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ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to assess good governance practice by taking the variables responsiveness and transparency among the other good governance manifestations. For this rationale, the land administration and urban planning and development offices were purposively selected. Provision of effective, efficient and quality service to the constituents is manifestation of improving good governance practice. So, there is a need to ensure good governance practice in the realm of service provision in the offices of land administration and urban planning and development. The general objective of the study is to assess the practice of good governance in Mekelle city administration. Accordingly, transparency and responsiveness which are the main indicators of good governance had used to assess the governance situation in the public institutions' of land administration and urban planning and development offices. The study used 153 purposely selected sample respondents from the selected sub cities that are Ayder and Hawelti sub cities and both qualitative and quantitative data analysis techniques were used accordingly. In order to gather the necessary data from the sample respondents, Questionnaire and interview were used data collection tools. In this regard descriptive statistics was employed to analyze the data obtained via questionnaire. The findings of the study show that there is lack of accessibility of information, limited Capacity (competence) of the offices and human power, discrimination, corruption and rent seeking behavior from the bureaucrats, delay of decisions, material and human resource, low level of skill and knowledge, lack of openness and low satisfaction from the constituents', dishonesty, low level of motivation and commitment irresponsiveness are considered the main hindrances' of good governance in the city administration in general and the selected public institutions in particular. So, transparency and responsiveness had compromised in the land administration and urban planning and development offices which are the most indicators of good governance. Therefore, there should be more and deeper inquiry.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

According to Uddin (2010) the good governance issue was commenced after Cold War as the concern of the development practitioner. In the aid issue “good governance” becomes the most notable paradigm within which to direct all political reform efforts. Aid was used simply as a carrot to assist this objective. The motives were questionable and less transparent. In relation to this as argued by Uddin (2010), the World Bank had originally gone on board upon utilizing the concept of governance as it came to grips with the challenge of why aid is not successfull. Accordingly, it focused inward to the institutions governing the economy and the implementation of structural reform. It found the problem to be Africa’s governance that is the management of a country’s economic and social resource endowments. A synthesis of current definitions provided by donor organizations such as the World Bank, the UNDP, international development agencies and multilateral donors yields a more complex concept of governance. Governance is a complex and holistic system of interactions among structures, traditions, functions (responsibilities), and processes (practices) manifested by three key values of accountability, transparency and participation (USAID, 2002 cited in Punyaratabandhu, 2004).

According to the World Bank, good governance shows sound public sector management (efficiency and effectiveness), accountability, exchange and free flow of information (transparency) and provide effective and efficient services to the general public in the given locality (UNESC, 2006). Good governance manifested in a partition of governance in which public capital and problems are managed effectively, efficiently and in response to critical needs and motivations of society and it relies on public participation, accountability and transparency and render the possible and available basic services in effective and efficient manner to the general public (Chaudhry et al, 2009). As far as service provision is concerned decentralization as an ingredient of good governance is fundamental for the empowerment of citizens and enhancing the responsiveness and accountability of the state in the delivery of basic services (ADB and ADF, 2009). To mean decentralization make service effective and efficient to the grass root people as far as individuals are get empowered.

In relation to this on his part (Ladi, 2008) argued that the rationale behind decentralization (devolution) within the broader umbrella of good governance is to have smart public decisions that reflect local main concern will be attained by being nearest and closest to the community, so that the public policies have been transferred authorities or power and resources from central government to the autonomous lower tiers of governments in local governance and make basic service delivery effective, efficient and closer to the given community.

With regard to African context Governance become a critical agenda and concern for any development policy and initiative. After the debate since the 1960s after the emancipation of some African countries. Recently with regard to Africa the concept of governance has been interpreted and conceptualizes from different perspectives by political leaders, institutions, and national and international communities. As a result of this a common understanding of good governance has been propagated and promoted during several consultative workshops held in South Africa, Uganda, Rwanda, Tanzania and Liberia, by the UNDESA.

Accordingly, most African policy-makers and leaders also became more familiar with the governance concept as a result of the debate within the OAU, and the recent AU and the commitments made through the international meetings. They started recognizing more and
more that sound governance is critical for economic growth and the welfare and common good of their fellow citizens. This represents a good progress in the direction of greater convergence on good governance issues (Mekolo and Resta, 2005). And with this decentralization can improve service delivery, primarily by encouraging user participation, facilitating local responsiveness and encouraging accountability as far as it is exemplary ingredient of good governance (Zoë Scott, 2012).

In effect, parallel with African context Ethiopia on her part is beginning to begin implementing the elements (manifestations’) of good governance. The issue of good governance given a due emphasis in Ethiopia in which it promotes decentralized governance which helps to participate (involve) the people at grass root level for effective and efficient service delivery at the lower tiers of government as well (Mezgebe, 2007). Accordingly, the Ethiopian Government’s good governance agenda presented in the PASDEP is comprehensive and responds to the challenges related to accountability and transparency, participation, legal and judicial reform and public service delivery. The reforms are consistent with the Bank Group’s Good Governance Policy as well as the NEPAD Vision (ADB and ADF, 2009). After PASDEP governance package the GTP governance package on its part take strategic measures and create mechanisms for zero tolerance to corruption in government organizations and public enterprises through improving their working system that increases accountability and transparency for basic service provision like education, health and infrastructure through implementing transparency, modern information technology, accountable to the public and takes measures to ensure proactive and reactive responsiveness. So, it comes up with its agenda to be achieved in the next five years parallel with MDGS which is actually commenced (MoFED, 2010).

In relation to this great move made so far by the government Local level decentralization began at the drafting stage of the 1995 Constitution. At that stage the status and powers of local government was at issue. As a result of this the devolution of power and resources from the federal and regional governments to woredas and localities appears to have improved the delivery of basic services such as education, health, roads and telecommunications etc. This is clearly shown in the Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Region (SNNPR) and to some extent in the Oromiya Region (Andrew and Rajkumare, 2008). In line with the above remarkable move Federal Ministry of Works and Urban Development (MWUD) has prepared draft legislation for the solidarity of the status of city municipalities and building their capacity (Meheret et al, 2001). According to WBI (2001) cited in Berhanu (2003) City governments (local governments) are expected to play critical roles in their respective regions in rendering effective and efficient services in a transparent and responsive manner to the general public. These are governance and management functions. Inspite of, the efforts made so far in the country many woreda and sub city administrations are simply overwhelmed with the high amounts of responsibilities and tasks they should implement. These are topped by weak access to quality capacity building programs and a general lack of practical tools and procedures such as related to participatory planning, monitoring and evaluation and inexistent coordination and management, that lead to inefficient structures and procedures (Yilmaz and Venugopal, 2008). By the same token Zemelak (2009) asserts “The most serious bottleneck for Ethiopian local government is capacity and local government institutions of the country have high shortage of qualified man power.” Many woredas have been witnessing a
deficiency in achieving feasible local development and delivering an efficient and effective service for their grass root people and marginalized sections of society (Helvetas, 2008).

This study has tried to deal with the issue of good governance by taking into account the decentralization issue and its functioning in delivering effective and efficient services. To deal with this study the researcher was incorporated two key indicators of good governance that are transparency and responsiveness to assess the situation of good governance in the city municipality with regard to land administration and urban planning and development. The researcher incorporated these two indicators because the more the indicators incorporated the more the study becomes shallow so, for in-depth study the investigator was incorporated the two indicators and it is also very difficult to address all the elements of good governance in this paper 1.2

Statement of the problem

Good governance is pivotal for decentralized governance in that it has numerous advantages especially when central governments fail to fulfill extraordinary needs of local community. Local government and communities know about its condition and are responsive to their needs. Decentralized good governance fosters accountability (Uddin, 2008). In accordance with this, it is at the center of the AU/NEPAD program, is also among the top priorities of the program. Accordingly, with NEPAD’s Democracy and Political Governance Initiative, African leaders committed themselves to create and consolidate basic good governance processes and practices (NEPAD, 2007). Ethiopia also made the endeavor for consolidation and upgrading of good governance at both the local, regional and national level especially after the EPRDF government comes to power (ibid,2008). Similarly ADB and ADF (2009) and Andrew and Rajkumar (2008) further argue that the issue of decentralization is essential for the empowerment of citizens and enhancing the responsiveness and accountability of the state in the delivery of basic services.

And it hoped to bring about harmony and cooperation and it has shifted authority from a central government to lower tiers in a decentralized system of governance (Tegegne, 2005). Article 50(4) of the Constitution recommended the regional states to empower local government by allocating service delivery responsibilities to the lower tiers of governments (FDRE, 1995). In effect the Government launched decentralization which is designed to shift decision-making closer to the people at the “grass roots level” and to improve the responsiveness of basic service delivery to the given dwellers’ (Institutional Governance Review, 2001). As part of the overall governance system of any society, decentralized governance offers important opportunities for enhanced human development. However, if improperly planned or poorly implemented, decentralized good governance can also be a bottleneck that may easily discourage local efforts to enhance human development (UNDP, 2005).

In spite of the endeavors made by the government, however, the process of fostering good governance practices at the lower tiers of government has still facing various bottle necks such as capacity and the dominance of local government institutions by the ruling party. So, that, if not thoroughly assessed and possible measures provided, could significantly hamper the effective and efficient service provision and development endeavors of the country (Zemelak, 2009:5). This finding is confirmed by Dickovick and Tegegne (2010). Studies conducted by these authors revealed that, the capacity of local government in formulating policies, and implementing strategies and development activities is an essential part of the governance structure at local/regional level. Despite the fact that there
is a clear capacity gap in running and managing different responsibilities under the umbrella of decentralized governance. In relation to this regarding to service provision in Ethiopia the major role of the citizens in service delivery seems to be develop a list of needs and then determine needs that can be fulfilled by the community itself by contributing cash/or labor. Most kebeles receive little or nothing of what they request through the planning exercise unless need can be supported by their own contributions which is because of severe capital budget constituents at the local level and when capital budget exists either through federal programs or NGOS the process of prioritizing needs by the Woreda is opaque. In a number of cases the kebelle citizens have themselves taken on the task of building schools, roads, water tanks and other social services. These efforts can be viewed as a failure of the state to provide services forcing the citizens to take on additional role (Yilmaz and Venugopal, 2008).

With regard to good governance different practitioners’ and researchers so far undertook research in relation to decentralized good governance for instance, Kumera (2006) undertook research on a decentralized governance and service delivery in Digelu and Tijo Woreda at Arsi zone and Tamiru (2012) paper assessed on local good governance emphasized on responsiveness in yem special Woreda But, these papers did not take in to account the manifestations(key indicators) of good governance in decentralized governance and Tamiru (2006) assessed only one key indicator of good governance that is responsiveness respectively and Belay(2012) undertook research on assessment of Governance and Administration of Urban Land in Abei Adei town assessed good governance only on one public office that is the office of urban land administration and Meskerem (2007)on local governance at woreda level in Ethiopia and did not incorporate indicators of good governance with regard to responsiveness and transparency and the same also goes to Muhamed (2006) paper assessed the performance of woreda decentralization program in Amhara national regional state.

