701	111,860	185,561	27%	87.0	6%	469
Duki	4	12,600	11,512	24,112	4%	88.7	7%	3,679
Zhob	21	44,717	32,126	76,843	11%	393.3	29%	5,118
Grand Total	84	369,385	305,964	675,349	100%	1,344.6	100%	1,991

Table 13: Estimated value of funds accessed by local support organisations in the form of cash and services, by sector (based on RSPN report)

Sector	Male Beneficiaries	Female Beneficiaries	Total Beneficiaries	Share in Total	Est. Value (PKR mn)	Share in Total
Adolescent and Youth Development	7,208	150	7,358	2%	1.2	2%
Civil Registration and Entitlements	26,856	28,725	55,581	13%	0.6	1%
COVID-19 Awareness	77,135	60,168	137,303	33%	0.8	1%
Disaster Risk Management	2,664	2,663	5,327	1%	-	
Education	9,455	5,777	15,232	4%	0.1	0%
Health	54,916	60,136	115,052	27%	0.0	0%
Natural Resource Management	23,117	8,390	31,507	8%	0.1	0%
Peace and Pluralism	2,372	2,236	4,608	1%	0.0	0%
Social Protection	21,656	26,147	47,803	11%	53.5	95%
Total	225,378	194,392	419,771	100%	56.2	100%

Table 14: Estimated value of funds accessed by local support organisations in the form of cash and services, by district (based on RSPN report)

Division and District	No. of LSOs	Male Beneficiaries	Female Beneficiaries	Total Beneficiaries	Share in Total	Est. Value (PKR mn)	Share in Total	PKR per Beneficiary
Makran								
Kech	Information not available							
Kalat								
Khuzdar	22	60,120	48,735	108,855	26%	12.6	22%	115
Washuk	4	3,360	3,492	6,852	2%	-	0%	
Nasirabad								
Jhal Magsi	8	33,004	24,900	57,904	14%	0.6	1%	10
Quetta								
Pishin	11	15,492	15,188	30,680	7%	5.8	10%	191
Killa Abdullah	8	13,040	12,921	25,961	6%	14.0	25%	541
Zhob								
Loralai	9	48,194	25,881	74,076	18%	17.5	31%	236
Duki	2	3,199	3,573	6,772	2%	5.7	10%	840
Zhob	23	48,969	59,702	108,671	26%	-	0%	
Total	87	225,378	194,392	419,771	100%	56.2	100%	134

Annex 4: Questions, Sub-questions and Sources of Information for the Study

Key Questions and Sub-questions Based on the Terms of Reference	Secondary Information		Primary Data			
	BRACE PIM and Other Reports ⁴⁴	Data from RSPN Linkages Report	Quantitative	Qualitative Methods		
			Household Sample Survey	Key Informant Interviews ⁴⁵	Group Interviews ⁴⁶	Focus Group Discussions ⁴⁷
Key Question 1: How do the community institutions [CIs] – village organisations [VOs] and local support organisations [LSOs] – decide on engaging institutions other than the BRACE IPs to help them? To what extent is this inclusive and transparent?						

44. "Other reports" include the progress reports of the IPs, the reports of the external monitoring mission and mid-term review, and special studies commissioned by the IPs.

45. Key informant interviews are individual interviews.

46. Group interviews included 2-5 individuals at one time.

47. Each focus group discussion (FGD) included 7-12 individuals.

Key Questions and Sub-questions Based on the Terms of Reference	Secondary Information		Primary Data			
	BRACE PIM and Other Reports ⁴⁴	Data from RSPN Linkages Report	Quantitative	Qualitative Methods		
			Household Sample Survey	Key Informant Interviews ⁴⁵	Group Interviews ⁴⁶	Focus Group Discussions ⁴⁷
1.1. How do VO and LSOs identify local development needs? To what extent are their ideas coming from felt need, group discussions, community awareness toolkit (CAT) sessions, various forms of media, and other sources?	✓	✓		LSO leaders		
1.2. Through what process do VO and LSOs decide local priorities and prepare VDPs, UCDPs and other initiatives? How long does the process last and how frequently and where do interactions take place?	✓					
1.3. To what extent are proceedings and decisions documented? Is documentation open to inspection by community members and BRACE staff? How frequently is it actually inspected and what kind of interaction takes place for this purpose?	✓					
1.4. In what ways are women consulted in these processes and their priorities reflected in the VDPs and UCDPs? What obstacles do they face, how do they aim to overcome them, and with what result?	✓					

Key Questions and Sub-questions Based on the Terms of Reference	Secondary Information		Primary Data			
	BRACE PIM and Other Reports ⁴⁴	Data from RSPN Linkages Report	Quantitative	Qualitative Methods		
			Household Sample Survey	Key Informant Interviews ⁴⁵	Group Interviews ⁴⁶	Focus Group Discussions ⁴⁷
Key Question 2: How do the CIs engage with potential contributors to local development, particularly state actors (including elected representatives and federal and provincial government organisations)? To what extent are the potential contributors responsive, and what factors influence this?						

Key Questions and Sub-questions Based on the Terms of Reference	Secondary Information		Primary Data			
	BRACE PIM and Other Reports ⁴⁴	Data from RSPN Linkages Report	Quantitative	Qualitative Methods		
			Household Sample Survey	Key Informant Interviews ⁴⁵	Group Interviews ⁴⁶	Focus Group Discussions ⁴⁷
1.1. To what extent and how frequently do the CIs present their plans to joint development committees (JDCs) at the district and tehsil levels? What kind of responses have they got from the JDCs? Where have these responses led them?	✓			JDC members, government officials, LSO leaders and TA Team members		
1.2. To what extent and how frequently do the CIs present their plans to other platforms for engaging state actors? What kind of responses have they got from these platforms? Where have these responses led them?	✓					
1.3. What factors explain the degree of responsiveness of the JDCs and other platforms at which the CIs present their local priorities? To what extent are these factors related to the policies of the institutions and the interests of the actors represented in these platforms?	✓					
1.4. What steps have BRACE (including the TA Team) and the CIs taken to influence the responsiveness of the JDCs and other platforms and the institutional policies they follow? To what effect? What factors have facilitated and inhibited change?	✓					

Key Questions and Sub-questions Based on the Terms of Reference	Secondary Information		Primary Data			
	BRACE PIM and Other Reports ⁴⁴	Data from RSPN Linkages Report	Quantitative	Qualitative Methods		
			Household Sample Survey	Key Informant Interviews ⁴⁵	Group Interviews ⁴⁶	Focus Group Discussions ⁴⁷
Key Question 3: What kind of assistance has citizen-state engagement brought into the communities (e.g., physical infrastructure, cash and services)? To what extent does this match community perceptions of the need for engaging with external institutions?						
1.1. What is the pattern of community perceptions of the need for engaging with external institutions for their wellbeing? In what ways do these perceptions differ between CO members and non-members, women and men, and the poor and non-poor?			✓			
1.2. What is the observed pattern of linkages in terms of the institutions and actors that have contributed to the wellbeing of the communities? To what extent is it consistent with community perceptions of the need for engaging with external institutions?		✓	✓			

Key Questions and Sub-questions Based on the Terms of Reference	Secondary Information		Primary Data			
	BRACE PIM and Other Reports ⁴⁴	Data from RSPN Linkages Report	Quantitative	Qualitative Methods		
			Household Sample Survey	Key Informant Interviews ⁴⁵	Group Interviews ⁴⁶	Focus Group Discussions ⁴⁷
1.3. What evidence is available on the quantum of resources brought into the communities and the number of beneficiaries of linkages (CO members and non-members, women and men, poor and non-poor)?		✓				
1.4. To what extent do community members (women and men, poor and non-poor) recognise the role of the CIs in the citizen-state initiatives observed in their communities?			✓			

Key Questions and Sub-questions Based on the Terms of Reference	Secondary Information		Primary Data			
	BRACE PIM and Other Reports ⁴⁴	Data from RSPN Linkages Report	Quantitative	Qualitative Methods		
			Household Sample Survey	Key Informant Interviews ⁴⁵	Group Interviews ⁴⁶	Focus Group Discussions ⁴⁷
Key Question 4: How successfully have the BRACE IPs, CIs and government institutions generated synergy ⁴⁸ through citizen-state engagement, ⁴⁹ and what could be done to further enhance it? ⁵⁰						

48. According to the Collins English Dictionary (available at <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/synergy>), "If there is synergy between two or more organisations or groups, they are more successful when they work together than when they work separately."

49. The expectations associated with citizen-state engagement are described in the BRACE Action Document (Section 4.2, expected results 1, 2, 3 and 8 of strategic objective 1, and expected results 1, 2 and 3 of strategic objective 2) and elaborated in the BRACE Programme Implementation Manual (available at <http://www.rspn.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/PIM-for-BRACE-English-4.1-V.pdf>), sections 1.3.17, 1.3.18 and 2.1 to 2.4. They are also reflected in proposals developed by the TA Team for discussion with GoB pursuant to strategic objective 2.

50. "Enhance" means "to improve the quality, amount or strength of something" (Cambridge English Dictionary, available at <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/enhance>).

Key Questions and Sub-questions Based on the Terms of Reference	Secondary Information		Primary Data			
	BRACE PIM and Other Reports ⁴⁴	Data from RSPN Linkages Report	Quantitative	Qualitative Methods		
			Household Sample Survey	Key Informant Interviews ⁴⁵	Group Interviews ⁴⁶	Focus Group Discussions ⁴⁷
1.1. How effectively have the CIs articulated local needs to potential contributors to community wellbeing (other than BRACE)? What factors have facilitated or hindered them?	Answers to key questions 1, 2 and 3 and associates sub-questions					
1.2. To what extent have the JDCs and other supply-side platforms responded to the needs articulated by the CIs? What factors have facilitated or hindered them?						
1.3. What measures taken by the CIs, BRACE IPs and other stakeholders have led to improved citizen-state engagement over time? Is this engagement sustainable where it should be? Why?						
1.4. Based on this assessment as well as evidence from elsewhere, what can be done to enhance citizen-state engagement for the wellbeing of the people, particularly women and the poor?						

Annex 5: Instrument for Qualitative Data Collection

Key Questions, Sub-questions and Instrument Questions ↓	Interactions →	KIIs and Group Interviews						FGDs with LSO General Bodies
		Provincial Elected Representatives	District-level Leaders	RSP Managers	TA Team	Government Officers	Male and Female CRPs	
Key Question 1: How do the community institutions (CIs) – village organisations (VOs) and local support organisations (LSOs) – decide on engaging institutions other than the BRACE IPs to help them? To what extent is this inclusive and transparent?								
1.1. How do VOs and LSOs identify local development needs? To what extent are their ideas coming from felt need, group discussions, community awareness toolkit (CAT) sessions, various forms of media, and other sources?				✓			✓	✓
1. How do community members become aware of their development needs? [Prompts: from family members; community gatherings; radio/TV; and social media; elders and elected leaders; CIs; government officials]				✓			✓	✓
2. How do community members find out about the opportunities for assistance from the government? [Prompts: from family members; community gatherings; radio/TV; and social media; elders and elected leaders; CIs; government officials]				✓			✓	✓

Key Questions, Sub-questions and Instrument Questions ↓	Interactions →	KIIs and Group Interviews						FGDs with LSO General Bodies
		Provincial Elected Representatives	District-level Leaders	RSP Managers	TA Team	Government Officers	Male and Female CRPs	
1.1. Through what process do VOs and LSOs decide local priorities and prepare VDPs, UCDPs and other initiatives? How long does the process last and how frequently and where do interactions take place?				✓			✓	✓
3. How do community members decide their priorities for self-help and external assistance? [Prompts: in informal community meetings; meetings of COs, VOs and/or LSOs; meetings with traditional leaders, government officials and/or other state actors]				✓			✓	✓
4. For each platform identified above, what are the steps in the process, how frequent is the interaction, where does it take place, and how long does the process take?				✓			✓	✓
1.2. To what extent are proceedings and decisions documented? Is documentation open to inspection by community members and BRACE staff? How frequently is it actually inspected and what kind of interaction takes place for this purpose?				✓			✓	✓
5. In each of the processes described above, who is responsible for writing down the proceedings and decisions? What is their position and location, and to whom are they responsible?				✓			✓	✓

Key Questions, Sub-questions and Instrument Questions ↓	Interactions →	KIIs and Group Interviews						FGDs with LSO General Bodies
		Provincial Elected Representatives	District-level Leaders	RSP Managers	TA Team	Government Officers	Male and Female CRPs	
6. If documentation is reportedly done, who is there to look at it? Where, how often and in whose presence?				✓			✓	✓
1.3. In what ways are women consulted in these processes and their priorities reflected in the VDPs and UCDPs? What obstacles do they face, how do they aim to overcome them, and with what result?				✓			✓	✓
7. How are women from the community involved in deciding priorities, documenting proceedings and decisions, and inspecting the documentation? Who are these women and how actively and frequently are they involved in these processes?				✓			✓	✓
8. Who from the community or outside the community helps these women in the processes mentioned above, and how? Who tries to obstruct or control their involvement, and how?				✓			✓	✓
Key Question 2: How do the CIs engage with potential contributors to local development, particularly state actors (including elected representatives and federal and provincial government organisations)? To what extent are the potential contributors responsive, and what factors influence this?								

Key Questions, Sub-questions and Instrument Questions ↓	Interactions →	KIIs and Group Interviews						FGDs with LSO General Bodies
		Provincial Elected Representatives	District-level Leaders	RSP Managers	TA Team	Government Officers	Male and Female CRPs	
1.1. To what extent and how frequently do the CIs present their plans to joint development committees (JDCs) at the district and tehsil levels? What kind of responses have they got from the JDCs? Where have these responses led them?				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
9. How many tehsil and district JDC meetings have VO and/or LSO representatives attended in each tehsil and district? Who chaired these meetings?				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
10. What did the VO/LSO representatives say and present at their meetings?				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11. What kind of responses did the VO/LSO representatives get from the chair and other members of the JDCs? Please share JDC minutes and the plans and proposals discussed at the JDC meetings.				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
12. What actions were observed in relation to the decisions taken in the JDCs? What projects or concrete assistance (not promises) did the communities receive as a result of JDC decisions?				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1.2. To what extent and how frequently do the CIs present their plans to other platforms for engaging state actors? What kind of responses have they got from these platforms? Where have these responses led them?				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Key Questions, Sub-questions and Instrument Questions ↓	Interactions →	KIIs and Group Interviews						FGDs with LSO General Bodies
		Provincial Elected Representatives	District-level Leaders	RSP Managers	TA Team	Government Officers	Male and Female CRPs	
13. How many other meetings have VO and/or LSO representatives attended with state actors? Who chaired these meetings?		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
14. What did the VO/LSO representatives say and present at their meetings?		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
15. What kind of responses did the VO/LSO representatives get from these meetings? Please share the minutes and the plans and proposals discussed at these meetings.		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
16. What actions were observed in relation to the decisions taken in these meetings? What projects or concrete assistance (not promises) did the communities receive as a result of these decisions?		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1.3. What factors explain the degree of responsiveness of the JDCs and other platforms at which the CIs present their local priorities? To what extent are these factors related to the policies of the institutions and the interests of the actors represented in these platforms?		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
17. Considering the answers above, to what extent have the JDCs ensured the delivery of goods and services for the priorities identified by the VOs and LSOs?		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Key Questions, Sub-questions and Instrument Questions ↓	Interactions →	KIIs and Group Interviews						FGDs with LSO General Bodies
		Provincial Elected Representatives	District-level Leaders	RSP Managers	TA Team	Government Officers	Male and Female CRPs	
18. Considering the answers above, to what extent have the other platforms ensured the delivery of goods and services for the priorities identified by the VOs and LSOs?		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
19. What factors explain your assessment of JDCs and other platforms? [Prompts: policies, resources, level of interest of state actors and community representatives]		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1.4. What steps have BRACE (including the TA Team) and the CIs taken to influence the responsiveness of the JDCs and other platforms and the institutional policies they follow? To what effect? What factors have facilitated and inhibited change?		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
20. What steps have been taken by those responsible to influence the responsiveness of JDCs to community priorities?		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
21. What were the results in terms of goods and services provided to the communities?		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
22. What kind of factors are responsible for these results?		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
23. What steps have been taken by those responsible to influence the responsiveness of other platforms to community priorities?		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Key Questions, Sub-questions and Instrument Questions ↓	Interactions →	KIIs and Group Interviews						FGDs with LSO General Bodies
		Provincial Elected Representatives	District-level Leaders	RSP Managers	TA Team	Government Officers	Male and Female CRPs	
24. What were the results in terms of goods and services provided to the communities?		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
25. What kind of factors are responsible for these results?		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Key Question 3: What kind of assistance has citizen-state engagement brought into the communities (e.g., physical infrastructure, cash and services)? To what extent does this match community perceptions of the need for engaging with external institutions?								
1.1. What is the pattern of community perceptions of the need for engaging with external institutions for their wellbeing? In what ways do these perceptions differ between CO members and non-members, women and men, and the poor and non-poor?		To be addressed only through the sample survey						
1.2. What is the observed pattern of linkages in terms of the institutions and actors that have contributed to the wellbeing of the communities? To what extent is it consistent with community perceptions of the need for engaging with external institutions?							✓	✓
26. Which state institutions and actors try to help the communities the most? Which ones are generally not interested?							✓	✓