Most researches undertook so far in Ethiopia with regard to good governance in local level did not take in to account the key indicators (manifestations) of good governance. Unlike the above mentioned papers this paper will research on good governance in city administration level since, the practice of good governance is not well researched in region level and with specific regard in the lower tiers of government specifically, in city level and with specific regard to the selected study area of city administration of Mekelle in regard to the selected city Municipality by incorporating the two selected key indicators that are transparency and responsiveness. Cognizant of this, the researcher motivated to undertake a research which are not taken in to account by the mentioned practionaries and researchers by incorporating the two indicators in the selected city with specific regard to the city municipality and in accordance with the pilot study conducted by the investigator and as the researcher informed from the city Municipality community (service providers) no research had been undertaken so far in relation to Good Governance with the identified key indicators that are responsiveness and transparency in the given city Municipality as well.

Accordingly it needs a thorough and further inquiry because, as many literatures, pointed out the issue of good governance is challengeable at lower tiers of government for effective and efficient service provision and the issue and practice of good governance is not well researched at local level. Cognizant of this, the investigator is highly initiated and motivated to undertake a research because of the above mentioned gaps by incorporating the two key indicators that are responsiveness and
transparency because, the more the indicators incorporated the more the study becomes shallow so for in depth study the two indicators will be incorporated and also it is difficult to address the issue and practice of good governance by taking all key indicators.

1.3 Research questions
1. What are the main factors that determine for the responsiveness and transparency in the offices of land administration and urban planning and development to the city dwellers with hin the city municipality?
2. What are the main factors that encumber the practice of good governance in the given city municipality with regard to land administration and urban planning and development in regard to responsiveness and transparency?
3. What are the possibilities of addressing the obstacles (hindrances) of good governance in the city Municipality in regard to responsiveness and transparency?
4. What are the key lessons to be drawn from the good governance practices in the given city Municipality?

1.4 Objective of the study
1.4.1 General objective of the study
The general objective of the study is to assess the practice of good governance in Mekelle city administration

1.4.2 Specific objective of the study
➢ To scrutinize the transparency and responsiveness of the city municipality in the offices of land administration and urban planning and development to the city dwellers
➢ To identify the main bottle necks of good governance of the city Municipality with regard to responsiveness and transparency
➢ To identify and indicate the possibilities of addressing the obstacles of good governance in the given city administration with regard the city Municipality
➢ To identify some of the main lessons to be drawn from the good governance practices in the city Municipality

1.5 Scope and limitation of the study
1.5.1 Scope of the study
Governance issue is a comprehensive issue because, it applied at every levels local, national, international, regional, and soon. Theoretically, the scope of the research was delimitied to good governance in decentralized city administration at local (city) level by incorporating the two key dimensions (indicators) of good governance that are transparency and responsiveness because most of the time in the issue of good governance at lowers tiers of governments in the realm (sphere) of public service provision relatively there is an observation of discontent mostly with regard to the selected key indicators that are responsiveness and transparency from the part of service recipients comparing to the other manifestations like participation and accountability e.t.c. Geographically, the research was confined to city Municipality of Mekelle under city administration of Mekelle town in Tigray regional state. Under the broader umbrella of the city administration of Mekelle there are seven sub cities namely Kedamay Woyane, Quiha, Hawelti,Ayder,Semen and Adihaki. Among these sub cities the research is delimited to Ayder and Hawelti sub cities in the office of land administration and urban planning and development of the city municipality because, in these sub cities there were many service users in the office of land administration and urban planning and development because, in these areas urbanization is expanding as a result of adequate or access to land for the community comparing to the other subcities. So, geographically, the study had been delimited to the office of land administration and urban planning and development.
Methodologically, the study drawn sample respondents from Ayder and Hawelti sub cities residents from the other seven sub cities and non probabilistic sampling had been used. The time coverage of the study delimited to June 10, 2013.

1.5.2 Limitations of the study
A thorough scrutiny of the issue of good governance demands the incorporation of the various manifestations of good governance. In any examination of governance undertakings it is obvious for everyone that there is no absolute way of methodological means of obtaining and analyzing data because it has wholistic (comprehensive) nature and the study may have methodological, geographical and theoretical limitations. Theoretically, the study may have alimitation in that good governance agenda is comprehensive which cannot be fully addressed by taking only two key indicators that are responsiveness and transparency and it is also wholistic to mean it is an issue in every public offices not only in the above mentioned offices. Geographically, the study may have alimmitation in that it was confined to the city of Mekelle with regard to the city municipality so, it has not include the surrounding areas and villages and also it is difficult to generalize (conclude) the issue and practice of good governance by taking only two sub cities from the seven sub cities of the city administration to the whole population of the given city dwellers’.

Methodologically since the study has drawn sample respondents from Ayder and Hawelti residents on behalf of the other sub cities so, the collected information from them might not reflected the exact idea of entire city residents of the other sub cities of the study area. And the study has not used census approach of sample selection in that every one might not achance to be selected. Because of the above mentioned limitations the investigation might not reflected the overall situation (clear image) of the overall governance agenda and its implementation in the given city.

1.6 Significance of the study
The investigation of good governance may have significance for policy planners in the city and the given sub cities, for city administrators, for the community, for the academic community as well as for other researchers. The study may give an insight to the extent to which good governance has developed and the hindrances’ that the city faces in the path towards promoting of good governance in the office of land administration and urban planning and development in the realm of service delivery and to deal with the bottle necks of good governance for the betterment of the general public.

For city administrators and the respective service providers the study may have a significance in that it may helps them to recognize and implement the policies and strategies' devised by the policy makers from top in which it helps them to provide (deliver) services effectively and efficiently in a transparent and responsive manner to the community at large.

For the community the study may have a significance in that it helps them to recognize and assure their rights of getting efficient and effective services from their respective administrators so as to articulate their interests.

For, the academic community the study may have significance or it may provide a direction to undertake an academic research on good governance since, Good Governance agenda is difficult to be addressed in this paper and as it is also problematic at the lower tiers of government. so, the paper may provide a direction for further inquiry. It may also encourages practitioners and academicians as well as other researchers with the similar field of study to conduct different research activities related to the topic by taking in to account the prevalent gaps.
1.7 Organization of the Paper
Chapter one included the back ground of the study, Statement of the problem, Research questions, Objectives of the study with its general and specific objectives, significance of the study, scope and limitation of the study and conceptual and working definitions. Chapter two of the paper included the review of related literature and chapter three will include research methodology and data collection, instruments of data collection and data sources, research design and strategy, sampling and sampling techniques, data analysis and data interpretation, time schedule, budget break down and chapter four included Results and Discussions and chapter five included conclusion, recommendation and bibliography.

1.8 Conceptual and working definition of key Terms

**Governance:** Governance means the manner in which power is exercised by governments in the management of a country's social and economic resource, how public resources utilized and how decision made.

**Good governance:** Defined as the system of governance which is participatory, transparent, responsive and accountable in which it ensures that political, social and economic priorities are based on broad consensus in society and the voices of the poorest and most vulnerable are heard in decision making (Momen and Marizina Begum, 2005).

**Decentralization:** Decentralization is the transfer of competencies and responsibilities for performing public service obligations from the central government to local or sub-national governments which can occur in the political and administrative domains (Popic & Mahesh, 2011).

**Responsiveness:** The government need to be both proactively and reactively responsive to the given study area population desires (demands) with regard service delivery within a reasonable time span.

**Transparency:** The government need to be open and communicative for his actions and duties for the service users in the given study area.

**Woreda:** is a structure of administration under regional government which is synonyms to district with at least 100,000 populations.

**Tabia (ketena):** is a structure of administration under regional government which is below woreda

2.1 Conceptual over View of Governance, Good governance and Decentralization
In the literature review part, the conceptual frame work of governance, decentralization, good governance, local governance, the essence of federalism, key indicators of good governance and the way it contributes to good governance, an overview of the practice of good governance in Africa and Ethiopia and values of good governance and their essences and why they prevail and how they will be conceptualized and exercised by different international organizations, civil societies and policy makers and the prevalent opportunities and their challenges in assuring good governance will be discussed.

Different individuals, groups and organizations forward their own views with regard to the conceptualization of governance, good governance, decentralization and their practicality.

The term “governance” means different things to different people (Uddin, 2010). Among the many definitions of “governance” that exist, the one that appears the most appropriate from the viewpoint of the Bank cited in (Uddin, 2010) is “The manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country’s economic and social resources for development”. On this meaning, the concept of governance is concerned directly with the management of the development process, involving both the public and the private sectors.
Commonly, governance as distinct from good governance is often equated with ‘government’ or ‘the act or process of governing’. International organizations and scholars have adopted more comprehensive definitions of the term from their point of views. As Keefer (2009: 439) in Gisselquist, 2012) notes, ‘There is no agreed definition of governance.

As United Nations Economic and Social Affairs (2007:42) in Negalegn (2001) governance can be studied at three levels. On a global level, governance can be compared across countries and over time, on a national level and on local level governance refers to the processes in government proceedings and how things are going to be done, not just what is done. It shows the quality of institutions and their effectiveness as well as their efficiency in transforming and also transplanting policy in to successful execution(UNECFE,2008).

![Fig.1 Conceptual Frame work](source)

- **Good governance in local government**
  - **Office of land administration**
  - **Office of urban planning**
- **Good governance**
  - **Transparency**
    - ✓ Free flow, relevancy and accessibility of information
    - ✓ Openness in decision making
    - ✓ Following rules and regulations in decision making
    - ✓ Clearness in government rules, regulations and decisions
    - ✓ Accessibility of rules and regulations
    - ✓ The right to acquire information
  - **Responsiveness**
    - ✓ Serving all stakeholders in specified time frame
    - ✓ Responding to citizens desires and preferences and prioritizing them in service delivery
    - ✓ Appropriate service provision
    - ✓ Handling Complaints
    - ✓ Receptiveness of institutions to the demands of their stakeholders.
    - ✓ Institutions approachable to their clients

**Fig 1: Source: My own construction (2013)**
Chapter Two: Review of Related Literature

Beside to this comparison, effectiveness and efficiency to Grindle (2010) Governance is widely understood, when applied with regard to government or the public sector, to refer to the institutional underpinnings of public authority and decision making. As a result, governance encompasses the institutions, systems, "rules of the game" and other factors that determine how political and economic interactions are structured and how decisions are made and resources allocated. Clearly embedded in the general concept is the notion that good governance is a positive quality of political systems and to him mal governance is required to be alleviated for the betterment of the general public.

There is amis conception and common understanding with regard to the understandings and conceptualization of the term among different scholars, researchers, practionaries as well as various international organizations so, there are nearly as many definitions of governance as there are commentators on the subject. The Oxford English Dictionary defines governance as "The action, manner, or fact of governing; government."

Governance is “The exercise of authority through formal and informal traditions and institutions for the common good." in which the main players in society, governments, businesses and civil society, work together to make that society better". Daniel Kauffmann and to Michal Skiad OECD Secretariat governance is "the general exercise of authority."

Similarly Mbao and Komboni (nd) on their paper argue that even if there is no universally accepted and agreed upon definition of “governance”, the popular usage of the term shows and examines how a given country is governed; how the affairs of a state are administered, managed and regulated and how on a nation’s political system functions in relation to the management or accomplishment of public affairs. It also holds that how country’s resources are managed and how the private sector, individuals as well as the state interact each other to consolidate good governance for the betterment of all in relation to this the World Bank also came up with its definition of governance in 1989 in the context of the exercise of political power in relation to the management of a country’s affairs.

Discussions of good governance increased in the development literature out concern about the ineffectiveness of aid to generate rapid economic growth in generally poorly governed developing countries. As a result, the initial conception of governance and what comprises “good governance" was a technocratic one which recommends governments to deliver effective and efficient services to the society so as ultimately to attain economic growth in the given society. This conception of governance was less concerned with democracy, human rights, rule of law, voice and accountability that are not directly related to the economic growth. Accordingly, in addition fighting corruption and other vices are considered part of good governance in this conceptualization and understanding, they are only considered components of good governance because they play a pivotal or vital role for effective and efficient service delivery to the given community at large (Brempong, 2011).

Nowadays Good Governance occupies a central stage in the development discourse and considered as the crucial element to be incorporated in the development strategy. However, apart from the universal acceptance of its importance, differences prevail in respect of theoretical formulations, policy prescriptions and conceptualization of the subject ( Abdellati, nd)

Accordingly, Good governance is buzzword in this era and has swept public attention for the last decade and it becomes a significant and indispensable pillar in the consideration of a
state’s ability to adjust itself with the universally acceptable democratic standards (Uddin, 2010). Even if there are divergences in the conceptualization of the term Good governance has been taken as a solution for different types of problems nowadays in many countries of the world. Decentralization, democratic governance as well as local governance are becoming indispensable elements as a manifestation of good governance and for the achievement of it as well (Muhammed, 2006).

Beside to this conceptualization according to UN (nd) ‘In the community of nations, governance is considered “good” and “democratic” if and only if the country’s public sectors say institutions are transparent for the society and Its institutions refer to such bodies as parliament and its various ministries. Its processes and functions need to be free of corruption and the institutions also need to be accountable to the people and a country’s success in achieving this standard has become a key measure of its credibility and respect in the world and it needs to promote equity, participation, pluralism, transparency, accountability and the rule of law, in a manner that is effective, efficient and enduring in translating these principles into practical implementation.

In relation to this to UNDP (2011), ‘Good governance is governing systems which are capable, responsive, inclusive, and transparent and it applies to all, developed and developing countries and more people having more of a say in the decisions which shape their lives’. In accordance to this former Paul Wolfowitz, World Bank President argue that ‘Good governance is essentially the combination of transparent and accountable institutions, strong skills and competence, and a fundamental willingness to do the right thing. Those are the things that enable a government to deliver services to its people efficiently’.

In relation to this various individuals as well as international organization and institutions conceptualize and understood good governance and its manifestations as well as its practice from their own perspectives.

To ADB (2012) manifestations of good governance are accountability, transparency, participation, combating and fighting corruption, and the consolidation of an enabling mechanism for legal and judicial framework. By the same token European Commission (2011) also defines good governance as an environment in which directness, participation, accountability, effectiveness and consistency prevails and each principle are pivotal and indispensable for establishing more democratic governance.

The Former IMF Managing Director Michel Camdessus, conceptualizes good governance as“The transparency of government accounts, the effectiveness of public resource management, and the stability and transparency of the economic and regulatory environment for private sector activity’.

To OECD, Directorate for Public Governance and Territorial Development “Good governance is a government that able to be accountable, transparent, effective and efficient, responsive and respects the rule of law and visionary among the larger society”

According to ADB in (IFAD ,1999) governance is a system in which power is exercised in the management affairs of a nation. Accordingly The AfDB’s development policy gives due emphasis for good governance and its practical functioning’s on the belief that it can bring sustainable and sound development for the given society in line with its vision for continued African development into the 21st century.

It is possible to say that there is a prevalence of good governance in a given society if and only if the government functions its operations in effective and efficient manner and for the betterment of the public goods. The public good is largely defined as enforcement of law and order, revenue collection, allocation of resources to meet specific demands, provision
of infrastructure which also includes the provision of services and promotion of human rights (Nyong’, 2001). Similarly Uddin (2010) argue that Good governance requires fair legal frame works that are enforced impartially among the citizens. It also requires full protection of human rights, particularly those of minorities and the marginalized which exist at grass root level so, in a good governance the rules and regulations implies should be clear and friendly enough to general public and should also motivate the nation to follow the implied law’s of the country.

According to the World Bank, good governance consists of a public service that is efficient, a judicial system that is reliable, and an administration that is accountable to the general public. The World Bank elaborates on four elements of good governance which includes Public sector management stressing the need for effective financial and human resource management through improved budgeting, accounting and reporting, and rooting out inefficiency particularly in public enterprises; Accountability in basic public services, including effective accounting, auditing and decentralization, and generally making public officials responsible for their actions and responsive to the demands of the consumers; A predictable legal framework with rules known in advance; a reliable and independent judiciary and law enforcement mechanisms; and availability of information and transparency in order to enhance policy analysis, promote public debate and reduce the risk of corruption (World Bank 1989, 1992).

In the discussion of poverty and development good governance becomes a pillar agenda with regard to its contribution to this discussion because, many researchers and international organizations have the stand that development is impossible to be achieved without assuring good governance. Cognizant of this Kofi Annan, former Secretary General of the United Nations in his speech to the UN argue that:-

“Good governance is perhaps the single most important factor in eradicating poverty and promoting development.”

For the World Bank, the striking characteristics of good governance are accountability and transparency, efficiency in how the public sector works, rule of law, and ordered interactions in politics and to a list of its worthy characteristics of how government ought to be carried out in (Grindle, 2010).

The UNDP, which has taken a strong concern in the promotion of good governance on its part, identifies characteristics like participation, transparency, accountability, effectiveness, and equity as its most important characteristics and it can be seen as the exercise of economic, political and administrative authority to manage a country’s affairs at all levels taking in to account the three dimensions economic, political and administrative governance. Economic governance includes the decision-making processes that shape a country’s economic activities and its interactions with other economies, Political governance is the process of decision making to formulate policy, Administrative governance is the system of policy implementation encompassing all which is mainly in which administrators function under the umbrella of the given policy for efficient and effective provision of services for common good (UNDP, 1997).

Similarly IFAD (1999) argue that Good governance incorporates the processes and structures that direct political and socio-economic ties in which the state go beyond it by taking in the private sector and civil society, all of which are critical in sustaining human development in which good governance is unachievable solely by government effort and the institutions of governance in the state, civil society and the private sector must be designed to contribute to this sustainable human development by establishing the political, legal, economic and social circumstances for poverty
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reduction, job creation, environmental protection and the advancement of women.

Good governance, therefore, also involves the state forging closer collaborations with the private sector and civil societies to improve basic public service delivery and bring about economic upliftment because, to bring about good governance the involvement of stake holders is pivotal in which government solely cannot bring about good governance in a given society. Towards this end, governments are recognizing the full role of non-state actors in the development process by giving them the space for them to play their full roles in policy formulation, service delivery and empowerment of communities to demand services. It is also recognized that, to have credibility and legitimacy, non-state actors need be professional and have sound internal governance and leadership structures that guarantee accountability, transparency and performance for effective and efficient service provision for service users especially at the grass root level since good governance is not solely ensured by government effort (NEPAD, 2007).

Cognizant of this, the enormous and growing discussions on decentralized governance has win the attention of scholars and policy makers all over the world. As a result of this awareness and understanding decentralized governance has been conceived as a device for local self-government for ensuring effective and efficient service provision and promoting healthy development to the general public which is expected to facilitate effective people's participation, enhance degree of transparency and ensure greater accountability (Islam, 2003). Decentralized governance is pivotal to provide more effective and competitive delivery of services at the grassroots level. because, decentralization is argued as a mechanism to enhance accountability in governance. It is one feature of governance and an ingredient for good governance and the successes or failures in governance are related to the issue of accountability (Allen 1990; Friedman 1992 cited in Meheret 1998).

In accordance with this, accountability is both personal and institutional. Accountability becomes personal when authority and responsibility are delegated vertically from top to bottom, from supervisor to subordinate, in which the supervisor holds the subordinate personally accountable. It is also institutional. From governance point of view, accountability is about being able to hold public officials responsible for their actions and activities. From such relationship, excellent results are obtained and failure may involve sanctions including the withdrawal or modifications of working systems (Bahatta, 1998).

2.2 Why Does Governance Matter?

Governance in today's context becomes a point of discussions in the country's economic, social as well as political changes and developments. Most governments of the world and international organizations incorporate the issue of good governance in their country affairs. Accordingly, according to the World Bank, good governance matters because, it entails sound public sector management (efficiency, effectiveness and economy), accountability, exchange and free flow of information (transparency), and a legal framework for development (justice, respect for human rights and liberties) in connection to this it "signifies a participative manner of governing that functions in a responsible, accountable and transparent manner based on the principles of efficiency, legitimacy and consensus for the purpose of promoting the rights of individual citizens and the public interest, thus indicating the exercise of political will for ensuring the material welfare of society and sustainable development with social justice" (UNESC, 2006). A more concise definition of good governance is given by Hirst cited in UNESC (2006) who propounds that it "means creating an effective political framework conducive to
private economic action: stable regimes, the rule of law, efficient State administration adapted to the roles that Governments can actually perform and a strong civil society independent of the State (ibid, 2006).

Similarly, Cheema and Rondinell (2005) argued good governance is critical because, it implied a mandate for governments to create or strengthen channels and mechanisms for public participation in decision making, to abide by the rule of law, to increase transparency in public procedures, and to hold officials accountable. Good governance is of crucial importance for effective governance at all levels of governments – central, regional, and local. Because, it implies that decisions (at all levels) are taken and implemented in a manner that is free of abuse and corruption, and with regard for the rule of law, it is participatory, transparent, responsive, consensus-oriented, equitable and inclusive, effective and efficient, and accountable. Decentralization’s as an ingredient to good governance is thought to be play pivotal role on service delivery for the general public (UNDESA, 2006).

In accordance with this issue in the realm(sphere) of delivering State services to the public, good governance consolidate human rights when they improve the State’s capacity to fulfill its responsibility to provide public goods which are indispensable for the protection of a number of human rights, such as the right to education, health, food and access to services and different reform programs may include machinery of accountability and transparency, culturally sensitive policy tools to ensure that services are accessible and acceptable to all, and paths for public participation in decision-making (UN, 2007).

This can be achieved through aggressive mobilization for participation on local level or their elected representatives in planning and decision-making processes, which should enhance capacity to deliver services to all (local) units. In many cases the effectiveness and efficiency of public service delivery are the most highly ranked characteristics of the autonomous local governments. Citizen participation ensures that public goods and delivery of services are consistent with voter preferences and public sector accountability. To provide effective and efficient services under the umbrella of decentralization accountability is crucial. Because, Without a strong system of local accountability, devolving authorities and financial resources to local governments can lead to waste of misuse of public funds, and the potential for political capture at the local level can spoil the benefits of decentralization (UNDESA, 2006).

With the regard to the concern of good governance Chowdhur and Skarsted (2005) on their paper argue that good governance is a big deal currently in that it compel the State to carry out its functions in a way that promote the principles of efficiency, non corruptibility, and responsiveness to civil society. It is therefore a principle that is mainly linked with statecraft. While the government is not compel to substantively provide any public goods, it must ensure that the processes for the identification and provision of such goods are genuine in terms of being responsive to public demands, being transparent in the sharing of resources and , being fair in the distribution of goods. The principle of good governance has also been adopted in the context of the internal operations of private sector organizations.