Key Questions, Sub-questions and Instrument Questions ↓	Interactions →	KIIs and Group Interviews						FGDs with LSO General Bodies
		Provincial Elected Representatives	District-level Leaders	RSP Managers	TA Team	Government Officers	Male and Female CRPs	
27. In which areas are there major gaps between what the communities need and what the state delivers?							✓	✓
1.3. What evidence is available on the quantum of resources brought into the communities and the number of beneficiaries of linkages (CO members and non-members, women and men, poor and non-poor)?							✓	✓
28. What amount of money has come to the communities through linkages between CIs and the state?							✓	✓
29. How many households (including CO members, non-members, women, poor) have benefitted?							✓	✓
1.4. To what extent do community members (women and men, poor and non-poor) recognise the role of the CIs in the citizen-state initiatives observed in their communities?	To be addressed only through the sample survey							

Annex 6: Survey Questionnaire

Q1	Type of Survey	1. CO Member 2. Non CO Member
Q2	District	1. Kech 2. Khuzdar 3. Loralai 4. Zhob
Q3	UC Name / LSO Name	1. Nodiz / Meerani 2. Solband / Shooma 3. Sharak / Gechein 4. Khuddan / Rashon 5. Turbat / Khairabad 6. Abi Noghey / Gawarikh 7. Baghbana 2 / Baghbana 8. Baghbana 3 / Samban 9. Loghorzad / Loghorzad 10. Abad Karkh / Gidan 11. Ponga / Mushtrika 12. Aghberg / Wattan 13. Nasar Abad 1 / Sabawoon 14. Thora Thana / Kakar 15. Zara / Khushal 16. Hassan Zai / Hassan Zai 17. Garda Babar / Garda Babar 18. Ghundai Sleman Zai / Itihad NaoJawan Ghundai 19. Barak Walla / Khushal Barak Walla 20. Mir Ali Khail / Sangey Ghar
Q4	CO Name	
Q5	Respondent's Name	
Q6	Respondent's Father's Name	
Q7	Respondent's Gender	1. Male 2. Female 3. Transgender
Q8	Respondent's CNIC	
Q9	Respondent's Contact Number	
Q10	Respondent's Age [in completed years]	
Q11	Respondent's Marital Status	1. Unmarried 2. Currently Married 3. Divorced/Separated 4. Widow 5. Other (Specify)

<p>Q12</p>	<p>Respondent's highest level of formal education completed</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completely illiterate 2. No formal education but can read 3. Below primary 4. Primary 5. Middle 6. Matric 7. Dars-e-Aama 8. Intermediate 9. Dars-e-Khasa 10. Undergraduate 11. Dars-e-Aalia 12. Graduate or above 13. Dars-e-Alema 14. Other (Specify)
<p>Q13</p>	<p>Is the respondent head of the household?</p> <p>Household: A household is a group of persons (relatives or non-relatives) who normally live and eat together under common cooking arrangements and have no other usual place of residence elsewhere and consider the same person as head of household.</p> <p>Head of Household: Head of the household is the person who usually lives in the respective household and all the household members consider him/her as the head of household.</p> <p>This person may be acknowledged as the head based on age (older), sex (generally, but not necessarily, male), economic status (main provider), or some other reason.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. No
<p>Q14</p>	<p>What is your employment status?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not part of labour force and not looking for work 2. Unemployed and looking for work 3. Government/semi-government employee 4. Regular paid employee, private sector 5. Seasonal paid employee / day labourer (agriculture) 6. Seasonal paid employee/ day labourer (non-agriculture) 7. Self-employed, non-agriculture 8. Self-employed, agriculture: own cultivator, sharecropper/ livestock or contract cultivator 9. Unpaid family worker /contributing family helper 10. Employer 11. Others

Q15.A	What is your household's average combined income from all revenue sources? [Note: This refers to the combined earnings from all employed members of the household]	
Q15.B	What is your household's poverty score card number, as estimated in the 2017-18 survey by BRSP/NRSP?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PSC 0-11 2. PSC 12-18 3. PSC 19-23 4. PSC 24-100 5. Do not know

Q16: Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.

[Do not prompt/do not read the options] [Multiple options possible].

Sector	Institution/Elected Representative	Tick if identified
Civil Administration	AC/DC/Commissioner	
	Police	
	Courts	
Elected Representatives	Senator	
	MNA	
	MPA	
	District or Municipal Councillor	
	UC Councillor	

Sector	Institution/Elected Representative	Tick if identified
Provincial Line Departments - Social Sector	Education - Primary and secondary education	
	Education - Higher Education	
	Education - Polytechnic Education	
	Health - EPI and preventive healthcare	
	Health - Basic Health Units	
	Health - Secondary Healthcare (THQ/DHQ hospitals)	
	Health - Rehabilitation Services	
	Drinking Water – Public Health Engineering	
	Drinking Water – LG&RDD	
	Social Welfare	
	Women Development	
	Population Welfare	
Provincial Line Departments - Infrastructure	LG&RDD	
	Communication	
	Physical Planning and Housing	
	Power – Electricity	
	Power – Gas	
	Urban Planning and Development	
	Union Council	
Provincial Line Departments - Agriculture and Natural Resources	Agriculture	
	Irrigation	
	Livestock	
	Forestry	
	Fisheries	
Provincial Line Departments - Other Productive Sectors	Industries	
	Manpower	
	Minerals	
	Food and Tourism	

Sector	Institution/Elected Representative	Tick if identified
Provincial Line Departments - Other Sectors	Environment	
	Sports	
	Information Technology	
	Culture	
	Others (please specify)	
Federal Organisations/ Programmes	NADRA	
	Ehsaas/BISP	
	Election Commission of Pakistan	
Commercial Institutions	Banks	
	Other For-profit Companies/Entities	
	Shopkeepers	
	Moneylenders	
	Middlemen	
Non-Profit Organisations	BRSP	
	CO, VO or LSO	
	Others (please specify)	

Q17: Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative has done something useful for you or other members of your household? In which year?

[Multiple options possible].

Sector	Institution/Elected Representative	Tick if identified	Year
Civil Administration	AC/DC/Commissioner		
	Police		
	Courts		
Elected Representatives	Senator		
	MNA		
	MPA		
	District or Municipal Councillor		
	UC Councillor		

Sector	Institution/Elected Representative	Tick if identified	Year
Provincial Line Departments - Social Sector	Education - Primary and secondary education		
	Education - Higher Education		
	Education - Polytechnic Education		
	Health - EPI and preventive healthcare		
	Health - Basic Health Units		
	Health - Secondary Healthcare (THQ/DHQ hospitals)		
	Health - Rehabilitation Services		
	Drinking Water – Public Health Engineering		
	Drinking Water – LG&RDD		
	Social Welfare		
	Women Development		
	Population Welfare		
Provincial Line Departments - Infrastructure	LG&RDD		
	Communication		
	Physical Planning and Housing		
	Power – Electricity		
	Power – Gas		
	Urban Planning and Development		
	Union Council		
Provincial Line Departments - Agriculture and Natural Resources	Agriculture		
	Irrigation		
	Livestock		
	Forestry		
	Fisheries		
Provincial Line Departments - Other Productive Sectors	Industries		
	Manpower		
	Minerals		
	Food and Tourism		

Sector	Institution/Elected Representative	Tick if identified	Year
Provincial Line Departments - Other Sectors	Environment		
	Sports		
	Information Technology		
	Culture		
	Others (please specify)		
Federal Organisations/ Programmes	NADRA		
	Ehsaas/BISP		
	Election Commission of Pakistan		
Commercial Institutions	Banks		
	Other For-profit Companies/Entities		
	Shopkeepers		
	Moneylenders		
	Middlemen		
Non-Profit Organisations	BRSP		
	CO, VO or LSO		
	Others (please specify)		
None [No other option can be selected with this option]			

Q18: Since 2018 (when BRACE started), do you think your CO, VO or LSO had a role in linking these departments (listed in response to Q17) with you or your village/community?

[Ask this question from only CO Members]

Sector	Institution/Elected Representative	Yes	No	Not Sure
Civil Administration	AC/DC/Commissioner			
	Police			
	Courts			

Sector	Institution/Elected Representative	Yes	No	Not Sure
Elected Representatives	Senator			
	MNA			
	MPA			
	District or Municipal Councillor			
	UC Councillor			
Provincial Line Departments - Social Sector	Education - Primary and secondary education			
	Education - Higher Education			
	Education - Polytechnic Education			
	Health - EPI and preventive healthcare			
	Health - Basic Health Units			
	Health - Secondary Healthcare (THQ/DHQ hospitals)			
	Health - Rehabilitation Services			
	Drinking Water – Public Health Engineering			
	Drinking Water – LG&RDD			
	Social Welfare			
	Women Development			
	Population Welfare			
Provincial Line Departments - Infrastructure	LG&RDD			
	Communication			
	Physical Planning and Housing			
	Power – Electricity			
	Power – Gas			
	Urban Planning and Development			
	Union Council			

Sector	Institution/Elected Representative	Yes	No	Not Sure
Provincial Line Departments - Agriculture and Natural Resources	Agriculture			
	Irrigation			
	Livestock			
	Forestry			
	Fisheries			
Provincial Line Departments - Other Productive Sectors	Industries			
	Manpower			
	Minerals			
	Food and Tourism			
Provincial Line Departments - Other Sectors	Environment			
	Sports			
	Information Technology			
	Culture			
	Others (please specify)			
Federal Organisations/ Programmes	NADRA			
	Ehsaas/BISP			
	Election Commission of Pakistan			
Commercial Institutions	Banks			
	Other For-profit Companies/Entities			
	Shopkeepers			
	Moneylenders			
	Middlemen			
Non-Profit Organisations	BRSP			
	CO, VO or LSO			
	Others (please specify)			

Q19: If answer to Q18 is yes, what kind of services were accessed through linkages with these departments thorough CO, VO, LSO?

[Options separated by commas in the last column to be treated as separate options and should be designed accordingly in application; Multiple options possible]

Sector	Institution/Elected Representative	Services
Civil Administration	AC/DC/Commissioner	Text box for entry
	Police	Text box for entry
	Courts	Text box for entry
Elected Representatives	Senator	Text box for entry
	MNA	Text box for entry
	MPA	Text box for entry
	District or Municipal Councillor	Text box for entry
	UC Councillor	Text box for entry
Provincial Line Departments - Social Sector	Education - Primary and secondary education	Construction, Provision Of Missing Facilities, Enrolment Campaign, Staff Appointment
	Education - Higher Education	Construction, Provision Of Missing Facilities, Scholarships, Staff Appointment
	Education - Polytechnic Education	Construction, Provision Of Missing Facilities, Scholarships, Staff Appointment
	Health - EPI and preventive healthcare	Child Vaccination, Polio Vacc., Covid-19 Vacc.
	Health - Basic Health Units	Construction, Provision Of Missing Facilities, Staff Appointment, Immunization Campaign, Basic Healthcare
	Health - Secondary Healthcare (THQ/DHQ hospitals)	Construction, Provision Of Missing Facilities, Staff Appointment, Healthcare
	Health - Rehabilitation Services	Construction, Rehabilitation, Staff Appointment, Rehab. Services
	Drinking Water – Public Health Engineering	Construction Of WS Scheme, Rehabilitation
	Drinking Water – LG&RDD	Construction Of WS Scheme, Rehabilitation
	Social Welfare	Child Welfare, Women Welfare, Disabled And Elderly Welfare, Vocational Training, ALNS, Correctional Services
	Women Development	Awareness, Day-Care, Hostels, Scholarships, Skills Training
	Population Welfare	Family Planning Services, Maternal And Childcare Services, Infertility Treatment

Sector	Institution/Elected Representative	Services
Provincial Line Departments - Infrastructure	LG&RDD	Maintenance Of Water Supply, Sanitation, Sewerage, Waste Management, Parks, Pavements, Community Welfare
	Communication	Construction/Maintenance Of Roads, Bridges,
	Physical Planning and Housing	Construction Of Housing, Parks, Water Supply Schemes
	Power – Electricity	Installation Of Poles, Transformers, Electrification
	Power – Gas	Pipelines, Gas Supply
	Urban Planning and Development	Land Use Planning, Mass Transit, Infrastructure Planning And Development
	Union Council	Birth Registration, Marriage Registration, Death Registration
Provincial Line Departments - Agriculture and Natural Resources	Agriculture	Pest Control, Subsidized Seeds, Agri. Inputs, Provision Of Equipment, Awareness
	Irrigation	Construction And Maintenance Of Irrigation Channels, Karez, Tube Wells,
	Livestock	Livestock And Dairy Development, Vaccination, Veterinarian Services, Capacity Building Of Farmers
	Forestry	Management Of Rangeland And Forests, Soil Conservation, Watershed Development
	Fisheries	Fisheries Development, Disease Control, Veterinarian Services, Capacity Building Of Farmers
Provincial Line Departments - Other Productive Sectors	Industries	Setting Up Of New Industry, SME Development Including Local Crafts, Facilitation Of Exports, Loans To Business
	Manpower	Labour Related Protection Services, Safety Training, Scholarships And Endowment Funds, Capacity Building Programmes
	Minerals	Exploration And Development Of Minerals, Mine Worker Welfare Schemes,
	Food and Tourism	Tourist Facilities, Food Regulation And Control

Sector	Institution/Elected Representative	Services
Provincial Line Departments - Other Sectors	Environment	Tree Plantation, Land Use, Pollution Control, Disaster Preparedness Training And Facilities
	Sports	Construction Of Sports Facilities, Sports Events, Stipends And Travel Of Sportsmen
	Information Technology	Construction Of IT Labs, IT Training, Laptop Schemes
	Culture	Text box for entry
	Others (please specify)	Text box for entry
Federal Organisations/ Programmes	NADRA	CRC, CNIC Issuance, Correction, NADRA Van For Community
	Ehsaas/BISP	Identification Of Beneficiaries, Registration, Benefit Disbursement, Record Correction
	Election Commission of Pakistan	Voter Registration, Correction, Community Level Registration Campaign In Village
Commercial Institutions	Banks	Account Opening, Deposit, Loan, Pension, Other Banking Services
	Other For-profit Companies/Entities	Related Services
	Shopkeepers	Credit Purchase, Subsidised Food-Items, Dispute Settlement
	Moneylenders	Loans, Dispute Settlement
	Middlemen	Credit Purchase, Dispute Settlement
Non-Profit Organisations	BRSP	CPI Schemes, Trainings, enrolment, immunization, Assistive Devices of PWDs
	CO, VO or LSO	IGG, CIF, TVET, awareness, exposure
	Others (please specify)	Text box for entry

Q 20: Before 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative did something useful for you or other members of your household? In which year?

[Multiple options possible.]