2.3 Current Decentralization Trends

Different countries have applied different methods of governance to facilitate service delivery to the people. Governance explores attempts to answer the question of how governance makes some societies more ‘successful’ than others accordingly (Bloom et al, 2004) argue that governance is fundamental because of the following elements:-

2.3.1 Competitiveness

One argument for the importance of good governance is the idea that nations with better
governance are better able to compete against other nations in every affairs

2.3.2 Institutions and rules
Douglass North cited in (Bloom et al, 2004) has highlighted the importance of “the rules of the game in a society or, more formally, the humanly devised constraints that shape human interaction.” Along with institutions such as governmental bodies, political parties, civil society organizations and universities, these rules are increasingly recognized as important drivers of development.

2.3.3 Social capital
Refers to the premise that networks between citizens have value. “Specific benefits,” according to Robert Putnam in (Bloom et al, 2004) “flow from the trust, reciprocity, information, and cooperation associated with social networks.” In a ‘civic society’, citizens involve or take part in their communities’ affairs, working together for common good and cooperatively to solve social problems and tackle public good issues. In an ‘un civic society’, on the other hand, citizens, lacking the trust in others that characterizes a cohesive community, pursue their own personal goals, often at the expense of others, to the long-run detriment of the community.

2.4 Dimensions of Good Governance
Good governance assure that political, social and economic choices /decisions are made on the basis of wide consensus in community through elected representatives. Good governance should among other things be participative, transparent, equitable and accountable. Good governance should enhance institutional effectiveness and generate economic growth, which can lead to better living standards for the majority of any country’s population (Tangier, 2002).

In relation to this according to Report of the Commission on Global Governance (1995) Good governance is a notion that refers to, and is functional in, a number of domains, going from institutional development to non-state actors’ involvement. There are different dimensions of good governance. They will be presented as follows:-

2.4.1 Technical Dimension:- Is part and parcel of economic governance, which shows the transparency of government accounts, the effectiveness of public resources management, and the permanence of the regulatory environment for private sector activity.

2.4.2 The socio-Economic Dimension:- The socio-economic aspect also taken in to account, especially with regard to state reforms and the effectiveness of the newly established statehood. Stability and equity are two of the principles that should regulate all economic activity, with international cooperation being particularly of special need, in order to adapt a former “violence economy” to the structures of “peace-time economy”.

2.4.3 Political Dimension:- Refers to “the legitimacy of government, the accountability of the political elements of government and respect for human rights and the rule of law.” When it comes to participation, equity, inclusiveness, or transparency, minorities or grass root peoples need a specific approach with regard to good governance strategies in terms of their tie with the major stakeholders,
since their position in the society is most often fragile and too “minor” or less influential. It also refers to re-gaining the legitimacy of the government and of its decisions over the entire population (a major problem especially for multi-ethnic societies, where inclusiveness and transparency are two principles of more importance than anywhere else). In order to succeed in establishing a legitimate and transparent state, all groups have to feel represented, which can be accomplished if several guidelines are applied - either a “horizontal division of power” or “group autonomy and vertical division of power and forms of joint exercise of power through decentralization (ibid, 1995).

According to OKEY (2004) Political governance ensures that:

“political representation is not merely symbolic, but substantive and sustainable: constitutionally guaranteed rights to open and credible competitive mechanisms for political representation, electoral laws that guarantee the rights of all social groups (gender, minorities) to fully participate and be adequately represented in all the organs and hierarchies of decision making....”

2.4.4 Security governance:- Security problems prevails in all post-conflict societies, as do problems such as lack of exercising legitimate authority, inability of the legal institutions to control crime, erosion of the judiciary system, or use of force (by both the legally established and the underground organizations). With this regard citizens' activities and the various functions need to be acknowledged and due emphasis need to be given and a separation of authority has to be operated properly, in order to ensure transparency through public control and regulation so as to create a secure environment for the people (ibid,1995).

2.4.5 Administrative Governance:- This essentially looks at institutional capacities, effectiveness and accountability and economic management, and corporate governance (okey, 2004). World Bank Institute, 2003 cited in Ilufoye (2010) contends that administrative governance a process of policy implementation conducted through a well-organized, autonomous, responsible and open public sector.

2.5 The Issue and Practice of Good Governance in Africa: An over view

Cognizant of the vitality of good governance in a given society African policy-makers and leaders became more informed with the governance concept as a result of the debate within the OAU which was formed in 1963 during the early stages of Africa’s independence campaign. Even if this is so the OAU could not able to consolidate and promote good governance in the continent .Following OAU, the AU comes up with a lot of measures and visions to bring about good governance and the commitments made through the international gatherings meetings (John k.Akokpar, 2004). In effect they started recognizing democracy, transparency, accountability, human rights, peace, security and stability as pivotal elements for good governance (Mekolo,2005).

To consolidate and foster good governance in Africa a partnership programme established between Africa and the G8 countries for the practice of good governance in Africa, NEPAD stresses on four dimensions of governance; namely economic and corporate governance; political governance; and peace and security.NEPAD represent a moral contract between African countries and the G8 under which the former strives to improve governance and promote democracy by undertaking political reforms and market-friendly economic policies while the latter aimed at supporting Africans who take an initiation and come up with a good move towards good governance and NEPAD document originally presented a
comprehensive view of governance (Akokpar, 2004).

As a result of this issue and agenda good governance has been incorporated in the objectives and policies of the African Union. Article 3(a) of the Constitutive Act of the African Union, adopted at Lome, Togo in July 2000, provides for the promotion of democratic principles and the prevalent institutions, popular participation which is inclusive and good governance. Similarly in accordance with this NEPAD also incorporated good governance as a remedy for development by strengthening accountability, transparency and participative governance for citizens (Mbao ,nd)

In effect most African leaders started recognizing more and more that good governance is critical for economic up liftment and for the common good of the general public. This connotes a good progress in the direction of greater convergence on good governance issues and not only is good governance seen as a result of an evaluation process, but also and more often is a pro-active leadership system referring to the efficiency and openness, and to the implementation of universal values and principles which guarantee a sound functioning of the institutions thanks to competent human resources delivering the best quality services while being responsive to the people needs especially at grass root levels (Mekolo and Resta ,2005). These examples of leaders’ quotations below stand as an instances of this commitment and the fundamental aspects of good governance such as democracy, transparency , human rights and other elements of good governance .

“….Some factors that are important for development are peace, security and stability. Accordingly, the leadership of the African continent saw the importance of breaking the vicious cycle of wars, conflict and instability which contributes to a very large degree, to the deep levels of poverty and underdevelopment…”(Thabo Mbeki, former President of South Africa, Johannesburg, 2004 )

On all these fronts, we are making real progress. In particular, we have made significant gains in good political and economic governance, despite the challenges and constraints of our recent history…” (Paul Kagame, President of Rwanda).

“It is Essential that African leaders follow up on the commitments they have made to the people of Africa, and genuinely improve governance and transparency in all sectors.” Kofi Annan, Implementation of the UN Millennium Declaration, 2002

Mass struggles for social justice in Africa and elsewhere are often entrenched in terms of demands for better(sound) governance. Even if this is so, but the new consensus over ‘good governance’ advocated by international financial institutions represents a much narrower programme of reform based on neoclassical economic theory (Gray and Khan, nd).The agenda of developing governance attributes in Africa are theoretically supposed to enhance growth. Some of these governance capabilities (such as measures to improve government accountability or lower corruption) appear to coincide with goals supported by social justice movements for better governance. But the reasons for supporting these are very different in the official good governance agenda, and the way they are supported can make the achievement of social goals even more difficult ( gray and khan ,nd).

According to World Wide Governance Indicators (WGI) produced by the World Bank in terms of these measures which are transparency, participation and accountability to the general public, most countries in Africa
perform badly on all of the major areas of concern of the good governance agenda. According to WGI the indicators place most African countries in the bottom 50th percentile of their six dimensions of governance meaning that Africa performs poorer than any other region with the exception of former Soviet Union (World Bank, 2008).

In accordance with the profile the continent need to be out from this image and achieve human development as well as economic development but, the reality in the ground is not the case it becomes difficult to be attained by most Africans (Chigbu, 2011). The lack of good governance has been strongly blamed in Africa different leaders, International organizations as well as researchers for instance the United States’ president, Barrack Obama, pointed fingers to lack of good governance as the reason for Africa’s difficulty accordingly, in effect the World Bank has persistently called for good governance in the Africa. The European Union and other world bodies have been and are still doing the same –calling for the institutionalization of good governance principles in African states. Due to this, and many other factors, the concept of good governance has appeared as one of the major principles for evaluating the performance of African countries (Chigbu, 2011).

Similarly Chigbu (2011) also argue that governance can be good if and only if the governed peoples and the respective leaders or governors are work or come to gether for common interest as well as common good so as to bring about human development. It could further be considered good when it effectively facilitates the generation and utilization of public resources in a manner that protected the human development essentials of a particular African society. Governance could be considered to be good if those tasked with the responsibility to manage public resources and affairs execute capability and readiness to account to the people on whose behalf they govern. Good leadership has squarely failed and good followership has infrequently succeeded in most African countries.

Emphasis on the political building blocks of governance has been mainly strong in governance work on Africa, where it was clearly incorporated into the mandates of several major organizations founded in the 2000s (World Bank 1989; Abrahamsen2000; NEPAD 2007) Cited in M.Gisselquist (2012) For instance, unlike the Organization of African Unity, the African Union openly recognizes ‘respect for democratic principles, human rights, the rule of law and good governance’ among its founding principles (African Union, 2000). The New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), launched by the AU in 2001 in its part also identifies and recognizes ‘, good governance as ‘conditions for sustainable development’ (NEPAD 2001: 18; ). In 2003, NEPAD launched the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), an initiative to develop voluntary self assessments of governance by AU member states, with the objective of guaranteeing that countries comply with the Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance (NEPAD, 2007).

In Good governance atmosphere responsibilities are discharged in an effective, transparent, and accountable manner while bad or governance is associated with maladministration in the discharge” of responsibilities in the past two decades Africa learn that there is abig divergence between the theories and the practice of political issues in the ground (AGGN Research and Publication Committee, 2010). In connection to this conceptualization and practice according to (AGGN Research and Publication Committee, 2010)

Criteria in defining good governance for Africa are: The power and influence of external change agents and outside resources on States and people, removal of disgusting cultural barriers to good governance (e.g. gender,
woman and child rights) without demonizing the cultural rubrics of the African societies, Organic consolidation of existing effective and efficient governance systems towards good governance, emphasis on cultural and historical peculiarities of African States and peoples, need for more culturally sustainable institutional arrangements so in accordance with the stand of the committee good governance must be viewed from a more comprehensive lens rather than the narrow political and economic views which have over shadowed other significant aspects of the lives of the African peoples. Accordingly, AGGN seeks conceptualize good governance in such a way as to offer protection for all Africans while not limiting its obedience to African governments, but to treat the African person to adopt pure expression of opinion, affection and enthusiasm on matters relating to Africa. The implication is that, from an African background, good governance must widen to family, clan, ethnic and general cultural values (ibid, 2010).

Similarly in relation to this Cabral (2011) argue in effect to this decentralization reforms have been pursued throughout Africa over the last 30 years because, under the umbrella of good governance decentralization is supposed to foster better governance and moreover it also improves governance efficiency, effectiveness and making policy more responsive to the needs of local people mainly the poor at the grass root levels. so, to him decentralization is like an ingredient of good governance for its real practibility and sustainability.

2.6 The Concept and Practice of Decentralization under the Broader Umbrella of Good governance

According to H. Ekpo (2007) by transferring decision making power to lower tiers of governments that are close to users, decentralization can give citizens greater influence over the level and mix of government services they consume and greater ability to hold their officials accountable.

Sub-national governments have been justified for two fundamental reasons. First, representative democracy seems to work best the closer the government is to its consistency. The assumption is that lower tiers of government, for example, a local government, is better placed at perceiving the desires and demands of its constituents for public services than a distant centralized government. It is for this rationale that most developing economies are stressing decentralization, a process of pushing responsibilities and resources to lower levels of government. Second, subsets of people in the country have the right to demand different types and quantities of public goods and services. There seems to be clear benefits from allowing subsets of residents to demand different arrays of services.

Decentralized governance is increasingly being opted as the most appropriate mode of governance through which poverty reduction interventions can be imagined, planned, implemented, monitored and evaluated. The assumption here is that the process of decentralization facilitates greater participation of societies in project identification, planning and implementation, which in turn increases ownership and the probability of sustainability. Decentralization is perceived as a policy of high priority and used as a tool of people empowerment, as a stage for sustainable democratization, a structure for the mobilization of resources for economic development, absolute instrument of reconciliation, social integration and well-being in post-conflict environments, and as an engine for the promotion of a culture of political, economic, civic, and managerial / administrative good governance. For all these reasons and perhaps even more, many development partners at local, national, regional, and international levels including intergovernmental bodies such as the United Nations Agencies are engaged in efforts at promoting decentralized governance in many countries (United Nations, 2002).
With decentralization, much of the responsibilities for service provision are transferred to lower tiers of governments. While several local governments are able to maintain the “quality” of services transferred to them, it is unable to enhance beyond its present capacity and has limited success in getting the communities involved in addressing local problems. It becomes imperative, therefore, that local capacity in planning, investment programming, micro-finance, monitoring and evaluation, and other areas where capacity is needed in the efficient and effective running of local governments be developed. Likewise, capacity for reporting the use of local resources, foreign loans and grant assistance should be enhanced not only for local governments but, more importantly, for national government ministries and offices. Emphasis should be placed on the operationalization of good governance principles in the affairs of government and the provision of additional assistance to poor local governments in order to improve their credit worthiness and allow them access to additional financial resources (UNDP, 2001).

Decentralization relates with good governance because, it is help full to guarantee human rights, rule of the law, accountability and transparency and besides for effective and efficient service delivery for the grass root people in which decentralization plays a pivotal contribution as far as power is decentralized to the lower tiers of the government bodies in decentralized system of governance in addition at the conceptual and practical level, for decentralization to be effective in service delivery, corruption must not be tolerated by the society in which without minimizing it becomes more difficult to assure decentralized good governance. And to this effect there is aneed for capacity at the lower level of government to ensure transparency and accountability improving service delivery. It is argued that the lower levels of government can deliver services such as water, education, sanitation, health etc effectively. Also, at the lower levels of government and service providers are cognizant of needs and desires of their community that will be more responsive to providing such services because, in which it is help full to recognize the preferences of their community at the lower tiers of government levels (Akpan h. Ekpo, 2008).

According to Saito (2000) in (Kiwanuka, nd) devolution of power and authority to lower governments (generally referred to as decentralization) is increasingly accepted and practiced in many African countries as one of the doctrines of good governance. This is based on the premise that decentralized governance gives a structural arrangement and a level playing field for stakeholders and players to enhance good governance and development. Many countries are promoting decentralized governance as a measure for democratization, people empowerment, and poverty reduction.

Decentralization is a very holistic term, conventionally used to portray the extent to which the political, administrative or fiscal powers of a central government have been shared or disseminated amongst territorially defined sub-national agencies or authorities. Within this broad conceptualization and practice, governmental decentralization in practice exhibits an enormous variety of forms, based on different principles, and with widely differing purposes (ibid, 2008).

This broad devolution of powers is aimed to promote service delivery. By shifting responsibility for policy implementation to the local beneficiaries themselves; to promote good governance by placing focus on transparency and accountability in public sector management; to promote widen, and intensify political and administrative ability in the management of public affairs; to democratize community by promoting inclusive, representative and gender-sensitive decision-
making; and to alleviate poverty through collaborative efforts between central and local governments, donors, non-government organizations (NGOs), community based organizations (CBOs), the private sector and other stakeholders (Kiwanuka, nd).

There are three manifestations of decentralization in regard to the above conceptualization: de-concentration, delegation and devolution. Only the latter is based on the principle of power sharing between national governments and sub-national governments, in which the sub-units are granted legal, financial and/or political autonomy over agreed areas of activity (Turner and Hulme, 1997). One significant disparity in decentralization schemes concerns the issue of delimitation of areas, which profoundly affects both the scale and viability of decentralized authorities and their political significance (Crook, nd).

The study of Azfar et al (1999) shows that decentralization of local public good finance and delivery — provided these are without considerable inter-jurisdictional spillovers — is argued to improve governance in public service delivery in at least three ways: by improving the efficiency of resource allocation; by promoting accountability and reducing corruption within government; and by improving cost recovery. These three dimensions of governance are closely interrelated, and depend on local governments being at least quasi-democratic.

2.6.1 Decentralization, Accountability and Transparency

In decentralization era, authorities of local government become aware of administering their respective localities or regions. They expected to fulfill the desires of the local citizens. In addition, the concern on good governance issue has been increased rapidly in these recent years (Damayanti, 2004).

As far as local government is concerned in decentralized system of governance fostering participation at the local level helps governments' helps for the local authorities to be more equitable, inclusive or responsive. Participatory activities can only successfully influence the outcomes or performance of local government if they are mediated through mechanisms of accountability, which ensure that the governments act in accordance with the wishes of representative bodies and implement authorized spending policies correctly (Crook, nd). In accordance with this similarly Crook (nd) argue that transparency, or "open government" which gives citizens full information on what is being decided and how, is a kind of public accountability device which only functions in systems which already have the basics of democratic accountability in place.

2.6.2 Decentralization and Participation

Local authorities expected to participate the local inhabitants. Accordingly, Citizens participation in their localities can be manifested in the form of appointing representatives as well as community based (Crook, nd).

2.6.3 Decentralization and Government Responsiveness

Decentralization is the transfer of competencies and responsibilities for performing public service responsibilities from the central government to local or sub-national governments. Decentralization can occur in the political, administrative, fiscal, and market domains. Political decentralization aims to shift power and accountability to locally elected bodies or outposts of sectoral ministries. Administrative decentralization reordered responsibility for local planning and operational management (Popic & Mahesh, 2011).

Decentralization has various features that need careful examination. Generally it describes the transfer of competencies and responsibilities for performing public service obligations from the central government to lower tiers of governments. Which is inclusive of political, administrative, fiscal, and market decentralization. There are some sort of
linkages and interactions between these components (Ibid, 2011)

2.6.4 Political Decentralization: Is the transferring of power to the lower tier of governments (localities) from the national level so as to make the service provision to the general public at the lower level more effective and efficient. In accordance with this theory Popic & Mahesh (2011) similarly argue that the prime aim is to foster and enhance participation of the given community in political decision-making. It implies that locally elected authorities must bear more responsibility to those who elected them and better signify local interests in political decision-making processes. One of the planned advantages of political decentralization is to improve accountability and responsiveness at the local level. Two basic concerns in understanding accountability are to determine the patterns of accountability and the approaches used to guarantee accountability. The pattern of accountability refers to identifying who is accountable to whom (the direction of accountability) and the legal basis for accountability among actors (Dickovick and Tegegne, 2010).

Political decentralization incorporates organizations and measures for increasing citizen involvement in selecting political representatives and in making public policy; changes in the structure of the government through devolution of powers and authority to local tiers of government; power-sharing institutions within the state through federalism, constitutional federations, or autonomous regions (Cheema and Rondinelli, 2007).

2.6.5 Administrative decentralization (functional assignment): Distributes the responsibilities to fulfill public obligations among governmental authorities at various levels of government. Responsibility for regional or local level planning, operational management and in part also for the financing of infrastructure and services is shifted from central to lower-level authorities. Administrative decentralization can be differentiated by its three main forms (Mulugeta, 2012).

Is the redistribution of authority and responsibility of administering the human resource, material and financial resources for delivering public services at various government tiers. While the main task of this dimension is service delivery, the responsibility of administering the whole sectors falls under this dimension. If officials are elected and authority and power to administer are not reassigned in whatever form, then the political decentralization will be worthless (ibid, 2012).

2.6.6 Deconcentration: Is a redistribution of responsibilities to sub-national units of central government (e.g. regional ministerial offices). It represents the weakest form of decentralization. Some argue that this is not even part of decentralization because the change in responsibility simply takes place within the central government hierarchy to mean the lower tiers of governments are recommended and directed by authorities from the center (ibid, 2011). By the same token Ekpo (2008) also argue that the aim is to preserve full control of service planning, expenditure and delivery whilst achieving greater efficiency and effectiveness; this is the weakest form of decentralization.

2.6.7 Delegation: Is a stronger form of administrative decentralization than that of deconcentration and refers to the redistribution of decision and operational responsibility to local authorities and to some extent it guarantees some sort of autonomy from the central authorities but, local authorities expected to report to the centre with regard to the functions and operations carried out by them (ibid, 2011).

2.6.8 Devolution: is the strongest form of administrative decentralization. It encompasses the transfer of powers for decision-making, finances and management from the central administration to sovereign local governments, usually referring to municipalities with locally
elected organs and clearly defined territorial responsibilities (Ekpo, 2008). 

By the same token Katsiaouni (2002) argued devolution implies for devolving power and resources to the lower tier governments without the direct interference on their affairs. Devolution aimed to support local governments by granting them the authority, responsibility, and resources to provide services and infrastructure, protect public health and safety, and devise and put into practice the local policies (Cheema and Rondinelli, nd). 

Devolution aimed to reinforce local governments by granting them the authority, responsibility, and resources to deliver services and infrastructure, protect public health and safety, and devise and execute local policies. Through delegation, national governments transfer management authority for specific functions to semi autonomous or parastatal organizations and state enterprises, regional planning and area development agencies, and multi- and single-purpose public authorities (Cheema and Rondinelli, nd).

2.6.9 Fiscal decentralization: It implies for the assignment of revenues and the grant mechanisms to lower tiers of governments which is helpful for local authorities to undertake their duties within available budget allocated. This may result in dynamics in the share of the public sector in overall governmental funding, in the stability of funding of services, and in changes in the relative funding of specific types of services. These effects may differ between rich and poor geographic areas and may be linked to local revenue raising capacities and the relative provision of funds by central and local government (Ekpo, 2008).