Sector	Institution/Elected Representative	Tick if identified	Year
Civil Administration	AC/DC/Commissioner		
	Police		
	Courts		
Elected Representatives	Senator		
	MNA		
	MPA		
	District or Municipal Councillor		
	UC Councillor		
Provincial Line Departments - Social Sector	Education - Primary and secondary education		
	Education - Higher Education		
	Education - Polytechnic Education		
	Health - EPI and preventive healthcare		
	Health - Basic Health Units		
	Health - Secondary Healthcare (THQ/DHQ hospitals)		
	Health - Rehabilitation Services		
	Drinking Water – Public Health Engineering		
	Drinking Water – LG&RDD		
	Social Welfare		
	Women Development		
	Population Welfare		

Provincial Line Departments - Infrastructure	LG&RDD		
	Communication		
	Physical Planning and Housing		
	Power – Electricity		
	Power – Gas		
	Urban Planning and Development		
	Union Council		
Provincial Line Departments - Agriculture And Natural Resources	Agriculture		
	Irrigation		
	Livestock		
	Forestry		
	Fisheries		
Provincial Line Departments - Other Productive Sectors	Industries		
	Manpower		
	Minerals		
	Food and Tourism		
Provincial Line Departments - Other Sectors	Environment		
	Sports		
	Information Technology		
	Culture		
	Others (please specify)		

Federal Organisations/ Programmes	NADRA		
	Ehsaas/BISP		
	Election Commission of Pakistan		
Commercial Institutions	Banks		
	Other For-profit Companies/Entities		
	Shopkeepers		
	Moneylenders		
	Middlemen		
Non-Profit Organisations	BRSP		
	CO, VO or LSO		
	Others (please specify)		
None (No other option can be selected with this option)			

Q 21: If Yes to Q20, before 2018 (BRACE), what kind of services were accessed when CO, VO, LSOs didn't exist? [Options separated by commas in the last column to be treated as separate options and should be designed accordingly in application; Multiple options possible]

Sector	Institution/Elected Representative	Services
Civil Administration	AC/DC/Commissioner	Text box for entry
	Police	Text box for entry
	Courts	Text box for entry
Elected Representatives	Senator	Text box for entry
	MNA	Text box for entry
	MPA	Text box for entry
	District or Municipal Councillor	Text box for entry
	UC Councillor	Text box for entry

Sector	Institution/Elected Representative	Services
Provincial Line Departments - Social Sector	Education - Primary and secondary education	Construction, Provision Of Missing Facilities, Enrolment Campaign, Staff Appointment
	Education - Higher Education	Construction, Provision Of Missing Facilities, Scholarships, Staff Appointment
	Education - Polytechnic Education	Construction, Provision Of Missing Facilities, Scholarships, Staff Appointment
	Health - EPI and preventive healthcare	Child Vaccination, Polio Vacc., Covid-19 Vacc.
	Health - Basic Health Units	Construction, Provision Of Missing Facilities, Staff Appointment, Immunization Campaign, Basic Healthcare
	Health - Secondary Healthcare (THQ/DHQ hospitals)	Construction, Provision Of Missing Facilities, Staff Appointment, Healthcare
	Health - Rehabilitation Services	Construction, Rehabilitation, Staff Appointment, Rehab. Services
	Drinking Water – Public Health Engineering	Construction Of WS Scheme, Rehabilitation
	Drinking Water – LG&RDD	Construction Of WS Scheme, Rehabilitation
	Social Welfare	Child Welfare, Women Welfare, Disabled And Elderly Welfare, Vocational Training, ALNS, Correctional Services
	Women Development	Awareness, Day-Care, Hostels, Scholarships, Skills Training
	Population Welfare	Family Planning Services, Maternal And Childcare Services, Infertility Treatment

Sector	Institution/Elected Representative	Services
Provincial Line Departments - Infrastructure	LG&RDD	Maintenance Of Water Supply, Sanitation, Sewerage, Waste Management, Parks, Pavements, Community Welfare
	Communication	Construction/Maintenance Of Roads, Bridges,
	Physical Planning and Housing	Construction Of Housing, Parks, Water Supply Schemes
	Power – Electricity	Installation Of Poles, Transformers, Electrification
	Power – Gas	Pipelines, Gas Supply
	Urban Planning and Development	Land Use Planning, Mass Transit, Infrastructure Planning And Development
	Union Council	Birth Registration, Marriage Registration, Death Registration
Provincial Line Departments - Agriculture And Natural Resources	Agriculture	Pest Control, Subsidized Seeds, Agri. Inputs, Provision Of Equipment, Awareness
	Irrigation	Construction And Maintenance Of Irrigation Channels, Karez, Tube Wells,
	Livestock	Livestock And Dairy Development, Vaccination, Veterinarian Services, Capacity Building Of Farmers
	Forestry	Management Of Rangeland And Forests, Soil Conservation, Watershed Development
	Fisheries	Fisheries Development, Disease Control, Veterinarian Services, Capacity Building Of Farmers

Sector	Institution/Elected Representative	Services
Provincial Line Departments - Other Productive Sectors	Industries	Setting Up Of New Industry, SME Development Including Local Crafts, Facilitation Of Exports, Loans To Business
	Manpower	Labour Related Protection Services, Safety Training, Scholarships And Endowment Funds, Capacity Building Programmes
	Minerals	Exploration And Development Of Minerals, Mine Worker Welfare Schemes,
	Food and Tourism	Tourist Facilities, Food Regulation And Control
Provincial Line Departments - Other Sectors	Environment	Tree Plantation, Land Use, Pollution Control, Disaster Preparedness Training And Facilities
	Sports	Construction Of Sports Facilities, Sports Events, Stipends And Travel Of Sportsmen
	Information Technology	Construction Of IT Labs, IT Training, Laptop Schemes
	Culture	Text box for entry
	Others (please specify)	Text box for entry
Federal Organisations/ Programmes	NADRA	CRC, CNIC Issuance, Correction, NADRA Van For Community
	Ehsaas/BISP	Identification Of Beneficiaries, Registration, Benefit Disbursement, Record Correction
	Election Commission of Pakistan	Voter Registration, Correction, Community Level Registration Campaign In Village

Sector	Institution/Elected Representative	Services
Commercial Institutions	Banks	Account Opening, Deposit, Loan, Pension, Other Banking Services
	Other For-profit Companies/Entities	Related Services
	Shopkeepers	Credit Purchase, Subsidised Food-Items, Dispute Settlement
	Moneylenders	Loans, Dispute Settlement
	Middlemen	Credit Purchase, Dispute Settlement
Non-Profit Organisations	BRSP	CPI Schemes, Trainings, enrolment, immunization, Assistive Devices of PWDs
	CO, VO or LSO	IGG, CIF, TVET, awareness, exposure
	Others (please specify)	Text box for entry

Annex 7: Sample Allocation and List of LSOs included in the Assessment

Table 15: Sample allocation plan – details

District	Beneficiaries of						Sample of CO members based on Proportional Allocation			Proposed sample of				No. of UCs/ LSOs	COs (3 from each sampled UC)		
	Hard Component			Soft Component			Male	Female	Total	CO Members		Non-CO Members					
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total				Male	Female	Male	Female			Total	
Zhob	44,717	32,126	76,843	60,120	48,735	108,855	169	131	300	162	138	300	60	60	120	5	15
Khuzdar	172,582	76,054	248,636	48,194	25,881	74,076	205	95	300	180	120	300	60	60	120	5	15
Loralai	73,701	111,860	185,561	48,969	59,702	108,671	125	175	300	132	168	300	60	60	120	5	15
Kech	Not available								300	150	150	300	60	60	120	5	15
Total							500	400	1,200	624	576	1,200	240	240	480	20	60

Table 16: List of sample LSOs and relevant characteristics for sample selection

Green shaded: information provided in the BRACE linkages report for 3 districts							Blue shaded: information provided by RSPN for Kech				
District	Tehsil/Sub-division	Union Council (UC)	No. of Revenue Villages in UC	Distance from UC Centre to District Headquarters (km)	IP	LSO	No. of soft interventions	No. of hard interventions			
Khuzdar	Tehsil Khuzdar	Baghbana-2	51	50	BRSP	1. Baghbana	16	4			
Khuzdar	Tehsil Khuzdar	Abi Noghey	62	60	BRSP	2. Gawarikh	16	1			
Khuzdar	Tehsil Khuzdar	Baghbana-3	25	60	BRSP	3. Samban	11	3			
Khuzdar	Sub Tehsil Nal	Laghorzard	16	65	BRSP	4. Laghorzard	13	3			
Khuzdar	Sub Tehsil Karkh	Abad Karkh	30	75	BRSP	5. Gidan	16	7			
Loralai	Bori	Ponga	34	8	BRSP	6. Mushtrika	19	10			
Loralai	Bori	Aghberg	28	40	BRSP	7. Wattan	21	4			
Loralai	Duki	Nasar Abad 1	12	46	BRSP	8. Sabawoon	17	7			
Loralai	Bori	Thora Thana	22	60	BRSP	9. Kakar	16	10			
Loralai	Bori	Zara	16	65	BRSP	10. Khushal	18	2			
Zhob	Zhob	Hassanzai	8	8	BRSP	11. Hassanzai	16	4			
Zhob	Zhob	Garda Babar	15	22	BRSP	12. Garda Babar	16	12			
Zhob	Zhob	Ghundai Slemanzai	10	51	BRSP	13. Itihad Naojawan Ghundai	15	8			
Zhob	Zhob	Barakwala	10	72	BRSP	14. Khushhal Barakwala	14	7			
Zhob	Zhob	Mir Ali Khail	12	78	BRSP	15. Sangay Ghar	6	2			
Kech		Nodiz		35	NRSP	16. Meerani					

Green shaded: information provided in the BRACE linkages report for 3 districts						Blue shaded: information provided by RSPN for Kech			
District	Tehsil/Sub-division	Union Council (UC)	No. of Revenue Villages in UC	Distance from UC Centre to District Headquarters (km)	IP	LSO	No. of soft interventions	No. of hard interventions	
Kech		Solband		35	NRSP	17. Shooma			
Kech		Sharak		40	NRSP	18. Gechein			
Kech		Kuddan		62	NRSP	19. Rashon			
Kech		Turbat		85	NRSP	20. Khatirabad			
						Total linkages for 3 BRSP districts, 15 LSOs	230	84	
						Average per LSO for 3 districts, 15 LSOs	15.33	5.60	
						Extrapolated for 4 districts, 20 LSOs	307	112	

Annex 8: Profile of Survey Respondents, by District
Table 17: Profile of survey respondents (summary)

Variable	CO Members						Non-CO Members						Overall					
	Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both	
	N	Mean or %	N	Mean or %	N	Mean or %	N	Mean or %	N	Mean or %	N	Mean or %	N	Mean or %	N	Mean or %	N	Mean or %
Mean Age (years)	606	39.4	621	39.2	1227	39.3	245	31.7	218	30.6	463	31.2	851	37.2	839	37.0	1690	37.1
Marital Status																		
· Unmarried	40	6.6%	38	6.1%	78	6.4%	83	33.9%	73	33.5%	156	33.7%	123	14.5%	111	13.2%	234	13.8%
· Currently Married	564	93.1%	557	89.7%	1121	91.4%	162	66.1%	136	62.4%	298	64.4%	726	85.3%	693	82.6%	1419	84.0%
· Other	2	0.4%	26	4.2%	28	2.3%	0	0.0%	9	4.2%	9	1.9%	2	0.2%	35	4.1%	37	2.20%
Education																		
· Completely illiterate	286	47.2%	488	78.6%	774	63.1%	104	42.4%	149	68.3%	253	54.6%	390	45.8%	637	75.9%	1027	60.8%
· No formal educ. but can read	8	1.3%	7	1.1%	15	1.2%	4	1.6%	0	0.0%	4	0.9%	12	1.4%	7	0.8%	19	1.1%
· Below primary	23	3.8%	26	4.2%	49	4.0%	7	2.9%	10	4.6%	17	3.7%	30	3.5%	36	4.3%	66	3.9%
· Primary	62	10.2%	37	6.0%	99	8.1%	23	9.4%	16	7.3%	39	8.4%	85	10.0%	53	6.3%	138	8.2%
· Middle	44	7.3%	16	2.6%	60	4.9%	20	8.2%	7	3.2%	27	5.8%	64	7.5%	23	2.7%	87	5.1%
· Matric	85	14.0%	27	4.3%	112	9.1%	41	16.7%	28	12.8%	69	14.9%	126	14.8%	55	6.6%	181	10.7%
· Intermediate	49	8.1%	12	1.9%	61	5.0%	29	11.8%	5	2.3%	34	7.3%	78	9.2%	17	2.0%	95	5.6%
· Undergraduate	26	4.3%	2	0.3%	28	2.3%	9	3.7%	1	0.5%	10	2.2%	35	4.1%	3	0.4%	38	2.2%
· Graduate or above	23	3.8%	6	1.0%	29	2.4%	8	3.3%	2	0.9%	10	2.2%	31	3.6%	8	1.0%	39	2.3%
Head of Household																		
· Yes	464	76.6%	93	15.0%	557	45.4%	132	53.9%	11	5.0%	143	30.9%	596	70.0%	104	12.4%	700	41.4%

Variable	CO Members						Non-CO Members						Overall						
	Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		
	N	Mean or %	N	Mean or %	N	Mean or %	N	Mean or %	N	Mean or %	N	Mean or %	N	Mean or %	N	Mean or %	N	Mean or %	
· No	142	23.4%	528	85.0%	670	54.6%	113	46.1%	207	95.0%	320	69.1%	255	30.0%	735	87.6%	990	58.6%	
Employment Status																			
· Economically inactive	93	15.3%	230	37.0%	323	26.3%	45	18.4%	74	33.9%	119	25.7%	138	16.2%	304	36.2%	442	26.2%	
· Unemployed	181	29.9%	108	17.4%	289	23.6%	52	21.2%	29	13.3%	81	17.5%	233	27.4%	137	16.3%	370	21.9%	
· Currently employed	332	54.8%	283	45.6%	615	50.1%	147	60.0%	114	52.3%	261	56.4%	479	56.3%	397	47.3%	876	51.8%	
· Unpaid family worker/contributing family helper	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	1	0.5%	2	0.4%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	2	0.1%	
Mean Household Income (PKR/month)	606	16720	621	14380	1227	15535	245	17751	218	13135	463	15578	851	17017	839	14056	1690	15547	
Median Household Income (PKR/month)	606	15000	621	10000	1227	13000	245	15000	218	12000	463	13000	851	15000	839	10000	1690	13000	
Household PSC																			
· 0-23	320	52.8%	321	51.7%	641	52.2%	2	0.8%	4	1.8%	6	1.3%	322	37.8%	325	38.7%	647	38.3%	
· 24-100	286	47.2%	300	48.3%	586	47.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	286	33.6%	300	35.8%	586	34.7%	
· Don't Know	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	243	99.2%	214	98.2%	457	98.7%	243	28.6%	214	25.5%	457	27.0%	

Table 18: Mean age of survey respondents by CO membership and gender (in years), by district

	CO Members						Non-CO Members						Overall					
	Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Kech	139	42.8	161	38.4	300	40.4	58	37.0	58	30.3	116	33.7	197	41.1	219	36.3	416	38.5
Khuzdar	151	40.4	142	36.7	293	38.6	62	28.2	64	28.2	126	28.2	213	36.8	206	34.1	419	35.5
Loralai	158	36.5	158	43.1	316	39.8	59	30.1	48	34.6	107	32.1	217	34.8	206	41.2	423	37.9
Zhob	158	38.5	160	38.3	318	38.4	66	31.8	48	30.1	114	31.1	224	36.5	208	36.4	432	36.4
Overall	606	39.4	621	39.2	1227	39.3	245	31.7	218	30.6	463	31.2	851	37.2	839	37.0	1690	37.1

Table 19: Marital status of survey respondents by CO membership and gender, by district

	CO Members						Non-CO Members						Overall							
	Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Kech																				
Unmarried	5	3.6%	4	2.5%	9	3.0%	14	24.1%	14	24.1%	28	24.1%	19	9.6%	18	8.2%	37	8.9%		
Currently Married	134	96.4%	144	89.4%	278	92.7%	44	75.9%	41	70.7%	85	73.3%	178	90.4%	185	84.5%	363	87.3%		
Divorced/Separated	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%	1	0.2%		
Widow	0	0.0%	12	7.5%	12	4.0%	0	0.0%	3	5.2%	3	2.6%	3	2.6%	0	0.0%	15	6.8%	15	3.6%
Other (Specify)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Khuzdar																				
Unmarried	9	6.0%	4	2.8%	13	4.4%	33	53.2%	19	29.7%	52	41.3%	42	19.7%	23	11.2%	65	15.5%		
Currently Married	141	93.4%	131	92.3%	272	92.8%	29	46.8%	41	64.1%	70	55.6%	170	79.8%	172	83.5%	342	81.6%		
Divorced/Separated	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Widow	1	0.7%	7	4.9%	8	2.7%	0	0.0%	4	6.3%	4	3.2%	4	3.2%	1	0.5%	11	5.3%	12	2.9%
Other (Specify)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		
Loralai																				
Unmarried	15	9.5%	1	0.6%	16	5.1%	19	32.2%	14	29.2%	33	30.8%	34	15.7%	15	7.3%	49	11.6%		
Currently Married	143	90.5%	151	95.6%	294	93.0%	40	67.8%	32	66.7%	72	67.3%	183	84.3%	183	88.8%	366	86.5%		
Divorced/Separated	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.1%	1	0.9%	1	0.9%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%	1	0.2%
Widow	0	0.0%	6	3.8%	6	1.9%	0	0.0%	1	2.1%	1	0.9%	1	0.9%	0	0.0%	7	3.4%	7	1.7%
Other (Specify)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

	CO Members						Non-CO Members						Overall						
	Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Zhob																			
Unmarried	11	7.0%	29	18.1%	40	12.6%	17	25.8%	26	54.2%	43	37.7%	28	12.5%	55	26.4%	83	19.2%	
Currently Married	146	92.4%	131	81.9%	277	87.1%	49	74.2%	22	45.8%	71	62.3%	195	87.1%	153	73.6%	348	80.6%	
Divorced/Separated	1	0.6%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	
Widow	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Other (Specify)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Overall																			
Unmarried	40	6.6%	38	6.1%	78	6.4%	83	33.9%	73	33.5%	156	33.7%	123	14.5%	111	13.2%	234	13.8%	
Currently Married	564	93.1%	557	89.7%	1121	91.4%	162	66.1%	136	62.4%	298	64.4%	726	85.3%	693	82.6%	1419	84.0%	
Divorced/Separated	1	0.2%	1	0.2%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%	1	0.2%	1	0.1%	2	0.2%	3	0.2%	
Widow	1	0.2%	25	4.0%	26	2.1%	0	0.0%	8	3.7%	8	1.7%	1	0.1%	33	3.9%	34	2.0%	
Other (Specify)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	

Table 20: Educational attainments of survey respondents by CO membership and gender, by district

	CO Members						Non-CO Members						Overall						
	Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Kech																			
Completely illiterate	52	37.4%	108	67.1%	160	53.3%	9	15.5%	28	48.3%	37	31.9%	61	31.0%	136	62.1%	197	47.4%	
No formal education but can read	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Below primary	5	3.6%	9	5.6%	14	4.7%	2	3.4%	3	5.2%	5	4.3%	7	3.6%	12	5.5%	19	4.6%	
Primary	8	5.8%	15	9.3%	23	7.7%	9	15.5%	2	3.4%	11	9.5%	17	8.6%	17	7.8%	34	8.2%	
Middle	8	5.8%	3	1.9%	11	3.7%	3	5.2%	0	0.0%	3	2.6%	11	5.6%	3	1.4%	14	3.4%	
Matric	22	15.8%	16	9.9%	38	12.7%	16	27.6%	19	32.8%	35	30.2%	38	19.3%	35	16.0%	73	17.5%	
Intermediate	24	17.3%	7	4.3%	31	10.3%	12	20.7%	3	5.2%	15	12.9%	36	18.3%	10	4.6%	46	11.1%	
Undergraduate	10	7.2%	0	0.0%	10	3.3%	4	6.9%	1	1.7%	5	4.3%	14	7.1%	1	0.5%	15	3.6%	
Graduate or above	10	7.2%	3	1.9%	13	4.3%	3	5.2%	2	3.4%	5	4.3%	13	6.6%	5	2.3%	18	4.3%	
Other (Specify)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Khuzdar																			
Completely illiterate	67	44.4%	118	83.1%	185	63.1%	29	46.8%	50	78.1%	79	62.7%	96	45.1%	168	81.6%	264	63.0%	
No formal education but can read	0	0.0%	1	0.7%	1	0.3%	1	1.6%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	1	0.5%	1	0.5%	2	0.5%	
Below primary	3	2.0%	1	0.7%	4	1.4%	0	0.0%	1	1.6%	1	0.8%	3	1.4%	2	1.0%	5	1.2%	
Primary	24	15.9%	4	2.8%	28	9.6%	8	12.9%	3	4.7%	11	8.7%	32	15.0%	7	3.4%	39	9.3%	
Middle	13	8.6%	5	3.5%	18	6.1%	3	4.8%	4	6.3%	7	5.6%	16	7.5%	9	4.4%	25	6.0%	

	CO Members						Non-CO Members						Overall					
	Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Matric	25	16.6%	6	4.2%	31	10.6%	15	24.2%	6	9.4%	21	16.7%	40	18.8%	12	5.8%	52	12.4%
Intermediate	11	7.3%	2	1.4%	13	4.4%	5	8.1%	0	0.0%	5	4.0%	16	7.5%	2	1.0%	18	4.3%
Undergraduate	1	0.7%	2	1.4%	3	1.0%	1	1.6%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	2	0.9%	2	1.0%	4	1.0%
Graduate or above	7	4.6%	3	2.1%	10	3.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	3.3%	3	1.5%	10	2.4%
Other (Specify)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Loralai																		
Completely illiterate	82	51.9%	150	94.9%	232	73.4%	36	61.0%	35	72.9%	71	66.4%	118	54.4%	185	89.8%	303	71.6%
No formal education but can read	1	0.6%	1	0.6%	2	0.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%	1	0.5%	2	0.5%
Below primary	6	3.8%	1	0.6%	7	2.2%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	1	0.9%	7	3.2%	1	0.5%	8	1.9%
Primary	21	13.3%	2	1.3%	23	7.3%	2	3.4%	6	12.5%	8	7.5%	23	10.6%	8	3.9%	31	7.3%
Middle	11	7.0%	1	0.6%	12	3.8%	4	6.8%	2	4.2%	6	5.6%	15	6.9%	3	1.5%	18	4.3%
Matric	21	13.3%	1	0.6%	22	7.0%	5	8.5%	3	6.3%	8	7.5%	26	12.0%	4	1.9%	30	7.1%
Intermediate	6	3.8%	2	1.3%	8	2.5%	5	8.5%	2	4.2%	7	6.5%	11	5.1%	4	1.9%	15	3.5%
Undergraduate	6	3.8%	0	0.0%	6	1.9%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	1	0.9%	7	3.2%	0	0.0%	7	1.7%
Graduate or above	4	2.5%	0	0.0%	4	1.3%	5	8.5%	0	0.0%	5	4.7%	9	4.1%	0	0.0%	9	2.1%
Other (Specify)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Zhob																		
Completely illiterate	85	53.8%	112	70.0%	197	61.9%	30	45.5%	36	75.0%	66	57.9%	115	51.3%	148	71.2%	263	60.9%

	CO Members						Non-CO Members						Overall					
	Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No formal education but can read	7	4.4%	5	3.1%	12	3.8%	3	4.5%	0	0.0%	3	2.6%	10	4.5%	5	2.4%	15	3.5%
Below primary	9	5.7%	15	9.4%	24	7.5%	4	6.1%	6	12.5%	10	8.8%	13	5.8%	21	10.1%	34	7.9%
Primary	9	5.7%	16	10.0%	25	7.9%	4	6.1%	5	10.4%	9	7.9%	13	5.8%	21	10.1%	34	7.9%
Middle	12	7.6%	7	4.4%	19	6.0%	10	15.2%	1	2.1%	11	9.6%	22	9.8%	8	3.8%	30	6.9%
Matric	17	10.8%	4	2.5%	21	6.6%	5	7.6%	0	0.0%	5	4.4%	22	9.8%	4	1.9%	26	6.0%
Intermediate	8	5.1%	1	0.6%	9	2.8%	7	10.6%	0	0.0%	7	6.1%	15	6.7%	1	0.5%	16	3.7%
Undergraduate	9	5.7%	0	0.0%	9	2.8%	3	4.5%	0	0.0%	3	2.6%	12	5.4%	0	0.0%	12	2.8%
Graduate or above	2	1.3%	0	0.0%	2	0.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.9%	0	0.0%	2	0.5%
Other (Specify)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Overall																		
Completely illiterate	286	47.2%	488	78.6%	774	63.1%	104	42.4%	149	68.3%	253	54.6%	390	45.8%	637	75.9%	1027	60.8%
No formal education but can read	8	1.3%	7	1.1%	15	1.2%	4	1.6%	0	0.0%	4	0.9%	12	1.4%	7	0.8%	19	1.1%
Below primary	23	3.8%	26	4.2%	49	4.0%	7	2.9%	10	4.6%	17	3.7%	30	3.5%	36	4.3%	66	3.9%
Primary	62	10.2%	37	6.0%	99	8.1%	23	9.4%	16	7.3%	39	8.4%	85	10.0%	53	6.3%	138	8.2%
Middle	44	7.3%	16	2.6%	60	4.9%	20	8.2%	7	3.2%	27	5.8%	64	7.5%	23	2.7%	87	5.1%

	CO Members						Non-CO Members						Overall													
	Male			Female			Both		Male			Female			Both		Male			Female			Both			
	N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%			
Matric	85	14.0%		27	4.3%		112	9.1%		41	16.7%		28	12.8%		69	14.9%		126	14.8%		55	6.6%		181	10.7%
Intermediate	49	8.1%		12	1.9%		61	5.0%		29	11.8%		5	2.3%		34	7.3%		78	9.2%		17	2.0%		95	5.6%
Undergraduate	26	4.3%		2	0.3%		28	2.3%		9	3.7%		1	0.5%		10	2.2%		35	4.1%		3	0.4%		38	2.2%
Graduate or above	23	3.8%		6	1.0%		29	2.4%		8	3.3%		2	0.9%		10	2.2%		31	3.6%		8	1.0%		39	2.3%
Other (Specify)	0	0.0%		0	0.0%		0	0.0%		0	0.0%		0	0.0%		0	0.0%		0	0.0%		0	0.0%		0	0.0%

Table 21: Survey respondents' head of household status by CO membership and gender, by district

	CO Members						Non-CO Members						Overall						
	Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Kech																			
Yes	120	86.3%	22	13.7%	142	47.3%	38	65.5%	3	5.2%	41	35.3%	158	80.2%	25	11.4%	183	44.0%	
No	19	13.7%	139	86.3%	158	52.7%	20	34.5%	55	94.8%	75	64.7%	39	19.8%	194	88.6%	233	56.0%	
Khuzdar																			
Yes	123	81.5%	1	0.7%	124	42.3%	22	35.5%	3	4.7%	25	19.8%	145	68.1%	4	1.9%	149	35.6%	
No	28	18.5%	141	99.3%	169	57.7%	40	64.5%	61	95.3%	101	80.2%	68	31.9%	202	98.1%	270	64.4%	
Loralai																			
Yes	115	72.8%	46	29.1%	161	50.9%	35	59.3%	3	6.3%	38	35.5%	150	69.1%	49	23.8%	199	47.0%	
No	43	27.2%	112	70.9%	155	49.1%	24	40.7%	45	93.8%	69	64.5%	67	30.9%	157	76.2%	224	53.0%	
Zhob																			
Yes	106	67.1%	24	15.0%	130	40.9%	37	56.1%	2	4.2%	39	34.2%	143	63.8%	26	12.5%	169	39.1%	
No	52	32.9%	136	85.0%	188	59.1%	29	43.9%	46	95.8%	75	65.8%	81	36.2%	182	87.5%	263	60.9%	
Overall																			
Yes	464	76.6%	93	15.0%	557	45.4%	132	53.9%	11	5.0%	143	30.9%	596	70.0%	104	12.4%	700	41.4%	
No	142	23.4%	528	85.0%	670	54.6%	113	46.1%	207	95.0%	320	69.1%	255	30.0%	735	87.6%	990	58.6%	

Table 22: Survey respondents' employment status by CO membership and gender, by district

	CO Members						Non-CO Members						Overall									
	Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both					
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%				
Kech																						
Economically inactive	11	7.9%	67	41.6%	78	26.0%	7	12.1%	26	44.8%	33	28.4%	18	9.1%	93	42.5%	111	26.7%				
Unemployed	4	2.9%	3	1.9%	7	2.3%	3	5.2%	1	1.7%	4	3.4%	7	3.6%	4	1.8%	11	2.6%				
Currently employed	124	89.2%	91	56.5%	215	71.7%	48	82.8%	31	53.4%	79	68.1%	172	87.3%	122	55.7%	294	70.7%				
Unpaid family worker /contributing family helper	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%				
Khuzdar																						
Economically inactive	16	10.6%	82	57.7%	98	33.4%	7	11.3%	35	54.7%	42	33.3%	23	10.8%	117	56.8%	140	33.4%				
Unemployed	62	41.1%	3	2.1%	65	22.2%	19	30.6%	2	3.1%	21	16.7%	81	38.0%	5	2.4%	86	20.5%				
Currently employed	73	48.3%	57	40.1%	130	44.4%	36	58.1%	26	40.6%	62	49.2%	109	51.2%	83	40.3%	192	45.8%				
Unpaid family worker /contributing family helper	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.6%	1	0.8%	1	0.8%	1	0.5%	1	0.2%				
Loralai																						
Economically inactive	36	22.8%	69	43.7%	105	33.2%	19	32.2%	11	22.9%	30	28.0%	55	25.3%	80	38.8%	135	31.9%				
Unemployed	70	44.3%	77	48.7%	147	46.5%	20	33.9%	25	52.1%	45	42.1%	90	41.5%	102	49.5%	192	45.4%				
Currently employed	52	32.9%	12	7.6%	64	20.3%	19	32.2%	12	25.0%	31	29.0%	71	32.7%	24	11.7%	95	22.5%				
Unpaid family worker /contributing family helper	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.9%	1	0.5%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%		

	CO Members						Non-CO Members						Overall						
	Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Zhob																			
Economically inactive	30	19.0%	12	7.5%	42	13.2%	12	18.2%	2	4.2%	14	12.3%	42	18.8%	14	6.7%	56	13.0%	
Unemployed	45	28.5%	25	15.6%	70	22.0%	10	15.2%	1	2.1%	11	9.6%	55	24.6%	26	12.5%	81	18.8%	
Currently employed	83	52.5%	123	76.9%	206	64.8%	44	66.7%	45	93.8%	89	78.1%	127	56.7%	168	80.8%	295	68.3%	
Unpaid family worker /contributing family helper	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Overall																			
Economically inactive	93	15.3%	230	37.0%	323	26.3%	45	18.4%	74	33.9%	119	25.7%	138	16.2%	304	36.2%	442	26.2%	
Unemployed	181	29.9%	108	17.4%	289	23.6%	52	21.2%	29	13.3%	81	17.5%	233	27.4%	137	16.3%	370	21.9%	
Currently employed	332	54.8%	283	45.6%	615	50.1%	147	60.0%	114	52.3%	261	56.4%	479	56.3%	397	47.3%	876	51.8%	
Unpaid family worker /contributing family helper	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	1	0.5%	2	0.4%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	2	0.1%	

Table 23: Mean household income of survey respondents by CO membership and gender (in PKR per month), by district

	CO Members						Non-CO Members						Overall					
	Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Kech	139	25064	161	23199	300	24063	58	21155	58	21241	116	21198	197	23913	219	22680	416	23264
Khuzdar	151	12026	142	15930	293	13918	62	13274	64	13063	126	13167	213	12390	206	15039	419	13692
Loralai	158	14674	158	7364	316	11019	59	16093	48	5792	107	11472	217	15060	206	6998	423	11134
Zhob	158	15910	160	11059	318	13469	66	20447	48	10781	114	16377	224	17246	208	10995	432	14236
Overall	606	16720	621	14380	1227	15535	245	17751	218	13135	463	15578	851	17017	839	14056	1690	15547

Table 24: Median household income of survey respondents by CO membership and gender (in PKR per month), by district

	CO Members						Non-CO Members						Overall					
	Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both	
	N	Median	N	Median	N	Median	N	Median	N	Median	N	Median	N	Median	N	Median	N	Median
Kech	139	21000	161	20000	300	20000	58	20000	58	20000	116	20000	197	20000	219	20000	416	20000
Khuzdar	151	8000	142	10000	293	9000	62	10000	64	10000	126	10000	213	8000	206	10000	419	10000
Loralai	158	15000	158	6000	316	9000	59	14000	48	5000	107	7000	217	15000	206	6000	423	8000
Zhob	158	15000	160	10000	318	14000	66	16000	48	12000	114	14500	224	15000	208	12000	432	14000
Overall	606	15000	621	10000	1227	13000	245	15000	218	12000	463	13000	851	15000	839	10000	1690	13000

Table 25: Survey respondents' household poverty score card status, by CO membership and gender, by district

	CO Members						Non-CO Members						Overall					
	CO Members		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both	
	N	%	Non-CO Members	Overall	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Kech																		
0-23	68	48.9%	104	64.6%	172	57.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	68	34.5%	104	47.5%	172	41.3%
24-100	71	51.1%	57	35.4%	128	42.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	71	36.0%	57	26.0%	128	30.8%
Don't Know	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	58	100.0%	58	100.0%	116	100.0%	58	29.4%	58	26.5%	116	27.9%
Khuzdar																		
0-23	73	48.3%	65	45.8%	138	47.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	73	34.3%	65	31.6%	138	32.9%
24-100	78	51.7%	77	54.2%	155	52.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	78	36.6%	77	37.4%	155	37.0%
Don't Know	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	62	100.0%	64	100.0%	126	100.0%	62	29.1%	64	31.1%	126	30.1%
Loralai																		
0-23	73	46.2%	63	39.9%	136	43.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	73	33.6%	63	30.6%	136	32.2%
24-100	85	53.8%	95	60.1%	180	57.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	85	39.2%	95	46.1%	180	42.6%
Don't Know	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	59	100.0%	48	100.0%	107	100.0%	59	27.2%	48	23.3%	107	25.3%
Zhob																		
0-23	106	67.1%	89	55.6%	195	61.3%	2	3.0%	4	8.3%	6	5.3%	108	48.2%	93	44.7%	201	46.5%
24-100	52	32.9%	71	44.4%	123	38.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	52	23.2%	71	34.1%	123	28.5%