2.7 Good governance, Decentralization and Local Governance in Africa and Ethiopia: An overview

It is instructive to note that the notion of good governance has been included in the objectives and policies of the African Union. Article 3(a) of the Constitutive Act of the African Union, adopted at Lome, Togo in July 2000, provides for the promotion of democratic principles and institutions, popular participation and good governance (Mbao and Komboni, nd). Furthermore, one of the key objectives of the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) is to promote and protect democracy, good governance and human rights in Africa by establishing or setting clear standards of accountability, transparency and participative governance. In essence, NEPAD approves good governance as essential conditions for sustainable development. Furthermore the African Peer Review Mechanism, though voluntary, is unique in that once a country chooses to sign up to the APRM, it undertakes to practice a higher standard of democracy, human rights and economic management. It surrenders a small measure of sovereignty to its peers within the APRM movement, though not outside it, and could be subject to unsought intervention. At the central part of APRM are the fundamentals of clean government, transparent economic policies and participatory, multi-party democracy (Mbao and Komboni, nd).

Good governance as an act of navigating people’s development includes full-range participation and holds transparency, accountability and equity. It requires effective capacities on the part of all stakeholders at community, local, national, regional and global levels, and in all sectors, i.e., public, private and civil society. African countries that have experienced noticeable successes in decentralized governance have conceived their local governance policies and strategies both horizontally and vertically. There is currently a strong desire for capacity-building in local governance to emphasize on empowering all stakeholders for their full-range socio-political-economic participation in decentralized governance (Kauzya, 2003).
The AU’s institutional governance agenda is two dimensional. On the one hand, there are institutions and processes that are proposed to promote the governance agenda of the Union itself; and on the other hand, there are institutional arrangements intended to facilitate the internalization of the AU’s governance agenda in member states of the organization. There are synergies between the two dimensions of the agenda (Shinkaiye, 2006).

Local governance is being consolidated in a number of African countries because it is believed that it gives a structural agreement through which local people and communities with support from other national, regional as well as international actors can participate in the fight against poverty at close range. However, it is acknowledged that various capacities of a multiplicity of stakeholders and actors need to be strengthened to meet the expectations of effective and responsive local governance (Kauzya, 2003).

By the same token Kauzya (2003) further argue that the central pillar of good local governance is the participation of the local people. Participation should be enhanced in its full range to hold the participation of local people in planning, priority setting, production, paying (financing) and expenditure if their living has to be sustained through local governance. The actual motive for building local governance capacity should be to strengthen and empower local communities to take part in full range participation, which is the only assurance for their continued living.

As an engine of good governance decentralization also given due focus which started between the late 1980s and early 1990s, often in the context of public sector reforms associated with structural adjustment programmes. Countries like Uganda, Ghana, Nigeria, Botswana, Côte d’Ivoire, Kenya and Tanzania, were among the first to include decentralization in their public sector reform packages. Accordingly, African governments have undergone repeated decentralization reforms since the early colonial period. In the most recent wave, beginning in the late 1980s, however, the language of reform has shifted from focusing on national unity and the management of local populations to a discourse more focused on democratization, pluralism and rights (Mbao and Komboni, nd).

Decentralization is any act in which a central government formally cedes powers to actors and institutions at lower tiers in a political-administrative and territorial hierarchy. Decentralization reforms are usually about strengthening both central and local governance in ways that support the objectives of national unification, democratization, and greater efficiency and equity in the use of public resources and service delivery (UNRISD, 2001).

Accordingly, the prime objective of decentralization reforms is to have governments that are able to carry out or maintain all of these functions with appropriate roles at multiple levels. So, decentralization is decisive in which local authorities become responsive for the grass root level peoples in effective and efficient service delivery in addition theorists also argue that this ability derives from local authorities having better access to information and being more easily held accountable to local populations for better service provision. In relation to this downward accountability of local authorities is good manifestation to this concept and practice. Because, when downwardly accountable local authorities also have flexible (optional) power that is a domain of local autonomy—over significant local issues, there is good reason to believe that greater equity and efficiency of service delivery to the public will follow. Even if this is so, in practice there is considerable confusion and misunderstanding about what comprises decentralization (UNRISD, 2001).

In the name of decentralization, powers over natural and other resources are being allocated.
to a variety of local bodies and authorities that may not be downwardly accountable or delegated with adequate powers and the legal-political design of local government in Africa tends to weaken the promotion of a democratic culture at the local level as well as weaken the ability of local authorities to take initiative in the field of service provision. Because, decentralizations that democratize and transfer powers intimidate many actors, few have been fully implemented. In turn, it should come as no surprise that most of the literature on decentralization focuses more on expectations and discourse than on practice and outcomes (UNRISD, 2001).

By and large, the decentralization experiment has only taken weak steps in the way of deconcentration. Many reforms are taking place in the name of decentralization, but they are not setting up the critical institutional infrastructure from which to expect the positive results that decentralizations assure. Instead, local democracies are created but given no powers, or powers are devolved to non representative or upwardly accountable local authorities (UNRISD, 2001).

Decentralizations are not taking the structures necessary to realize the benefits that theory predicts because they fail to entrust downwardly accountable representative actors with significant domains of autonomous discretionary power. The decentralizations underway differ by the level of legal reform involved, the degree and number of layers of ‘local’ government, the varieties local authorities being engaged and developed, the blend of powers and responsibilities devolved, the sectors involved, the nature of the enabling environment, and by the motives of governments for beginning of these reforms in the first place. These are all scrutinized with regard to how they may shape expected outcomes (UNRISD, 2001).

As part of the emerging concerns of ‘good governance,’ decentralization becomes a big deal as far as it transfers power as well as resources to the local authorities for effective and efficient provision of services to the localities. To mean decentralization is a big agenda under the umbrella of good and has been popularized in developing countries and many aid agencies support it. Decentralization is a gradual process and is expected to improve the opportunities for participation by placing more power and resources at a closer, more familiar, and more easily influenced level of government. Because, in the atmosphere of poor participation by citizens decentralization is vital to increase and foster participation by the large people. Within Africa itself, decentralization has also been opted as a solution to political challenges that seem to threaten national unity (UNDP and ECA, 2002).

Countries with a history of linguistic, ethnic/tribal, and religious tensions have often found the federal approach to national governance desirable for national harmony. Both Ethiopia and Uganda, for example, derive their initiation and commitment to decentralization from past history of political disorder. In accordance with this, a large number of African countries, including Mozambique, Cape Verde, Mauritania, and Zimbabwe see decentralization as a solution not only to the enhancement of the state’s capacity to speed up local development but also as a way to improve the poor’s voice at the grass root level and power in the continuing struggle against poverty which is help full for alleviating poverty (UNDP and ECA, 2002).

Good governance, a canon that is highly concerned with decentralization, is about power and authority. Although people are the means and the ends of it, they have different amounts of power and resources, and different interests. In every part of societies the needs and ambitions of the haves and the have nots reflects in the policy devised by the authorities in power. But this is rarely true of the poor and the marginalized, who struggle to get their
voices heard. So, good governance and decentralization prevail to rectify this problem of the marginalized as well as the poor and accommodate the interests of the majority and minority, the poor and the rich, the privileged and the underprivileged. To mean good governance is holistic in essence every section of the society is the concern of good governance. Accordingly, governments that disregard the needs of large sections of the population in devising and implementing policy are not supposed to be a capable (good) government. The process of strengthening institutions, particularly institutions that boost the democratic practice begin by bringing the government closer to the people. Basically, this means bringing popular voice into policy making. In the right setting, it also means greater decentralization of central power, authority, and resources. In the average African country, these ideals are still far from being appreciated and achieved (UNDP and ECA, 2002).

The decentralization of public service from the Regional States to the local government has taken place in two phases. The first phase of local decentralization has taken place in the period of 1995 -2001. This phase was more political and administrative type of decentralization. In this period the power and resources were concentrated in the hands of Regional Governments and Zonal administration. Resources allotment decisions were made at the Regional level. And the political and fiscal autonomy of the local/district government were eroded by the powerful Regional Government and its zonal administrative organ. This era of decentralization was cementing ,and strengthening the Regional State rather than local governments. The Regional Government structure became so powerful; in contrast, the arrangement at district level was a victim of the powerful regional government as they were not given any fiscal and political autonomy to deal with their socio-economic affairs (Abdulahi, 2008).

By the same token Tegegne (1998) argued that decentralization in Ethiopia is believed to bring about agreement and collaboration between different groups and promote local self-administration. The decentralization process in Ethiopia has proceeded in two phases. The first wave of decentralization (1991-2001) was centered on creating and empowering Regional Governments and hence was termed as mid-level decentralization. During this period, Regional Governments were established with changes in the local and central government system (Yigremew, 2001). The Regional Governments were entrusted with all powers in respect of all matters within their jurisdictions, and out of those that fall under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government (Kasshun and Tegegne, 2004). In particular, the regional states are authorized, among others, to issue regional constitutions and other laws, plan and execute socio-economic developments.

The first wave of decentralization was unsuccessful to create effective self rule at the lower level i.e. at the woreda level but it was also scored irrefutable success in instituting local governance and regional self-rule. Though the Constitution allows for the creation of weredas with their elected councils, yet they lack power, human and material resources and authorities has hindered them to effectively keep in democratic self-rule. Beside to this woreda was critical controlled checked and monitored its activities by the Zonal and Regional authorities which can be seen as impediment to the self administration the woreda itself. By taking this issue as a lesson the Ethiopian government introduced the District Level Decentralization Program in which the government further devolves powers and responsibilities to the weredas in 2001. Unlike the first wave of decentralization, that features a simultaneous country-wide coverage, the second wave was initially restricted to the four
Regional States (Oromia, Amhara, Tigray and SNNPR). This second wave of decentralization allow for the local governments to have legislation power, fiscal reform, institutional streamlining, capacity development, etc.

In relation to the notion and practice of decentralization in Ethiopia there were a debate i.e. some elites argue that the powers of local government need to be incorporated (included) in the law of the land. Others argued that issues that concern to the local government need to be left for the local government finally the agreement concluded that it need to be included. Thus under the federal Constitution an obligation was imposed on the regional states to establish local government and to provide it with adequate powers. However the structure of the local government and the real power to have and function lifted for the regions to decide. In 1995 the biggest four states (Amahara, Oromia, Tigray and SNNP) soon followed by the other states, established a three tiered local administration through their constitutions. In 2001, again amended their constitutions and restructure their respective local administration with its system and other regions also follow this and done it and power is devolved to the localities for effective and efficient service delivery to the grass root peoples (Zemelak, 2009).

2.8 Reality of Decentralization in Africa

Decentralization reforms have been practiced throughout Africa over the last 30 years with the aims of consolidating governance efficiency and making policy more responsive to the needs of local people, particularly the marginalized. But behind these vocalized aims, political motivations are a major driving force. Decentralization has often been used to expand the power of the ruling elite to local levels or to neutralize challenging forces emerging from below (Cabral, 2011).

Decentralization, since the middle of the 1980’s is transforming the arrangement of governance in Africa since most countries have begin change power, resources and responsibilities to their sub national governments. The introduction of decentralization democracy is the most vital determinant of decentralization in Africa. Most citizens and donor organizations believe that decentralization is a practical way of appoint services to neglected areas, getting more fair sharing of public services and increasing popular participation (Egbenya, 2009).

In Africa Most colonial governments approved colonial legacy after independence. In the French-speaking territories and British former colonies, for example, central governments continued assigning local government. There are five levels of government (village-LC 1, Parish-LC 2, Sub-county-LC3, County-LC-4 and District-LC 5), but political authority and considerable resources are only with LC 3 and LC 5 (units of decentralization). The local government to which power is transferred is given a shared status, autonomy and functions government officials (Kiwanuka, nd).