	CO Members						Non-CO Members						Overall											
	CO Members			Non-CO Members			CO Members			Non-CO Members			CO Members			Non-CO Members			Overall					
	CO Members	Female		Both	Male	Female		Both	Male	Female		Both	Male	Female		Both	Male	Female		Both	Male			
		N	%			N	%			N	%			N	%			N	%			N	%	N
Don't Know	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	64	97.0%	44	91.7%	108	94.7%	64	28.6%	44	21.2%	108	25.0%				
Overall																								
0-23	320	52.8%	321	51.7%	641	52.2%	2	0.8%	4	1.8%	6	1.3%	322	37.8%	325	38.7%	300	35.8%	586	34.7%	647	38.3%		
24-100	286	47.2%	300	48.3%	586	47.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	286	33.6%	300	35.8%	214	25.5%	457	27.0%				
Don't Know	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	243	99.2%	214	98.2%	457	98.7%	243	28.6%	214	25.5%	457	27.0%						

Annex 9: List of Joint Development Committee Meetings, 2019 to 2021**Table 26: List of Joint District Development Committee meetings, January 2019 to December 2021, 9 districts**

No.	District	Date	Chair	Number	Participants								Minutes Signed By (1 = Yes)					
					Organisations Present (1 = Yes)								Chair	RSP	TA	All Participants		
					Line Departments	RSP	TA	LSOs	NGOs	PPH	Media							
2019																		
1	Loralai 1	11-Jan-19	DC	30	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	Pishin 1	24-Jan-19	DHO	24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	Kech 1	19-Jan-19	CO	17	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	Kech 2	22-Feb-19	CO	23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	Washuk 1	25-Feb-19	DC	15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	Zhob 1	26-Feb-19	DC	15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
7	Jhal Magsi 1	6-Mar-19	DC	22	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
8	Loralai 2	28-May-19	DC	23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
9	Jhal Magsi 2	30-May-19	DC	22	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
10	Pishin 2	31-May-19	DC	17	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
11	Washuk 2	13-Jun-19	DC	19	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
12	Zhob 2	21-Jun-19	DC	11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
13	Khuzdar 1	29-Jun-19	DC	13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

No.	District	Date	Chair	Participants								Minutes Signed By (1 = Yes)							
				Number	Organisations Present (1 = Yes)							Chair	RSP	TA	All Participants				
Line Departments	RSP	TA	LSDs		NGOs	PPH	Media												
14	Zhob 3	2-Sep-19	DC	14	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1					
15	Kech 3	13-Sep-19	DD LG	25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	
16	Pishin 3	16-Sep-19	ADC-G	18	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				
17	Jhal Magsi 3	26-Sep-19	DC	22	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				
18	Loralai 3	2-Oct-19	DC	25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				
19	Dukti 1	8-Oct-19	DC	23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				
20	Killa Abdullah 1	26-Oct-19	DC	13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				
21	Kech 4	30-Dec-19	DD LG	20	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	
Total for 2019				411	21	21	8	14	17	4	4	4	16	6	0	3			
Average per meeting				20	1.0	1.0	0.4	0.7	0.8	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.3	-	0.1			
2020																			
22	Pishin 4	1-Jan-20	DC	27	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				
23	Loralai 4	9-Jan-20	DC	24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				
24	Killa Abdullah 2	10-Jan-20	DC	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	

No.	District	Date	Chair	Participants								Minutes Signed By (1 = Yes)					
				Number	Line Departments	RSP	TA	LSOs	NGOs	PPH	Media	Chair	RSP	TA	All Participants		
25	Duki 2	23-Jan-20	DC	24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
26	Washuk 3	2-Mar-20	DC	20	1	1	1	1	1								
27	Jhal Magst 4	5-Mar-20	DC	30	1	1	1	1	1			1					
28	Kech 5	22-Apr-20	DDLG	15	1	1	1	1	1								1
29	Pishin 5	15-May-20	DC	12	1	1	1	1	1								
30	Loralai 5	20-May-20	ADC	15	1	1	1	1	1								
31	Khuzdar 2	3-Jun-20	DC	13	1	1	1	1	1				1			1	
32	Zhob 4	12-Jun-20	ADC	18	1	1	1	1	1								
33	Duki 3	16-Jul-20	DC	15	1	1	1	1	1								
34	Washuk 4	13-Aug-20	DC	13	1	1	1	1	1								
35	Kech 6	9-Sep-20	DDLG	23	1	1	1	1	1								1
36	Loralai 5	21-Sep-20	ADC	21	1	1	1	1	1								
37	Duki 4	5-Nov-20	DC	20	1	1	1	1	1								
38	Khuzdar 3	9-Nov-20	DC	17	1	1	1	1	1				1				

No.	District	Date	Chair	Participants								Minutes Signed By (1 = Yes)						
				Number	Organisations Present (1 = Yes)							Chair	RSP	TA	All Participants			
					Line Departments	RSP	TA	LSOs	NGOs	PPH	Media							
39	Pishin 6	24-Nov-20	DC	18	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				
40	Kech 7	3-Dec-20	DD LG	21	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	
41	Killa Abdullah 3	3-Dec-20	ADC	12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				
42	Washuk 5	11-Dec-20	DC	15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				
43	Kech 8	31-Dec-20	DD LG	17	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	
Total for 2020				399	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	12	18	3	1	16	4	4
Average per meeting				18	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.8	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.2	-	0.2
2021																		
44	Loralai 6	6-Jan-21	DC	26	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
45	Zhob 5	14-Jan-21	DC	19	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
46	Khuzdar 4	11-Mar-21	DC	17	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
47	Duki 5	25-Mar-21	DC	20	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
48	Jhal Magsi 5	26-Mar-21	DC	22	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
49	Washuk 6	6-Apr-21	DC	16	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		

No.	District	Date	Chair	Participants							Minutes Signed By (1 = Yes)					
				Number	Line Departments	RSP	TA	LSOs	NGOs	PPH	Media	Chair	RSP	TA	All Participants	
50	Loralai 6	26-Apr-21	DC	19	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
51	Khuzdar 4	9-Jun-21	DC	17	1	1	1	1	1			1		1		
52	Kech 9	15-Jun-21	DD LG	19	1	1	1	1	1	1	1					1
53	Duki 6	24-Jun-21	DC	21	1	1	1	1	1					1		
54	Pishin 7	25-Jun-21	DC	16	1	1	1	1	1					1		
55	Loralai 7	7-Jul-21	AC	15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1		
56	Jhal Magsi 6	19-Aug-21	DC	26	1	1	1	1	1			1		1		
57	Duki 7	22-Sep-21	DC	20	1	1	1	1	1					1		
58	Washuk 7	22-Sep-21	DC	22	1	1	1	1	1					1		
59	Loralai 8	28-Sep-21	DC	24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1		
60	Kech 10	29-Sep-21	DD LG	19	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1		1
61	Pishin 8	5-Oct-21	DC	47	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1		
62	Kech 11	12-Oct-21	DD LG	24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1		
63	Jhal Magsi 7	14-Oct-21	DC	25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1		

No.	District	Date	Chair	Participants								Minutes Signed By (1 = Yes)					
				Number	Organisations Present (1 = Yes)							Chair	RSP	TA	All Participants		
				Line Departments	RSP	TA	LSOs	NGOs	PPH	Media							
64	Zhob 6	28-Oct-21	DC	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
65	Pishin 9	4-Nov-21	DC	1	1	1	1	1									
66	Loralai 9	11-Nov-21	DC	1	1	1	1	1									
67	Kech 12	18-Nov-21	DDLG	1	1	1	1	1									
68	Khuzdar 5	19-Nov-21	DC	1	1	1	1	1									
69	Jhal Magsi 8	21-Dec-21	DC	1	1	1	1	1							1		
70	Duki 8	23-Dec-21	DC	1	1	1	1	1	1						1		
Total for 2021		Meetings	27	27	27	27	15	19	6	5	25	2	1	2			
Average per meeting				1.0	1.0	1.0	0.6	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.0	0.1			

Source: DAI HD Technical Assistance Team

Table 27: List of Tehsil Joint Development Committee meetings, Kech District, June 2019 to September 2021

No.	District	Date	Chair	Number	Participants							Minutes Signed By (1 = Yes)				
					Line Departments	RSP	TA	LSOs	NGOs	PPHI	Media	Chair	RSP	TA	All Participants	
1	Kech	14-Jun-19	ADC/TJDC	16	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	Kech	14-Jun-19	ADC/TJDC	16	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	Kech	25-Sep-19	ADC/TJDC	11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	Kech	25-Sep-19	ADC/TJDC	15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	Kech	28-Jan-20	ADC/TJDC	11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	Kech	28-Jan-20	ADC/TJDC	12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
7	Kech	11-Feb-20	ADC/TJDC	13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
8	Kech	11-Feb-20	ADC/TJDC	13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
9	Kech	23-Jun-20	AC/TJDC	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
10	Kech	23-Jun-20	ADC/TJDC	15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
11	Kech	24-Nov-20	AC/TJDC	11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
12	Kech	24-Nov-20	ADC/TJDC	12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
13	Kech	27-Nov-20	ADC/TJDC	12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
14	Kech	4 June 21	AC/TJDC	11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

No.	District	Date	Chair	Participants								Minutes Signed By (1 = Yes)			
				Number	Organisations Present (1 = Yes)							Chair	RSP	TA	All Participants
Line Departments	RSP	TA	LSOs		NGOs	PPHI	Media								
15	Kech	4-Jun-21	AC/TJDC	12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
16	Kech	8-Jun-21	AC/TJDC	12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
17	Kech	8-Jun-21	ADC/TJDC	12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
18	Kech	11-Mar-21	AC/TJDC	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
19	Kech	24-Sep-21	AC/TJDC	19	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
20	Kech	24-Sep-21	AC/TJDC	11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
21	Kech	27-Sep-21	AC/TJDC	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
22	Kech	27-Sep-21	AC/TJDC	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
		Number of Meetings	22	273	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22

Source: DAI HD Technical Assistance Team

Annex 10: Examples of Union Council Development Plans

Union Council Development Plan

General Information

District: Pishin Tehsil: Pishin Union Council: Kamalzai
 LSO ID: 13800 LSO Name: zaland Category: Mixed Formation Date: 2 May 2019 Formation Type: New Formation

Hard Component

#	Priority	Activity No	Sector	Activity	Male Facilitated	Female Facilitated	Total Facilitated	From Date	To Date	Budget
1	1	30206	Drinking Water Supply	وائر سپلائي پمپ سولار کي تنصیب	1168	1035	2203	2021-04-19	2025-05-20	9,700,000
2	2	30211	Village Development	Union Office	1168	1035	2203	2021-04-19	2024-05-20	34,040,000
3	3	30216	Health Hard	labour room	1168	1035	2203	2021-04-19	2023-05-20	35,700,000
4	4	30219	Education Hard	Library Construction GHS. Boys	1168	1035	2203	2021-04-19	2022-05-21	2,800,000
5	5	30220	Village Development	street light for village	1168	1035	2203	2021-04-19	2023-04-20	8,280,000
6	6	30221	Agriculture Hard	agricultural seeds	1168	1035	2203	2021-04-19	2022-04-20	6,700,000
7	7	30222	Drinking Water Supply	Check Dam	1168	1035	2203	2021-04-19	2023-04-20	2,520,000
8	8	30223	Agriculture Hard	grafting of zaitoon trees	1168	1035	2203	2021-04-19	2024-04-19	600,000
9	9	30224	Health Hard	animal hospital	1168	1035	2203	2021-04-19	2023-05-19	0
10	10	30225	Village Development	cricket ground	1168	1035	2203	2021-04-19	2025-05-19	20,000,000
11	11	30226	Education Hard	technical vocational center	1168	1035	2203	2021-04-19	2023-05-19	4,000,000

Soft Component

#	Priority	Activity No	Sector	Activity	Male Facilitated	Female Facilitated	Total Facilitated	From Date	To Date	Budget
1	1	30227	Human Rights	CNIC	1168	1035	2203	2021-04-19	2022-09-25	NA
2	2	30228	Human Rights	Birth Certificate	1168	1035	2203	2021-04-19	2021-09-25	NA
3	3	30229	Education	Enrollment Campaigns	108	75	183	2021-04-19	2022-05-19	NA
4	4	31223	Resource Mobilization	unorganized HH will be organized	329	225	554	2021-04-19	2021-09-25	NA
5	5	31224	Resource Mobilization	To increase the saving	225	0	225	2021-04-19	2021-09-25	NA
6	6	31225	Resource Mobilization	CMST training	52	26	78	2021-04-19	2021-09-25	NA

Copyright © 2017-2022 Balochistan Rural Support Program, ICT Department. All rights reserved.

Union Council Development Plan

General Information

District: 17890 LSO Name: Sachan local support organization Tehsil: Nal Union Council: Garuk Nal Formation Type: New Formation

Category: Mixed Formation Date: 13 September 2019

Hard Component

#	Priority	Activity No	Sector	Activity	Male Facilitated	Female Facilitated	Total Facilitated	From Date	To Date	Budget
1	1	34036	Communication	Black Top Road	800	250	1050	2021-05-02	2024-06-06	4,500,000
2	2	34037	Drinking Water Supply	DWSS	800	250	1050	2021-05-02	2024-06-06	4,500,000
3	3	34041	Health Hard	new hospital	1800	1700	3500	2021-05-02	2024-06-06	1,500,000
4	4	34042	Village Development	protection wall	1100	1100	2200	2021-05-02	2024-06-06	1,500,000
5	5	34043	Education Hard	Repair and Renovation GHS. Boys	180	180	360	2021-05-02	2024-06-06	1,500,000
6	6	34044	Health Hard	Ambulance - BHU	250	300	550	2021-05-02	2024-06-06	1,500,000
7	7	34045	Energy	Solar system	280	200	480	2021-05-02	2024-06-06	1,500,000

Soft Component

#	Priority	Activity No	Sector	Activity	Male Facilitated	Female Facilitated	Total Facilitated	From Date	To Date	Budget
1	1	34023	Resource Mobilization	unorganized HH will be organized by CRP	2800	2600	5400	2021-05-02	2021-12-06	NA
2	2	34026	Resource Mobilization	saving and Resource Mobilization	400	400	800	2021-05-02	2021-12-06	NA
3	3	34029	Resource Mobilization	Resources	600	567	1167	2021-05-02	2021-12-06	NA
4	4	34031	Capacity Building	Conduct CMST Training for untrained members	40	40	80	2021-05-02	2021-12-06	NA

Copyright © 2017-2022 Balochistan Rural Support Program, ICT Department. All rights reserved.

Union Council Development Plan

General Information

District: Khuzdar Tehsil: Khuzdar Union Council: Abi Noghay
 LSO ID: 9210 LSO Name: Gawarikh LSO Category: Mixed Formation Date: 28 January 2019 Formation Type: Adoption/Revitalization

Hard Component

#	Priority	Activity No	Sector	Activity	Male Facilitated	Female Facilitated	Total Facilitated	From Date	To Date	Budget
1	1	21316	Health Hard	new hospital	675	712	1387	2019-09-16	2020-12-12	20,000,000
2	2	21317	Drinking Water Supply	Water supply	491	580	1071	2019-09-16	2020-12-12	6,000,000
3	3	21318	Village Development	Link road	950	1036	1986	2019-09-16	2020-12-12	11,800,000
4	4	21319	Village Development	sewerage line	695	758	1453	2019-09-10	2020-12-12	4,535,340
5	5	21320	Education Hard	Repairing of school	1257	1378	2635	2020-03-01	2020-12-12	17,650,000
6	6	21322	Village Development	Embroidery Center for women's	1	1378	1379	2019-09-16	2020-12-15	24,000,000
7	7	21323	Agriculture Hard	land leveling	1375	3360	4735	2019-09-10	2021-01-01	8,500,000
8	8	21324	Village Development	protection wall	97	101	198	2019-08-06	2019-12-31	1,600,000
9	9	21325	Village Development	Solar Panels and Batteries at H level	1375	3255	4630	2019-11-12	2021-12-30	2,250,000
10	10	21326	Agriculture Hard	channels	125	135	260	2019-09-06	2021-12-30	123,150

Soft Component

#	Priority	Activity No	Sector	Activity	Male Facilitated	Female Facilitated	Total Facilitated	From Date	To Date	Budget
1	1	21214	Resource Mobilization	CO	675	712	1387	2019-10-27	2021-06-09	NA
2	2	21215	Resource Mobilization	unorganized HH will be organized	45	0	45	2019-06-27	2019-11-10	NA
3	3	21216	Resource Mobilization	To increase the saving	1636	0	1636	2019-04-05	2019-10-19	NA
4	4	21219	Resource Mobilization	Resources	450	541	991	2019-08-16	2019-12-01	NA
5	5	21220	Capacity Building	Skill trainings	30	55	85	2019-09-05	2019-12-12	NA
6	6	21221	Capacity Building	Conduct LMST Training for untrained members	6	6	12	2019-10-05	2020-01-12	NA
7	7	21222	Capacity Building	Conduct Exposure Visits	216	0	216	2019-11-19	2020-03-03	NA
8	8	21223	Capacity Building	Conduct Financial Management Training for untrained members	0	0	0	2019-06-06	2019-06-15	NA

Annex 11: Technical Assistance Team's Response to Key Question 2

Key Question 2: How do the CIs engage with potential contributors to local development, particularly state actors (including elected representatives and federal and provincial government organisations)? To what extent are the potential contributors responsive, and what factors influence this?