The quest for proper planning after independence in many African countries resulted in the implementation of decentralization (deconcentration), in the form of a network of development committees, which functions in every administrative unit in the field which was associated to the parent committee or a government ministry at the center (Oyugi, 2000). Between the 1960s and 1980s, decentralization initiatives (deconcentration) were carried out in the context of nation building and go along with the Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) under donor initiative in countries like Kenya and Malawi, aimed to improve the active participation from the part of the citizens. Democratization and globalization now aday initiated Africans states to adopt political and administrative decentralization (devolution) (Devas, 2004) cited in( Kiwanuka , nd)

According to USAID (nd) the issue of decentralization is of growing interest to African
governments. In the last twenty years ago most African states were follow acentralized kind of government structure. But now aday the story changed and local populations got an autonomy to decide upon themselves and this is part and parcel of governance change in the continent. The move with regard to decentralization has goes with the economic as well as political liberalization to getherly processes and this becomes a success story throughout the continent.

In relation to the success story, USAID Africa Bureau’s Office of Sustainable Development (AFR/SD/CPG) and the Office of Democracy, Human Rights and Governance in the Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance Bureau have developed a set of studies to understand and to draw some lessons from what Africa experienced in decentralization (USAID, nd).

Similarly Olowu (2004) argue that to days concept of decentralization practiced by many African governments focuses on the promulgation and revised rules and responsibilities for administrative and political personnel, and on founding the structure for some sort of local accountable political institutions.

In accordance to this administrative and political decentralization given due emphasis in to days developmental agenda of Africa and in other states. Although the possible advantages have been well theorized and conceptualized the real politics of decentralization are not well understood. Often there is a divergence between the reforms undertook and the real commitment to carry out the reforms by the leaders. And often legal changes have not produced with regard to what decentralization expected to come up with political as well as administrative reforms(changes) and these changes become clear especially in rural areas of Africa, in which the various reform agenda produce un fruit full results or changes (Boone, nd).

2.9 Governance Theories and Practices

2.9.1 Network Management Theory

Networks have been widely recognized by both scholars and practitioners as a vital form of multi-organizational governance. The advantages of network coordination in both public and private sectors are considerable, including improved learning, more efficient utilization of resources, increased capacity to plan for and address complex problems, greater competitiveness, and better services for clients and customers. Alter and Hage 1993; Brass et al. 2004; Huxham and Vangen 2005) cited in (Bevir, nd). By the same token Bevir (nd) argued that network as a form of governance approach considered networks as the unit of analysis. Network is viewed as an instrument of coordination, or what has often been referred to as network governance.

Network theories argue that the key governance task is to manage networks effectively Stoker (2006) and Rhodes R.A.W (1997) Argue that ‘governance is about managing networks’. And although there has been some abstract reference to ‘governing without government’ , accordingly, most scholars agree that the core focus of attention is how a given government can interrelate with hin diverse organizations and also beyond the boundary of the state in order to attain its goals for the betterment of the general public (Rhodes, 1997)

2.9.2 Social Interpretive Theories:-They argue that the human nature is not easily manageable and that the design of governance measures is not an easy task which covers this school of thought (Wesley et al, 2008). It develops a more complex and nuanced perspective on how individuals and groups react to the challenges and difficulties of governance (Stoker, 2006).

2.9.3 Theories of delegation:- Delegation theorists argue that key to effective governance is getting the structure of delegation right and when incentives are appropriately aligned then
the desired outcome can be achieved is the basic assumption of delegation theorists. An understanding of how delegation works could provide a key element in understanding the operation of governance (Stoker, 2006).

2.9.4 The new public management theory:-
Proponents of this theory have the stand that incorporating the private sector and improving the incentive mechanism will boost and promote the efficiency as well as the effectiveness of a given organization. Applying the new public management theory principles to organizations would need running the organizations like a private business (Ibid, 2006). This theory basis itself on the governments mission oriented rather than that of rule bounded, results oriented, enterprising, anticipatory, and customer driven and government agencies and accordingly, the government should meet the needs of citizens rather than those of the bureaucracy which is managed by the bureaucrats (civil servants). Pillar to this theory decentralization also given a special emphasis which is helpful for the ultimate attainment of the stated goals (Cheema and Rondinelli, nd).

In their book *Reinventing Government*, which reveal innovative reforms in the United States and influenced thoughts in other countries during the 1990s, David Osborne and Ted Gaebler cited in (Cheema and Rondinelli, 2005) argue that national, state, and local government should be inventive, market oriented, decentralized, and focused on offering their “customers” the highest quality services. They and supporters of new public management argue that governments should “steer rather than row” and oversee service provision rather than deliver it directly; further, governments must encourage local groups to deal with their own problems by deregulating and privatizing those activities that could be undertaken by the private sector or by civil society organizations more efficiently or effectively than by public organizations.

2.10 An Overview of Good governance and its practice in Ethiopia

The emergence and recognition of the idea of good governance can be accredited to more than its attractive characteristics and admirable policy goals, however to be sure, by the late 1980s, a convergence of intellectual and experiential tendencies brought increased visibility to this idea. Good governance incorporates ideas of equity and fairness, protection for the poor, for minorities, and for women, and a positive role for the state. For many others found along the continuum from right to left, the concept is attractive for its concern about order, decency, justice, and accountability (Grindle, 2010).

The concept of good governance is comprehensive (holistic) because it incorporates various indispensable elements such as democracy, human rights and peace and e.t.c. In the sphere of delivering State services to the public, good governance reforms promote human rights when they improve the State’s capacity to fulfill its responsibility to offer public goods which are important for the protection of a number of human rights, such as the right to education, health and food. Reform initiatives may include mechanisms of accountability and transparency, culturally sensitive policy tools to guarantee that services are accessible and acceptable to all, and paths for public involvement in decision-making (United Nation, 2007).

Ethiopia had a decentralized governance system throughout much of its survival as a state. This decentralized system was distinguished by the co-existence of triple authorities: sovereign kings and provincial and local nobilities apply powers within their area while at the same time recognizing the imperial throne as the central authority. Scholars uphold that the huge size of the country, its rugged and broken landscape, the economic and cultural diversity of its society, and the absence of a
modern means of communication were the core causes of the decentralized system and structure. In the second half of the 19th century, however, Emperor Tewodros II (1855-1868) set the centralization process in motion by bringing an end to the autonomy of regional and local nobilities. This process of expansion and the centralization was followed energetically by Emperor Menelik II in which he shaped the country’s current boundary (Zemelak, 2008).

With regard to governance history of Ethiopia authoritarian as well as dictators ruled the country for decades and there were not a conducive room for the practice of good governance so, historically there were not an experience and tradition of good governance. The situation changed during 1991 when the EPRDF regime over throw the Derg through insurgency. Accordingly, since 1991 the government has taken important measures to promote good governance and the FDRE Constitution adopted in 1995 establishes a multi-party parliamentary system of government and recognizes as well as legalizes most of the human rights elaborated under international law (Dessalegn et al, 2008).

The Derg sustained the tendency of top-down governance, although with a radically different structure: Haile Selassie’s version of indirect rule was changed with a militarized Marxist-Leninist vanguard party. The Derg developed a far more piercing state than Haile Selassie through militarization, establishing rural peasant associations and urban dwellers associations (or kebeles), grassroots extensions of the formal government structure in rural and urban areas. The Derg also shaped village development committees, nationalized industry, collectivized agriculture, and forced “villagization.” (Dickovick and Tegegne, 2010).

The EPRDF government shown and furthered the commitment to promote good governance via ratifying a number of international human rights instruments, reforming domestic laws to harmonize and to cope up with international human rights standards, emphasizing good governance in different policies and programs such as the PASDEP and now the GTP. Despite the fact that important progresses so far, the process of building good governance is at its early stage, which has been facing serious and complex bottlenecks. Major bottle necks in good governance include lack of adequate awareness about human rights among the public, the limited democratic culture and experience in the country, limited participation of citizens in governance, lack of adequate and appropriate laws and policies in some areas, capacity limitations of law enforcement and governance organs of the government, etc (Serdar and Varsha, 2008).

In relation to this Local governments also seem to lack the power to control and manage their workforce as all employing and firing have to go through zonal or regional offices (the degree of say these upper levels of government is different across regions) (Serdar and Varsha, 2008). Each regional state government must officially devolve sufficient decision-making authority and control over resources to zonal, woreda and kebele administrations in order to consolidate democratic decentralization and get government nearer to the people. However, the stark reality in Ethiopia’s.

Decentralization process is that woredas and kebeles have been given too much responsibility and functions without the necessary financial and resource capacity to carry out development at the local level. This situation has to change in favor of transferring responsibilities and functions to woredas and kebeles accompanied by sufficient financial and human resource strength to undertake development at the local level (UN-HABITAT, 2002). To minimize the problem CSOs/NGOs have been engaged actively in addressing the...
bottle necks in promoting good governance (Dessalegn et al, 2008).

In accordance with good governance endeavors made so far the federal constitution provides for a four-tier decentralization framework consisting of regions (or states), zones (cluster of districts), *woredas* (or districts) and *kebeles* (neighbourhoods) (ADB, ADF, 2009). The FDRE constitution of the 1995 establishes the federal structure based on nine regional states and gives them the right to secede (Article 39 of the constitution). Accordingly, the regional states are responsible for implementation of economic and social development policies as well as the maintenance of public order and administration a police force, and the federal state is given for all powers not delegated to, or shared with the states (Ibid,2008).

In Ethiopia, some of the opportunities of good governance consolidation and promotion moves of the today’s government include: prevalence of good constitution, conducive policies and some initiative by government; the establishment of Ethics and anti-corruption commission, Ombudsman, Human Right Commission, Ministry of Women’s Affairs, initiatives 53 of civil societies, and presence of favorable condition to get organized and the existence of better education opportunities and exposure to mass media are paramount one (DFID,2007:24).

Despite vibrantly visible advances registered so far in good governance practice consolidations, there are so many political and administrative governance practice hindrances which are still unabated at local level. Some of the good governance restraints identified in different literatures include: immaturity in the actual practices of multi party system, absence of well expressed separation of government power either vertically or horizontally, difficulties in assuring party neutral and competent civil service, lack of administrative autonomy and lack of human and institutional capacity which in turn results ineffectiveness and inefficiencies in public service delivery and policy implementation (Yilmaz and Venugopal, 2008; ADB and ADF, 2009:4).

### 2.11 Ethiopia’s Governance Structure Post 1991

In Ethiopia, the governance structures at the region, zone, *woreda* and the *kebele* level follow the same tripartite structure—an elected head of the administration, a council with an executive committee and a sector bureau. The regional governments are responsible for implementing economic and social development policies and for maintaining public order, including administering a police force, and the federal state is responsible for all powers not delegated to, or shared, with the regions. Each region has at its apex a Regional Council, with its council members directly elected to represent *woredas*. Regions decide the number of representatives their *woredas* are allowed to send (Yilmaz and Venugopal, 2008).

One advantage of Ethiopia’s decentralized system of governance is that regions are allowed to choose their own approach for making block grant allocations, as long as this is done in a nondiscretionary, formula-based way. Most regions use a three-parameter formula, explained further below, for making block grant allocations to rural *woreda* while some have experimented with other approaches. The block grant is intended to help *woredas* meet the recurrent and investment needs of state functions such as education, health care, and agricultural extension. In several regions, urban administrations are not treated like other (rural) *woredas* in the block grant allocation process and are subject to different rules when determining transfer amounts from regions, even though they officially have *woreda* status (Ibid,2008).