MATURE CIs are, 1) mobilised, 2) capacitated, 3) registered, and 4) operate their own Bank Account and ARE able to develop (A) their bottom-up development plans that include B) priority project. The CIs do this with the technical assistance from an NOG/RSPs. Once these plans are developed, RSPs also assist these CIs to implement their development projects/activities, which also requires developing linkages with government and non-government entities.

Engagement of CIs with potential contributors (mostly District level stakeholders) under the BRACE programme, is limited, in terms of (a) coverage of the total population and (b) in terms of being able to provide the full range of socio-economic-social-capital stimuli.

At present in the BRACE Districts, the interaction between CIs and other (District) stakeholders is mostly facilitated by RSPs and rarely the community leads or contacts on its own initiative the political leadership for resolving their priority needs/issues.

The GoB envisages for CIs to play this role through the Local Councils (Article 78 of the new amended LG Act) but the LC have not been in place since 2019. There is a disconnect between CIs and Secretaries of UCs. The reason is the authority and competition for resources. NOTE: the CLLG Policy and JDDC ToR Guidelines aim

to regulate the sharing distribution of local (devolved) budget/resources.

In BRACE Districts the mobilised CIs are guided by RSPs, who are supporting them in all activities from Registration to Implementation of the projects/interventions.

The Intra-District-Coordination forum (JDDC) was not streamlined and there were/are different JDDC notifications being followed by BRSP & NRSP and District Administration. The discrepancies in JDDC can be noticed as

- Agenda, participants, discussions, action-oriented decisions, recording of minutes
- Minutes are either signed by BRSP or DC office
- CPIs are not presented and approved in JDDC (in BRSP districts)
- Secretariat of JDDC is not specified/notified
- GoB line departments do not share their progress in the JDDC yet
- GoB line departments consider JDDC as BRACE program specific meeting where only RSPs present its progress
- Limited inter-sector coordination/progress review is conducted
- GoB involvement & input in BRACE field activities looks limited
- Guidelines for conduct of JDDC are missing
- Community-Led District Development Strategy and Plan

The working relations between CIs/IPs/Line department require much focus as:

- UC Secretaries are not engaged in BRACE program field activities.
- Working relation b/w the Deputy Commissioner Office & LG Department needs to be reinforced.
- Because district LG was not involved in the BRACE activities, the capacity of the ADLG remained weak in the community engagement approaches and would require special attention to enable him to play an effective role in any community engagement program.

The coordination issues between CIs, representatives & GoB line departments exist as:

- The coordination between CIs and GoB line departments is carried out through the RSPs/TA concerned which limits the direct interaction of CIs with GoB line departments/representatives.
- The RSPs (especially BRSP) hesitate to share complete information with the GoB district administration/line departments at the JDDC which resulted in trust deficit.
- The CIs have limited access to the BCR&RA and always depends on the RSPs during registration / renewal / audit & Accounts.

The ground situation reveals that the efforts has not yet been made to onboard the potential contributors (representatives of LCs/Province/Federation) to develop a close coordination between CIs and potential contributors for improved responsiveness. The response of the potential state actors to CIs is very limited.

The frequency and quality of this ENGAGEMENT is highly dependent on the quality of social mobilisation and capacity building support and the individual community leaders identified

at higher tiers. Wherever, you find these two factors converging, you will see that CIs engage with potential contributors including selected line departments, NGOs, and sometime member parliamentarians. The factors influencing the response of the potential contributors are:

- Legal cover for CIs is missing
- Lack of coordination of IPs with elected representatives. No proper roadmap/ approach for engagement of state actors and resource mobilisation
- Non-representation of elected representatives in JDDC
- Non-existence of LCs and non-engagement of Secretary UC with CIs

Sub-question 2.1: To what extent and how frequently do the CIs present their plans to joint development committees (JDCs) at the district and tehsil levels? What kind of responses have they got from the JDCs? Where have these responses led them?

The JDDC meetings are held monthly. However, only RSPs present their project progress in these JDDC meetings. During the DDSP assignment in three pilot districts (Loralai, Pishin, Kech), it was observed that as part of these progress review presentations, RSPs share the number of bottom-up development plans prepared (monthly, quarterly, YTD). Led by NRSP, only CIs of Kech district presents their prioritized needs / projects to be funded by BRACE. These needs are prioritized in the bottom-up development plans. After scrutiny these schemes are approved, which In BRSP districts, BRSP present their progress in similar manner however projects to be funded by BRACE are not presented in the JDDC meeting for scrutiny/approval. These are separately discussed with DC for approval and

directly uploaded on the BRSP MIS system. The CIs got good responses from the JDDC in Kech district on the BRACE funded projects.

Generally acute community issues are raised in the JDDC by the CI representatives. You would not see development plans professionally separately presented, discussed, approved and implemented through JDDC as such. Administration response is very positive in most cases. Line departments are sceptical sometime towards communities as their gaps are raised in the JDDC and they do not want to discuss that in the JDDC in front of all. During the DDSP assignment, 6 JDDC meetings were attended where it was observed that issues raised by communities were taken well. Some of the long-standing issues of service delivery were resolved. Response also depends on the nature of issue.

Sub-question 2.2: To what extent and how frequently do the CIs present their plans to other platforms for engaging state actors? What kind of responses have they got from these platforms? Where have these responses led them?

As stated above, you will find it in very rare cases where a motivated community leader on his personal contact approached state actor and then he received positive response. There may be very few such examples.

Sub-question 2.3: What factors explain the degree of responsiveness of the JDCs and other platforms at which the CIs present their local priorities? To what extent are these factors related to the policies of the institutions and the interests of the actors represented in these platforms?

The following factors explain the degree of responsiveness of the JDDC forum:

- Interest taken by the JDDC Chair; the deputy commissioner
- Document of Development plan
- Scrutiny of Development plan by JDDC Members
- Authentication of Development plan
- Approval of Development plan
- Minutes of JDDC Meeting

Some of the above lacunas will be addressed through the institutionalization process triggered by BRACE TA. The BRACE TA supported LGERDD to internalize the CIs through the amendments in the LGA 2010 and development of CLLG Policy Details are given below:

- A. Amendments on LGA 2010: The BRACE TA proposed amendment in the Section-87 of Balochistan Local Government Act 2010 which has been endorsed by the GoB Cabinet on 1st Feb 2022 and soon will be presented before the Provincial Assembly for its approval. This amended Act 2022 will provide a foundation to the CLLG Policy Framework. This amendment will cover the registered CBOs/CIs which can be engaged by Local Councils to implement the development projects that may be funded by donor organizations.

This will be a major shift in the local government system in the Balochistan province. The Section-87 of BLGA 2022 will provide the legal basis for CBOs/CIs to be formally and institutionally recognized as part of a GoB Local Government System.

- B. CLLG Policy: TA BRACE has worked out the proposed Provincial Community-Led Local Governance (CLLG) policy which is to be implemented through nine (09) Implementation Arrangements (IAs). The

CLLG Implementation Arrangements include:

1. GoB Local Government and Rural Development Framework
2. GoB LGRD Sector Medium Term Budgetary Framework (MTBF).
3. GoB District Development Strategy and Plan Guidelines
4. GoB Joint District Development Committee (JDDC) ToR
5. GoB Community Institutions (CI) Registration Requirements
6. GoB Community Institutions (CI) Mobilisation Requirements
7. CLLG Policy MoU/NOC between GoB District Level Stakeholders and Community Institutions
8. Institutional Set-Up to Implement GoB Rural/Urban CLLG Development Programmes
9. M&E and Audit Framework for GoB Rural/Urban CLLG Development Programmes

Once the Policy is in place and these CIs are owned (IA 5,6) by the government, the response from state actors and other donors towards the CIs will increase. TA has already prepared the streamlined JDDC TORs (IA 4), and standardized procedures for quality meetings by the JDDCs. Also, Guidelines and outlines are being developed for the DDSP (IA 3). The streamlined JDDC through DDSP will mobilise resource and engage all stakeholders particularly state actors to engage in productive manner with the CIs. Similarly, MOU arrangement where government with a proper institutional setup is always at the back also increase trust of the stakeholders.

C. Streamlined JDDC ToRs: The JDDC is the district instrument of the Provincial

CLLG Policy. The final draft JDDC ToR have already been reviewed by P&DD, which is the competent Authority to notify the JDDC subject to adoption of CLLG Policy. The main objectives of JDDC are to:

- Create synergy & complementarity between GoB & CI development plans
- Create complementarity between GoB and CI investments
- Monitor progress, learn-lessons, communicate, disseminate information
- Build capacity of GoB and CI stakeholder

The JDDC has 12 functions which are:

1. Act as Coordination forum for scrutiny/authentication/approval of CIs plans
2. Meet at least once in a quarter
3. Align CIs/NPOs VDPs/UCDPs/DDPs, with GoB District/Tehsil Development Plans
4. Identify specific opportunities/linkages between CI & GoB's Development Plans
5. Facilitate in registration and renewal of registration of CIs/NPOs
6. Create effective communication channels b/w Govt., CI/NPO, community leaders
7. Support NPOs & BRDA for Capacity Building initiatives
8. Consider the CI/NPO-CPI & Community Mobilisation investments submitted by CIs
9. Activate contractual agreements b/w NPOs/ CIs & GoB Line Departments
10. Invite and coordinate with district stakeholders to share progress on the development and action plans of their respective offices/departments
11. Review progress of Community /co-funded

projects/report to PMU/disseminate information & collate its experiences & lessons learned

12. Align the SDGs with the development activities at district/sub-district level

Sub-question 2.4: What steps have BRACE (including the TA Team) and the CIs taken to influence the responsiveness of the JDCs and other platforms and the institutional policies they follow? To what effect? What factors have facilitated and inhibited change?

The BRACE TA has taken following steps to influence the responsiveness of the JDDC and the institutional policies:

- Prepared streamlined JDDC ToRs
- Guidelines for the time efficient and productive JDDC meeting
- Representation of the elected members of local Councils/Provincial/Federation
- Templates/formats for JDDC meetings
- AD LG as Secretariat of JDDC specified in the streamlined JDDC TORs
- Preparation of CLLG Policy is in progress

Parts of this question is addressed above.

And the CIs have not taken any step to influence the responsiveness of the JDDC/TJDDC. CIs are not yet at that stage. The process in Balochistan is yet to reach at that stage.

The factors facilitated in the change include:

- Strategy and Policy Dialogue Committee (SPDC)
- Establishment of Sector Coordination Committee
- Establishment of Working Groups

- District Development Strategy & Plan

Additional information on DDSP provided by the TA Team on 24 May 2022

- a Description of improvements introduced through the DDSP in the pilot districts

Objective of the DDSP Assignment

Streamlining and invigorating the JDDCs on how to integrate community voices and prioritized needs in the Local Government processes, and guiding JDDCs to systematically seek synergy between the Community bottom-up and strategic Government top-down Development Plans, was the objective of the DDSP Assignment.

Introduction

Objectives of the DDSP Assignment required an action-packed work plan that covered; two rounds of field visits of one week each to each of the three pilot districts; the first round was allocated for an extensive participatory situation analysis and bilateral consultation sessions with all relevant stakeholders of each pilot district. The second round was allocated to conduct three concluding district workshops and tested the Streamlined JDDC TORs/Guidelines in all pilot districts. The DDSP Assignment was finally concluded in provincial workshop with the provincial & District level stakeholders.

Initial training on the streamlined JDDC procedures and transforming JDDC into a synergy producing forum was delivered to the key BRACE/CLLG Champions where they were tasked to introduce the JDDC standardized procedures, reorganize the JDDCs in their respective districts and start creating synergy and complementarity

projects at the JDDC forum.

Improvements Introduced through DDSP in 3 Pilot Districts

1. The DDSP Assignment firstly, addressed the need to streamline and improve the effectiveness of the JDDC Meetings, by including all district stakeholders and seeking immediate synergies between the bottom-up development plans and investments, with the top-down development plans and investments. The DDSP presented the community representatives and district officials the practical examples and success stories from their districts where the joint-venture of top-down and bottom-up efforts significantly improved (a) the service delivery by the government institutions and (b) opportunities for collective actions to reduce poverty of the targeted beneficiaries.
2. Secondly, the DDSP Assignment and Guidelines improved development effectiveness, by developing guidelines that aim to integrate scaled-up bottom-up development investments with more strategic higher provincial or district level development strategies and priorities, and thereby achieve broader based sustainable socio-economic development at UC, or district levels. The DDSP Assignment showed how the streamlined JDDC forum can contribute to a more strategic UC/ District development objectives, and link to various regional, provincial or sector Development Plans, including a proposed LGRD Sector Plan, and to SDG achievement.
3. The DDSP team developed and tested guidelines to streamline the way JDDC meetings are to be conducted and developed procedures for the JDDC, to systematically engage with all District Stakeholders to seek more coordinated, inclusive and strategic development at district and sub-district levels.
4. The streamlined guidelines, procedures and formats were tested in actual JDDC meetings with the JDDC Chair in the lead, in the three pilot Districts, and proved to be effective and were appreciated by the district stakeholders.
5. While a clear set of streamlined guidelines and procedures has been formulated, tested and proved to be effective, but there is still a long way to go, for all district stakeholders to effectively adopt and apply these new and innovative local development planning and development coordination and cooperation practices.
6. DDSP Assignment facilitated in addressing the inconsistencies of JDDC forum, methods, and procedures through streamlined guidelines and arrived at standardized streamlined practices applied in all three pilot districts, and to be replicated in all 9/10 BRACE districts.
7. The learnings from the TA DDSP in the three pilot districts, are to be used to further streamline the JDDC forum in all the BRACE targeted districts after the notification from Government of Balochistan.
8. During the DDSP Assignment, the stakeholders identified 35+ specific synergy opportunities across all sectors/line-departments, and these are to be used to make sure that the Top-Down/Bottom-up synergies and complementarities can be identified, if possible, in advance by the

- JDDC Forum, when stakeholders present their respective development plans, and in a deliberate transparent manner the JDDC Forum can now identify and activate these synergies, i.e., contribute to coordinated district development.
- b Effects of the DDSP on citizen-state engagement (through the JDCs or other platforms)
1. The DDSP Assignment was piloted in three BRACE districts including Loralai, Pishin, and Kech. The JDDC standardized procedures developed during the DDSP assignment was pilot tested in these three districts, where the Government started understanding the long-term objectives of the JDDC which is an integrated forum where synergies between Government and Community Institutions (CIs) are identified, supervised, and reviewed.
 2. The Assistant Director Local Government started providing secretarial support to JDDC for the first time. ADLGs understood and conveyed in JDDC meetings the objectives on how to make JDDC an effective collaboration forum.
 3. Line Departments for the first time realized that they are also accountable and supposed to present at the JDDC in front of the community representatives.
 4. Service delivery side i.e. the Line Departments in Kech for the very first time started presenting their progress on JDDC, which was appreciated by JDDC members especially community institutions.

Annex 12: Survey Respondents' Assessment of Linkages with Various Institutions**Table 28: Respondents' assessment of the importance and usefulness of institutions and elected representatives, comparison of responses by women and men, by institution**

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives	Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.	Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative has done something useful for you or other members of your household?						Expectations Gap: (A) minus (B) as Percentage of (A)						
		Percentage of Respondents							Percentage of (A)					
		Men	Women	Both	Men	Women	Both		Men	Sig.	Women	Sig.	Both	Sig.
Civil Administration and Courts	AC, DC, Commissioner	23	24	24	2	2	2	90	***	91	***	90	***	
	Police	32	39	35	10	10	10	67	***	74	***	71	***	
	Courts	17	15	16	3	2	2	84	***	89	***	86	***	
	Total	37	44	40	14	13	14	61	***	70	***	66	***	
Elected Representatives	Senator	-	-	-	0	0	0		***		***		***	
	MNA	14	23	19	1	2	1	94	***	92	***	93	***	
	MPA	28	24	26	13	4	8	56	***	82	***	68	***	
	District or Municipal Councillor	9	13	11	1	2	1	93	***	86	***	89	***	
	UC Councillor	9	15	12	1	5	3	88	***	66	***	74	***	
	Total	33	37	35	14	11	13	56	***	71	***	64	***	

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives	Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.	Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative has done something useful for you or other members of your household?				Expectations Gap: (A) minus (B) as Percentage of (A)							
		Percentage of Respondents				Percentage of (A)							
		Men	Women	Both	Sig.	Men	Women	Both	Sig.	Men	Women	Both	Sig.
Provincial Line Departments - Social Sectors	Education - Primary and secondary education	47	54	51		28	17	23		40	68	55	***
	Education - Higher Education	10	20	15		1	1	1		92	95	94	***
	Education - Polytechnic Education	3	10	7		0	0	0		93	98	96	***
	Health - EPI and preventive healthcare	5	16	11		1	15	8		78	9	26	***
	Health - Basic Health Units	12	21	17		5	7	6		60	67	64	***
	Health - Secondary Healthcare (THQ/DHQ hospitals)	65	30	48		46	7	27		30	75	44	***
	Health - Rehabilitation Services	7	15	11		1	2	1		86	86	86	***
	Drinking Water - Public Health Engineering	4	8	6		2	2	2		58	71	67	***
	Drinking Water - LG&RD	8	15	11		6	8	7		20	46	37	***
	Social Welfare	1	2	1		1	-	0		17	100	79	***
	Women Development	1	10	6		0	1	1		71	88	86	***
	Population Welfare	1	4	3		0	0	0		75	95	91	***
Total	77	69	73		58	41	49		25	41	32	***	

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives	Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.	Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative has done something useful for you or other members of your household?				Expectations Gap: (A) minus (B) as Percentage of (A)						
		Percentage of Respondents				Percentage of (A)						
		Men	Women	Both	Sig.	Men	Women	Both	Sig.			
Provincial Line Departments - Infrastructure	LG&RD	1	9	5	0	1	0	83	*	92	91	***
	Communication	1	9	5	0	0	0	89	**	96	95	***
	Physical Planning and Housing	0	9	5	-	-	-	100	**	100	100	***
	Power – Electricity	18	44	31	5	7	6	75	***	85	82	***
	Power – Gas	8	21	14	1	0	0	92	***	99	97	***
	Urban Planning and Development	0	6	3	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-
	Union Council	2	8	5	1	1	1	59	***	89	83	***
	Total	20	48	34	6	9	7	70	***	82	79	***
	Agriculture	21	35	28	9	5	7	57	***	86	75	***
	Irrigation	13	20	17	5	3	4	63	***	86	77	***
Provincial Line Departments - Agriculture and Natural Resources	Livestock	12	20	16	3	2	75	***	90	85	***	
	Forestry	7	17	12	1	2	86	***	90	89	***	
	Fisheries	0	1	1	-	0	0	100	**	83	88	***
	Total	26	44	35	12	9	10	54	***	80	70	***

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives	Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.	Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative has done something useful for you or other members of your household?	Expectations Gap: (A) minus (B) as Percentage of (A)										
			Percentage of Respondents										
			Men	Women	Both	Men	Women	Both	Sig.	Women	Sig.	Both	Sig.
Provincial Line Departments - Other Productive Sectors	Industries	2	19	11	1	2	1	71	**	90	***	88	***
	Manpower	5	12	8	4	0	2	8		96	***	71	***
	Minerals	1	11	6	0	1	1	75	*	91	***	90	***
	Food and Tourism	1	10	6	1	1	1	50		90	***	85	***
	Total	7	24	16	6	4	5	18		84	***	69	***
Provincial Line Departments - Other Sectors	Environment	-	-	-	-	1	0				***		***
	Sports	2	20	11	1	4	2	44		82	***	79	***
	Information Technology	1	11	6	-	0	0	100	***	99	***	99	***
	Culture	2	15	9	1	1	1	67	**	92	***	90	***
	Others (please specify)	-	-	-	-	-	-						
Total	3	24	14	2	5	3	44	*	81	***	77	***	

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives	Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.	Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative has done something useful for you or other members of your household?				Expectations Gap: (A) minus (B) as Percentage of (A)					
		Percentage of Respondents				Percentage of (A)					
		Men	Women	Both	Sig.	Men	Women	Both	Sig.		
Federal Organisations/ Programmes	NADRA	61	53	57	53	39	46	13	27	19	***
	Ehsaas/BISP	42	41	42	30	27	28	30	34	32	***
	Election Commission of Pakistan	7	10	8	0	1	1	95	93	94	***
	Total	73	59	66	67	52	60	7	11	9	***
	Banks	4	17	10	1	1	1	67	96	91	***
Commercial Institutions	Other For-profit Companies/ Entities	1	12	7	0	0	0	88	99	98	***
	Shopkeepers	18	36	27	14	11	12	22	69	53	***
	Moneylenders	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	98	97	***
	Middlemen	1	3	2	1	1	1	50	57	55	***
	Total	21	39	30	16	12	14	24	70	54	***
Non-Profit Organisations	RSPs	63	65	64	47	45	46	26	30	28	***
	CO, VO or LSO	49	59	54	43	41	42	12	31	22	***
	Others (please specify)	1	0	0	-	-	-	100	100	100	***
	Total	68	68	68	59	49	54	14	28	21	***

The asterisks indicate the statistical level of significance of the difference between the respective column percentages for a two-sided Z-test – three asterisks for 1 percent level of significance, two for 5 percent, and one for 10 percent. Three asterisks (1 percent) represent the highest level of significance.

Table 29: Respondents’ assessment of the importance and usefulness of institutions and elected representatives, comparison of CO members and non-members, by institution

	Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.	Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative has done something useful for you or other members of your household?				Expectations Gap: (A) minus (B) as Percentage of (A)						
		Percentage of Respondents				Percentage of (A)						
		CO Member	Non-Member	Both		CO Member	Non-Member	Sig.	Both	Sig.		
Civil Administration and Courts	AC, DC, Commissioner	22	27	24	3	2	2	89	93	***	90	***
	Police	35	38	35	11	9	10	69	77	***	71	***
	Courts	14	21	16	3	1	2	81	96	***	86	***
	Total	40	41	40	15	11	14	63	73	***	66	***
Elected Representatives	Senator	-	-	-	-	-	0			***		***
	MNA	18	20	19	2	1	1	91	96	***	93	***
	MPA	26	25	26	10	5	8	64	79	***	68	***
	District or Municipal Councillor	10	13	11	2	0	1	85	97	***	89	***
	UC Councillor	12	13	12	4	2	3	69	88	***	74	***
	Total	35	35	35	14	8	13	59	78	***	64	***

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives	Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.	Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative has done something useful for you or other members of your household?	Expectations Gap: (A) minus (B) as Percentage of (A)											
			Percentage of Respondents						Percentage of (A)					
			CO Member	Non-Member	Both	CO Member	Non-Member	Both	CO Member	Non-Member	Sig.	Both	Sig.	
Provincial Line Departments - Social Sectors	Education - Primary and secondary education	54	42	51	25	16	23	53	62	***	55	***		
	Education - Higher Education	14	16	15	1	1	1	94	92	***	94	***		
	Education - Polytechnic Education	6	8	7	0	-	0	95	100	***	96	***		
	Health - EPI and preventive healthcare	12	8	11	8	8	8	32	0	***	26	***		
	Health - Basic Health Units	18	14	17	7	4	6	62	73	***	64	***		
	Health - Secondary Healthcare (THQ/DHQ hospitals)	49	46	48	28	22	27	42	51	***	44	***		
	Health - Rehabilitation Services	10	12	11	2	0	1	82	96	***	86	***		
	Drinking Water – Public Health Engineering	6	6	6	2	1	2	62	79	***	67	***		
	Drinking Water – LG&RD	12	10	11	7	7	7	40	27	***	37	***		
	Social Welfare	2	1	1	0	0	0	80	75	***	79	***		
	Women Development	6	6	6	1	0	1	84	93	***	86	***		
	Population Welfare	3	2	3	0	-	0	89	100	***	91	***		
Total	76	65	73	52	42	49	32	35	***	32	***			

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives	Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.	Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative has done something useful for you or other members of your household?	Expectations Gap: (A) minus (B) as Percentage of (A)										
			Percentage of Respondents										
			CO Member	Non-Member	Both	CO Member	Non-Member	Both					
Provincial Line Departments - Infrastructure	LG&RD	5	5	5	0	0	0	92	91	91	***	***	
	Communication	5	5	5	0	-	0	94	100	95	***	***	
	Physical Planning and Housing	5	4	5	-	-	-	100	100	100	***	***	
	Power – Electricity	34	24	31	7	1	6	78	95	82	***	***	
	Power – Gas	13	16	14	1	-	0	96	100	97	***	***	
	Urban Planning and Development	3	3	3	-	1	0	100	67	-	-	***	
	Union Council	6	3	5	1	0	1	82	87	83	***	***	
	Total	37	26	34	9	3	7	76	88	79	79	***	***
	Agriculture	28	27	28	8	5	7	73	81	75	75	***	***
	Irrigation	17	17	17	4	3	4	74	85	77	77	***	***
Provincial Line Departments - Agriculture and Natural Resources	Livestock	16	17	16	3	2	2	84	87	85	***	***	
	Forestry	12	11	12	2	1	1	87	92	89	***	***	
	Fisheries	1	1	1	0	-	0	83	100	88	***	***	
	Total	36	32	35	11	8	10	68	76	70	70	***	***

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives	Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.	Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative has done something useful for you or other members of your household?	Expectations Gap: (A) minus (B) as Percentage of (A)											
			Percentage of Respondents						Percentage of (A)					
			CO Member	Non-Member	Both	CO Member	Non-Member	Both	Sig.	Non-Member	Sig.	Both	Sig.	
Provincial Line Departments - Other Productive Sectors	Industries	11	9	11	2	0	1	86	95	88	***	***		
	Manpower	8	9	8	2	3	2	72	67	71	***	***		
	Minerals	6	7	6	1	1	1	90	90	90	***	***		
	Food and Tourism	6	5	6	1	0	1	82	96	85	***	***		
	Total	15	16	16	5	4	5	68	73	69	***	***		
Provincial Line Departments - Other Sectors	Environment	-	-	-	0	-	0				***	***		
	Sports	12	10	11	3	2	2	77	84	79	***	***		
	Information Technology	6	6	6	0	-	0	99	100	99	***	***		
	Culture	8	9	9	1	0	1	87	95	90	***	***		
	Others (please specify)	-	-	-	-	-	-							
Federal Organisations/ Programmes	Total	14	13	14	4	2	3	74	85	77	***	***		
	NADRA	60	49	57	51	33	46	15	33	19	***	***		
	Ehsaas/BISP	43	39	42	30	24	28	29	39	32	***	***		
	Election Commission of Pakistan	8	8	8	1	0	1	92	97	94	***	***		
	Total	68	59	66	64	47	60	6	20	9	***	***		

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives	Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.	Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative has done something useful for you or other members of your household?	Expectations Gap: (A) minus (B) as Percentage of (A)									
			Percentage of Respondents									
			CO Member	Non-Member	Both	CO Member	Non-Member	Both				
Commercial Institutions	Banks	10	10	10	1	-	1	88	100	91	***	***
	Other For-profit Companies/Entities	7	7	7	0	-	0	98	100	98	***	***
	Shopkeepers	28	23	27	13	12	12	55	49	53	***	***
	Moneylenders	4	3	3	0	-	0	95	100	97	***	***
	Middlemen	2	1	2	1	-	1	46	100	55	**	***
	Total	31	26	30	15	12	14	53	55	54	***	***
Non-Profit Organisations	RSPs	70	48	64	54	25	46	23	47	28	***	***
	CO, VO or LSO	61	35	54	51	18	42	17	48	22	***	***
	Others (please specify)	0	0	0	-	-	-	100	100	100	**	***
	Total	74	51	68	63	31	54	16	40	21	***	***

The asterisks indicate the statistical level of significance of the difference between the respective column percentages for a two-sided Z-test – three asterisks for 1 percent level of significance, two for 5 percent, and one for 10 percent. Three asterisks (1 percent) represent the highest level of significance.

Table 30: Respondents' assessment of the importance and usefulness of institutions and elected representatives, comparison by income level (up to and above the median level of income), by institution

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives	Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.	Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative has done something useful for you or other members of your household?	Expectations Gap: (A) minus (B) as Percentage of (A)									
			Percentage of Respondents			Percentage of (A)						
			Up to Median	Above Median	Both	Up to Median	Above Median	Sig.				
Civil Administration and Courts	AC, DC, Commissioner	23	24	24	2	3	2	92	88	***	90	***
	Police	40	31	35	11	9	10	73	69	***	71	***
	Courts	12	20	16	2	3	2	87	86	***	86	***
	Total	44	37	40	13	14	14	70	61	***	66	***
Elected Representatives	Senator	-	-	-	0	0	0					***
	MNA	19	18	19	2	1	1	91	95	***	93	***
	MPA	25	27	26	8	8	8	67	69	***	68	***
	District or Municipal Councillor	9	13	11	2	1	1	81	94	***	89	***
	UC Councillor	13	11	12	6	1	3	58	94	***	74	***
Total	39	31	35	15	10	13	61	68	***	64	***	

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives	Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.	Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative has done something useful for you or other members of your household?	Expectations Gap: (A) minus (B) as Percentage of (A)										
			Percentage of Respondents			Percentage of (A)							
			Up to Median	Above Median	Both	Up to Median	Above Median	Both	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.		
Provincial Line Departments - Social Sectors	Education - Primary and secondary education	48	54	51	20	26	23	58	52	55	***	***	***
	Education - Higher Education	12	18	15	1	1	1	95	93	94	***	***	***
	Education - Polytechnic Education	6	8	7	0	0	0	96	97	96	***	***	***
	Health - EPI and preventive healthcare	12	10	11	8	8	8	29	22	26	**		***
	Health - Basic Health Units	11	22	17	3	9	6	74	60	64	***	***	***
	Health - Secondary Healthcare (THQ/DHQ hospitals)	47	48	48	31	22	27	33	55	44	***	***	***
	Health - Rehabilitation Services	9	13	11	1	2	1	89	84	86	***	***	***
	Drinking Water – Public Health Engineering	6	7	6	1	3	2	77	59	67	***	***	***
	Drinking Water – LG&RD	8	14	11	2	12	7	70	18	37	***		***
	Social Welfare	1	1	1	0	0	0	92	67	79	***	**	***
	Women Development	7	4	6	0	1	1	95	70	86	***	***	***
Population Welfare	4	1	3	0	0	0	95	75	91	***	*	***	
Total	72	74	73	46	53	49	35	29	32	***	***	***	

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives	Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.	Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative has done something useful for you or other members of your household?	Expectations Gap: (A) minus (B) as Percentage of (A)											
			Percentage of Respondents						Percentage of (A)					
			Up to Median	Above Median	Both	Up to Median	Above Median	Both	Up to Median	Above Median	Sig.	Both	Sig.	
Provincial Line Departments - Infrastructure	LG&RD	4	5	5	1	0	0	86	96	91	***	***		
	Communication	4	6	5	0	0	0	91	98	95	***	***		
	Physical Planning and Housing	4	5	5	-	-	-	100	100	100	***	***		
	Power – Electricity	31	31	31	3	8	6	89	74	82	***	***		
	Power – Gas	13	15	14	0	0	0	97	98	97	***	***		
	Urban Planning and Development	3	3	3	0	0	0	93	89	-	***	***		
	Union Council	6	3	5	1	1	1	83	83	83	***	***		
	Total	34	34	34	5	9	7	85	73	79	***	***		
	Agriculture	28	27	28	6	8	7	78	72	75	***	***		
	Irrigation	15	19	17	2	5	4	84	71	77	**	***		
Provincial Line Departments - Agriculture and Natural Resources	Livestock	15	18	16	2	3	2	85	84	85	***	***		
	Forestry	12	11	12	2	1	1	87	91	89	***	***		
	Fisheries	1	1	1	0	-	0	71	100	88	*	***		
	Total	36	34	35	9	12	10	74	65	70	***	***		

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives	Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.	Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative has done something useful for you or other members of your household?	Expectations Gap: (A) minus (B) as Percentage of (A)											
			Percentage of Respondents						Percentage of (A)					
			Up to Median	Above Median	Both	Up to Median	Above Median	Both	Sig.	Up to Median	Above Median	Sig.	Both	Sig.
Provincial Line Departments - Other Productive Sectors	Industries	11	10	11	2	1	1	85	93	***	88	***		
	Manpower	7	10	8	1	4	2	81	64	***	71	***		
	Minerals	6	6	6	1	0	1	84	96	***	90	***		
	Food and Tourism	5	6	6	2	0	1	70	98	***	85	***		
	Total	17	15	16	5	5	5	70	68	***	69	***		
Provincial Line Departments - Other Sectors	Environment	-	-	-	1	0	0			***		***		
	Sports	14	9	11	4	1	2	74	86	***	79	***		
	Information Technology	5	8	6	0	-	0	98	100	***	99	***		
	Culture	9	8	9	2	0	1	83	97	***	90	***		
	Others (please specify)	-	-	-	-	-	-			**		**		
Total	17	11	14	5	1	3	71	86	***	77	***			

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives	Name the departments, institutions or elected representatives that you think are important for the wellbeing of your household.	Since 2018 (when BRACE started), which department, institution or elected representative has done something useful for you or other members of your household?	Expectations Gap: (A) minus (B) as Percentage of (A)										
			Percentage of Respondents			Percentage of (A)							
			Up to Median	Above Median	Both	Up to Median	Above Median	Both	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.		
Federal Organisations/ Programmes	NADRA	59	55	57	42	50	46	29	9	19	***	***	***
	Ehsaas/BISP	38	46	42	28	29	28	26	37	32	***	***	***
	Election Commission of Pakistan	6	11	8	0	1	1	94	93	94	***	***	***
	Total	66	66	66	55	64	60	16	2	9	***	***	***
	Banks	10	11	10	1	1	1	94	89	91	***	***	***
Commercial Institutions	Other For-profit Companies/Entities	6	7	7	0	0	0	98	98	98	***	***	***
	Shopkeepers	33	20	27	16	9	12	52	56	53	***	***	***
	Moneylenders	2	5	3	0	0	0	95	97	97	***	***	***
	Middlemen	3	1	2	1	1	1	62	29	55	***	***	***
	Total	36	24	30	17	11	14	53	55	54	***	***	***
Non-Profit Organisations	RSPs	67	60	64	48	44	46	29	27	28	***	***	***
	CO, VO or LSO	59	49	54	42	42	42	29	14	22	***	***	***
	Others (please specify)	0	0	0	-	-	-	100	100	100	***	*	***
	Total	72	63	68	54	54	54	25	16	21	***	***	***

The asterisks indicate the statistical level of significance of the difference between the respective column percentages for a two-sided Z-test – three asterisks for 1 percent level of significance, two for 5 percent, and one for 10 percent. Three asterisks (1 percent) represent the highest level of significance.

Table 31: CO members’ assessment of whether community institutions played a role in linkages with state actors, by institution

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives		Percentage of Respondents						
		All CO Members	Male	Female	Sig. (by gender)	Up to Median Income	Above Median Income	Sig. (by income)
Civil Administration and Courts	AC, DC, Commissioner	1	1	0		1	1	
	Police	6	6	5		7	4	**
	Courts	1	1	1		1	1	
	Total	7	8	6		9	5	**
Elected Representatives	Senator	0	0	0		0	0	
	MNA	1	1	1		1	0	*
	MPA	7	11	4	***	7	8	
	District or Municipal Councillor	0	0	0		1	0	
	UC Councillor	2	0	4		4	0	***
	Total	10	12	8	**	12	8	**
Provincial Line Departments - Social Sectors	Education - Primary and secondary education	19	24	14		16	22	
	Education - Higher Education	0	0	0		0	0	
	Education - Polytechnic Education	0	0	0		0	0	
	Health - EPI and preventive healthcare	6	1	11		6	6	
	Health - Basic Health Units	4	3	5		2	7	
	Health - Secondary Healthcare (THQ/DHQ hospitals)	22	38	6	***	25	19	**
	Health - Rehabilitation Services	1	1	1		1	1	
	Drinking Water - Public Health Engineering	1	1	0	*	0	1	
	Drinking Water - LG&RD	7	6	8		2	12	
	Social Welfare	0	0	0		0	0	
	Women Development	0	0	0		0	0	
	Population Welfare	0	0	0		0	0	
	Total	40	47	32	***	37	43	

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives		Percentage of Respondents						
		All CO Members	Male	Female	Sig. (by gender)	Up to Median Income	Above Median Income	Sig. (by income)
Provincial Line Departments – Infrastructure	LG&RD	1	0	1		1	0	**
	Communication	0	0	0		0	0	
	Physical Planning and Housing	0	0	0		0	0	
	Power – Electricity	6	6	6		4	8	
	Power – Gas	0	0	0		0	0	
	Urban Planning and Development	0	0	0		0	0	
	Union Council	1	0	1		2	0	***
	Total	7	6	8		5	9	
Provincial Line Departments - Agriculture and Natural Resources	Agriculture	5	7	3	***	4	5	
	Irrigation	2	3	2		1	4	
	Livestock	2	3	0	***	1	2	
	Forestry	0	0	0		0	0	
	Fisheries	0	0	0		0	0	
	Total	6	9	4	***	5	7	
Provincial Line Departments - Other Productive Sectors	Industries	1	0	1		1	0	***
	Manpower	2	3	0	***	1	3	
	Minerals	0	0	1		0	0	
	Food and Tourism	0	0	1		1	-	**
	Total	3	4	2	**	3	3	
Provincial Line Departments - Other Sectors	Environment	2	1	3		3	1	***
	Sports	1	0	2		1	0	**
	Information Technology	0	0	0		0	0	
	Culture	1	0	1		1	0	**
	Others (please specify)	-	-	-		-	-	
	Total	2	1	4		4	1	***
Federal Organisations/ Programmes	NADRA	38	49	28	***	32	45	
	Ehsaas/BISP	22	25	20	**	21	24	
	Election Commission of Pakistan	2	3	2		2	2	
	Total	48	59	38	***	42	55	

Departments, Institutions and Elected Representatives		Percentage of Respondents						
		All CO Members	Male	Female	Sig. (by gender)	Up to Median Income	Above Median Income	Sig. (by income)
Commercial Institutions	Banks	1	1	0		1	1	
	Other For-profit Companies/Entities	0	0	0		0	0	
	Shopkeepers	10	13	8	***	12	8	***
	Moneylenders	0	0	0		0	0	***
	Middlemen	1	0	3	***	3	-	**
	Total	11	14	8		13	9	
Non-Profit Organisations	RSPs	45	49	41	***	47	43	
	CO, VO or LSO	38	37	39		35	41	
	Others (please specify)	0	0	0		0	0	
	Total	51	59	44	***	52	51	

The asterisks indicate the statistical level of significance of the difference between the respective column percentages for a two-sided Z-test – three asterisks for 1 percent level of significance, two for 5 percent, and one for 10 percent. Three asterisks (1 percent) represent the highest level of significance.

Annex 13: Trust and Trustworthiness – Literature Review

The topic of trust has recently inspired a host of books and conferences.¹ This is in part because of recent events. The overturning of the communist regimes in Eastern Europe and the emergence of democratisation movements in other parts of the world raise questions about how to institute trust in an unaccustomed state and government. The creation of new institutions to manage the European Union seem also to depend on the development of trust, this time among both member states and their citizens. The intensity of ethnic and religious conflicts generate concern about what fuels and maintains distrust. The relative success of the Japanese economy or of Korean immigrants to the United States suggests the importance of small group trust in generating productive and efficient economic organisation.

Of equal importance in explaining the focus on trust is the need for some such concept in social science research dedicated to the explanation or design of institutions. Many economists and political economists who spent most of the 1980s working on models aimed at “getting the incentives right” are now recognizing that they need something more than incentives if they are to have better models of internal relationships within the firm (see, e.g., Kreps 1990, Miller 1992; and Williamson 1993), organisations more generally (Kramer and Tyler, eds. 1996); collective action and cooperation (see, e.g., Gambetta, ed., 1988; North 1990; Orbell and Dawes 1991, 1993), negotiation of government policies (Scharpf 1994), or compliance with

government regulations (see, e.g. Levi 1988, 1997; Ayres and Braithwaite 1992). Further contributing to this preoccupation with trust is the attractiveness of the idea of social capital, a concept popularised by Robert Putnam (1993) but drawing on the work of the economist Glen Loury and the sociologist James Coleman, as a means to produce better polities and economies.

Trust is, in fact, a holding word for a variety of phenomena that enable individuals to take risks in dealing with others, solve collective action problems, or act in ways that seem contrary to standard definitions of self-interest. However, what it is, what work it does in improving governance, and what accounts for its variation are only beginning to be the subjects of serious theoretical and empirical investigations.

What is trust?

Trust has three parts: A trusts B to do X. The act of trust is the knowledge or belief that the trusted will have an incentive to do what she engages to do. As Hardin (1993, this volume) argues, trust is a form of encapsulated interest. A trusts B because she presumes it is in B’s interest to act in a way consistent with A’s interest. Further, trust is relational. The initial grant of trust depends on one person’s evaluation that another will be trustworthy. Its maintenance requires confirmation of that trustworthiness, or else trust will be withdrawn. Trust, by this definition, is not equivalent to cooperation, a

1. From: Levi, Margaret. 2003. “A State of Trust,” available at <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.46.pokFKiNH52ZK1W64wsVWH1Z2t2gueuTcj2xWWp3QCtAWGhC4m6WsQ7Sou6AtzEzrfTkoPy2tbAyA9vWsdnsRscRcX7bVvyand> Governance; New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2003 (see <https://www.russellsage.org/publications/trust-and-governance-1>).

common conflation [see, e.g., Orbell, Dawes and Schwarz-Shea 1994] although it may facilitate cooperation.

Behaviourally, the more trusting an individual is the lower the personal investment she will make in learning about the trustworthiness of the trusted and in monitoring and enforcing his compliance in a cooperative venture. Notice that each clause is important here. The investigation is of trusting behaviour, not its outcome. In other words, someone can trust mistakenly. The measurement is of personal investment in monitoring and enforcement and not of the cost of institutional arrangements that lower that investment. At issue is a cooperative venture, which implies that the truster possesses a reasonable belief that well-placed trust will yield positive returns and is willing to act upon that belief. Thus, the observer can tell if an individual is trusting by noting whether a transaction took place, determining what kind of transaction it was, and measuring her investment in learning about potential partners in cooperation and in monitoring them and enforcing their behaviour once the bargain has been struck. The absence of a transaction indicates the absence of trust. A transaction that depends on the institutionalization of assurances and commitments reflects less trust than one that requires only a handshake. The higher the investment in information gathering, monitoring, etc., the less trust.

Trust implies a risk to the truster. In some instances, the risk may be so low that we tend to use the label confidence instead of trust. In other instances, the risk is so high that we consider the truster gullible. In certain cases, the risk is worth the payoff; this seems to be the estimate of the Persian rug salesperson who offers to let someone take a valuable rug home, often to another state or country, and try it out before

paying a cent. In other cases, the possible risk is so considerable that no trust is given. The over-guarding of children by their parents exemplifies this.

The actual extent of risk and the extent to which the truster is taking a “sensible” risk are variables. They are always partially and often largely functions of the trustworthiness of not only the trustee but also those on whom the truster relies for information and sanctions against a trust-breaker. Sometimes this actor is the truster him or herself; this is the case when s/he relies on her own assessments of character. More often, there is a third party who has either vetted the trustee, will sanction the trustee if necessary, or both. Trust is, therefore, a relational and rational, although not always fully calculated, action. In many, if not most, cases it depends upon confidence in institutions that back up the trustee.

Trust is not one thing and does not have one source. It has a variety of forms and causes. Although a reasonable belief that the trustee will act consistently with the truster’s interests depends on knowledge of the trustee, this can but need not be detailed, personal knowledge. Arrangements that both lower personal investment and reinforce reasonable beliefs are diverse, ranging from an individual’s capacity to make sound character assessments; to her embeddedness in thick networks of interaction that make knowledge of others easy to acquire; to reliance on institutions that do the work of information-gathering and monitoring.

This discussion begins to clarify another significant analytical distinction, between trust and trustworthiness. Only persons can trust or be trusting, but trustworthiness can attach to either individuals or institutions. In everyday language and in contemporary media, there are innumerable expressions of concern about

the loss of trust in institutions generally and in government specifically. These concerns make sense if what is meant is a decline in the trustworthiness of these institutions and governments. Institutional trustworthiness implies procedures for selecting and constraining the agents of institutions so that they are competent, credible, and likely to act in the interests of those being asked to trust the institution. Thus, it is not actually the institution or government that is being trusted or is acting in a trustworthy manner. Rather, when citizens and clients say they trust an institution, they are declaring a belief that, on average, agents will prove to be trustworthy. In this paper, the terminology of trusting the state or another institution carries this meaning.²

Box 2.2 Trust in institutions stems from delivering on commitments (p. 55)

Trust is a central aspect of strengthening governance and delivering on development. Trust is related to positive outcomes in terms of economic growth, as well as government performance (Putnam 1993; La Porta and others 1997). But what exactly is trust, where does it come from, and why does it matter? **This Report defines trust as the probability that an actor assigns to other actors of delivering on their commitment, conditional on their past behaviour. In the game theory literature, this is known as reputation.** The literature distinguishes between two key kinds of trust: interpersonal trust and institutional trust.

Interpersonal trust refers to trust among individuals. It can arise from their relationships such as shared ties, or it can be present as

a social norm (table B2.2.1). The notions of bonding social capital and bridging social capital are relevant to interpersonal trust (Putnam 2000). Bonding social capital – the horizontal ties within communities and among organizations – can bring about a sense of purpose and identity, encouraging social cohesion. Bridging social capital consists of the cross-cutting ties that breach social divides, such as economic class, ethnicity, and religion. If the bridging of social capital is missing, it can lead to balkanized societies in which strong ties within communities actually work against the collective interest, holding back development (Portes and Landolt 1996).

Table B2.2.1: Sources of trust

	Type of trust	
	Institutional trust	Interpersonal trust
Source of trust	Relationships	Relationships
	Commitment	Norms

Source: WDR 2017 team, based on Lach and López-Calva 2016.

Institutional trust refers to society's trust in organizations, rules, and the mechanisms to enforce them. Institutional trust can arise from elements based on relationships, or it can be a function of repeated commitment (table B2.2.1). This Report focuses on institutional trust, built by repeatedly delivering on commitments, such as by enforcing contracts or not defaulting on pledges and obligations. This type of trust

2. From: World Bank. 2017. World Development Report 2017: Governance and the Law; Washington, DC: World Bank (<http://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/wdr2017>).

is important because it strengthens the capacity to commit (outcome legitimacy), and ultimately it enables cooperation and coordination by inducing voluntary compliance³ [box 2.9].

What about the aim? The aim is to have more trust. Well frankly, I think that's a stupid aim. It's not what I would aim at. I would aim to have more trust in the trustworthy but not in the untrustworthy. In fact, I aim positively to try not to trust the untrustworthy. And I think, of those people who, for example, placed their savings with the very aptly named Mr. Madoff, who then made off with them, and I think of them, and I think, well, yes, too much trust. More trust is not an intelligent aim in this life. Intelligently placed and intelligently

refused trust is the proper aim. Well once one says that, one says, yeah, okay, that means that what matters in the first place is not trust but trustworthiness. It's judging how trustworthy people are in particular respects.

The aim, I think, is more trustworthiness, and that is going to be different if we are trying to be trustworthy and communicate our trustworthiness to other people, and if we are trying to judge whether other people or office-holders or politicians are trustworthy. It's not easy. It is judgment, and simple reaction, attitudes, don't do adequately here.

3. from: O'Neill, Onora. 2013. "What we don't understand about trust," June 2013 video available at https://www.ted.com/talks/onora_o_neill_what_we_don_t_understand_about_trust, transcript: https://www.ted.com/talks/onora_o_neill_what_we_don_t_understand_about_trust/transcript#t-575008.

The European Union Funded

BRACE Programme

Balochistan Rural Development and Community Empowerment (BRACE) Programme is supported by the European Union (EU) and is being implemented in collaboration with the Local Government and Rural Development (LG&RD) Department of the Government of Balochistan (GoB). The grant component of this five year (2017-2022) Programme is being implemented by Rural Support Programmes Network (RSPN), National Rural Support Programme (NRSP) and Balochistan Rural Support Programme (BRSP) in ten districts of Balochistan. BRACE is working in Jhal Magsi, Kech, Khuzdar, Killa Abdullah, Chaman, Loralai, Pishin, Duki, Washuk and Zhob. The Programme is technically supported by DAI, a company that supports Government of Balochistan in fostering an enabling environment for strengthening the capacities of local authorities to manage and involve communities in the statutory local public sector planning, financing and implementation processes.



EUROPEAN UNION

More information about the European Union is available on:

- https://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/pakistan_en
- EUinPakistan
- EUpakistan

"This publication was produced with the financial support of the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of. Rural Support Programmes Network (RSPN) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union."



Rural Support Programmes Network

IRM Complex, 3rd Floor, Plot# 7, Sunrise Avenue
(Off Park Road), Near COMSATS University, Islamabad, Pakistan
Phone: +92-51-8491270-99, Fax: +92-51-8351791

- www.rspn.org | www.brace.org.pk
- www.facebook.com/BRACEProgramme
- www.twitter.com/BRACE_BRSP
- www.linkedin.com/company/brace-programme
- www.instagram.com/braceinbalochistan
- BRACE Programme in Balochistan