The federal constitution provides for a four-tier decentralization framework consisting of regions.
or states), zones (cluster of districts), woredas (or districts) and kebeles ('neighborhoods')(ADB, ADF, 2009). The FDRE constitution of the 1995 establishes the federal structure based on nine regional states and gives them the right to secede (article 39 of the constitution. The regional states are responsible for implementation of economic and social development policies as well as the maintenance public order and administration a police force, and the federal state is given for all powers not delegated to, or shared with the states (Yilmaz and Venugopal, 2008)

2.11.1State governments: state governments shall be established at state and administrative levels that they find necessary and adequate power shall be granted to the lowest unit of government to enable the people to participate directly in the administration of such units (FDRE constitution, 1995).

2.11.2 Zonal Administration: zonal administration is the governance level which found below the regional states and the woreda level. The governance structures in the Zones vary- in southern nations, zones (special woredas such as Konso elect councils, that is also have executive committees; in Amhara and Oromiya there are no such elected councils and zonal executive committee and members are appointed by the state council and include those from its own ranks. According to Yilmaz & Venugopal (2008) zonal executives are chaired by the zonal administrator and comprise, in addition to the elected representatives, civil servants from the other bureaus and security officials. The sector bureaus have officials at the zonal level.

2.11.3 Woreda Administrations: Below zonal administration there is a woreda administration which is the most important local administrative institution under the Ethiopian local governance system (Zemelak, 2009). At the woreda level, the woreda council consists of directly elected representatives from each kebelle in the woreda. Yilmaz and Venugopal (2008) put that the woreda council has dual accountability; upward to nits respective zonal and regional executive committees and down ward to its electorate.

2.11.4 Kebele Administrations: Kebele administrative units are the lowest levels of administration in the governance structure of the country that is more closer to the people and are found in both the “urban and rural areas of the country with an average population of 5000” (BerhanuLegesse and Zemelak, 2009). According to Berhanu Legesse (2009) Kebele administrations have elected councils, executive administration, committee social tribunal /courts, a manager and a pool of civil servants and they are entry points for service delivery and their proximity to the people gives them a unique advantage to be responsive to community needs.

Under the broader umbrella of Ethiopian governance structure with regard to municipalities, executive committees or teams of 2-7 are usually appointed by a higher level of government to manage them. At times an elected council supports these commits. The main responsibilities of municipalities were stated in proclamation N0.74 of 1945 and proclamation No. 206 0f 1981. More recently, regional governments have been reviewing municipal roles and introducing new legislation on the functions of municipalities in their jurisdictions. Allowable municipal functions (subject to appropriate regional approval include Preparation of budget proposals, assessment and collection of allowable municipal revenues, preparation and implementation of development plans, provision of internal roads and bridges, provision of markets, slaughter houses, terminals, public gardens, recreational areas and other public facilities, regulation of clean lines and provision of solid wastes, water, sewerage and drainage services, delivery of miscellaneous services, including free protection, libraries, public toilets, street lighting, nursing schools,...
2.11 Why Local Government is a point of Discussion Under the broader umbrella of good governance and decentralization now a day?

Local governments are responsible for most services to citizens, such as primary education, health, roads, agriculture extension, and water and sanitation. The central government is present in policy making, regulation of local governments, and certain national key functions. Outlines the key responsibilities for service provision in the main sectors and the extent to which legal or other issues are outstanding (Anwar shah, nd). Local governments are nearer to the people and they can address local requirements and preferences better than the central government. Decentralization also approaches a competitive market in that local governments supply services on the basis of people's preferences and people are made to pay a tax based on the benefit they receive (Van der Loop et al, 2002).

Local governance portrays the means authority is organized, legitimated, and employed within the local space. It includes how plans and policies are devised, how decisions are made, and how those who make and implement decisions are held accountable for their actions and results through both governmental and non-governmental forms of public or joint decision and action. All institutions of decision and action in a local space contribute to local governance (Helling et al, 2005).

Figure 2. Ethiopia government structure

Local governance does not make reference to local government or local populations solely. It refers to a situation where whatever a governance actor (an international NGO, a central government institution, a local government agency or a private sector enterprise) does, is planned, implemented, maintained, evaluated, and controlled with the requirements, priorities, interests, participation, and common good of the local population as the central and guiding consideration (Kauzya, 2003). Similarly H. Ekpo (2008) argued that the lower tiers of government can deliver services such as water, education,
sanitation, health etc effectively. Also, at the lower levels of government, politicians and civil servants are more cognizant of the needs of their society that will be more responsive to delivering such services. Preferences of local populations are better known at lower levels of government.

Decentralization can facilitate an enabling environment for a holistic people-centered approach to development management. In all of the cases, decentralization was vital to the enlargement of local participation in many aspect of local development—planning, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Many of the cases show how participating the community in these activities can help to promote the performance of local governments. Some of the cases also provide facts that local people were more satisfied with the decentralized decision-making processes than with the systems they replaced, suggesting a degree of empowerment and enhanced governance (Robertson, nd).

By the same token a study conducted by Helling et al (2005) shows that Local service provision needs a sufficient resource base—the money, people, information, and technology required to twist decisions about what people and societies require into public facilities and public services. Some resources are mobilized locally through voluntary contributions (including beneficiary time and labor) and through compulsory taxes and fees. Other resources are offered through transfers from outside organizations, both governmental and non-governmental, to local governments and community-based organizations. A local revenue base is an important foundation for sustainable empowerment and governance as well as service provision. The greater sense of ownership among people who contribute through taxes and fees to the costs of local infrastructure and services strengthens both citizen demand and the accountability of public officials. And the greater degree of local discretion associated with own-source revenues enhances the capacity for responsiveness by decision-makers and service providers. Promoting service provision for local development needs specifying suitable institutional arrangements for the production of public facilities and provision of public services. These include properly allocating roles among local organizations, according to the context and conditions, and enhancing their capacity to shoulder these roles.

Local government service provision systems typically follow the sectoral model of functional organization: specialized organization units suppose responsibility for particular functions, such as roads, water supply, land-use regulation, and sanitation. Thus, in spite of different lines of accountability, many local governments utilize the same service delivery instrument as do deconcentrated sectoral agencies. Further, because local governments are initiated to respond to citizen desires they frequently offer services beyond those assigned them by law. In many countries local governments Organize schools and clinics on their own initiative, even when these responsibilities formally fall to ministries of health and education. Local governments also serve as advocates for their electorates, lobbying ministerial departments to increase the coverage and enhance the quality of the services they deliver to local communities (Helling et al, 2005).

In relation to this study conducted by Berhanu (2009) reveals that Local governments make good decision than central governments in the production and delivering of specific services. It is a question of availability of localized information for decision making process and the incentives to reach proper decision, plus a closer match between services delivered and the preference of service beneficiaries. It also enhances increased accountability of local decision makers. More significantly, in present day, government and lending institutions focus
on attaining national development goals and prefer broader scale local accountability and responsibility; for example, for meeting MDGs, giving focus on local government. This shows the connection of local level decentralization to service delivery. Decentralization of the delivery of public services can be said to lead to greater economic efficiency because the pattern of expenditure would be more in accordance with the needs of the people. Decentralization gives opportunities in different facades. The following are some. helps to attain national development goals by participating people more closely, solves problems and constraints of communities, voices of the poor and marginalized are heard and thus helps to address problems of inequality, improves access for services more effectively, enhances the delivery of basic services by mobilizing resources from the community, assures accountability and good governance as services are nearer to the community, transfers responsibilities from the center, which otherwise had been inefficient (ibid,2009).

In relation to local governance a study conducted by C. Misuraca (2007) is indicative of the fact that local governance is increasingly recognized as basic element of good governance, since they provide an enabling atmosphere in which decision making and service delivery can be brought nearer to the people, especially to the poor. On the other hand decentralization is instrumental in the overall issue of re-inventing government and is pivotal to achieving the internationally set Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Under the collective pressure of facilitating the continuous demands for deeper and expanded democratization, central governments are seeing their traditional roles continuously challenged. Re-inventing government would then need revisiting the nature and role of the state itself and the devolving of political power and administrative responsibilities.

Strengthening local government parallel with decentralization of service delivery invites people to take their future into their hands by increasing their participation in decision-making at the grass-roots level on issues that directly affect their lives. Decentralizing government enables the public to take part directly in governance processes and empower people previously excluded from decision-making. More fundamentally, it encompasses the devolution of power for making decisions at local levels and improves the efficiency of the public sector by making it more responsive to the needs of the public. So, decentralization is directly linked with good governance, transparency and accountability as well as responsiveness to community needs by bringing government closer to people at the lowest tiers of administration. Accordingly to come up with this decentralization need to increase allocation of resources to local authorities for service delivery at the grass root level (Ministry of capacity building,nd)

In relation to this Rondinelli, D.A(1981) argued that decentralization helps decision making process to be closer to the people, so as to increase their participation and voice, and to improve governments response to their needs. It helps also the government to be scrutinized and investigated by the civil societies for better service delivery as well as to foster political accountability. In theory, lower-level (local governments) will tailor programmes to meet diverse localized needs, reduce the time it takes to implement plans, respond to the needs of marginalized communities, improve local capacity, reduce the workload of central ministries, be more innovative and flexible, etc. The general aim, then, is to improve efficiency in the delivery of services and use of development resources to reduce poverty and to consolidate democracy and promote good governance especially at lower tier governments.
One of the primary responsibilities of local government is to secure the smooth and efficient functioning of the public services, which are generally managed by its technical-administrative apparatus. As a matter of fact, this was one of the fundamental arguments of the first generation of decentralization proponents, also claimed that it would be easier to tailor local-level services to local needs and preferences (Lindert and Otto, 2007).

In relation to this as experience show in literature, two characteristics of the local government service provision process need specific consideration with regard to the evaluation of responsiveness: The level of local political influence on allocations decisions and the level of civic participation in the decision making process (Andrews and Anwar shah, 2003).

The key benefits to be had from engaging local government in service delivery argued by (De Visser 2005:19) in Sansom et al (2009) are firstly, local government one tier of government which is nearest to the people at lower level. At least in theory, municipalities are able to hear the desires and voices of the localities as far as they are near to the poor. They should also be best placed to identify and unlock local potential, and mobilize resources present in the locality. These characteristics do not automatically lead to a higher quality and legitimacy of decisions but certainly have the potential to do so. This depends on whether local (Municipal) governments are indeed configured and behave responsively, and to what extent local governments are able to pursue their communities’ wishes for the locality through broader government structures and partnerships.

Secondly, there is the promise that local government enhance and foster decentralized good governance as well as democracy. Thirdly, the allocation of responsibility to municipalities creates room for local creativity and avoids the occurrence where the entire country needs to experience the same experiment before it can be evaluated. Fourthly, municipalities are key players in multi-sectoral coordination because they are the real service providers at the lowest level of governments.

By the same token Manasan et al (1999) argued Good local governance requires prudence. Local governments should focus more on prevention rather than cure, as it is easier and less luxurious to solve problems rather than to respond to crises.

In emerging countries local governments are becoming more numerous and are increasingly required to play pivotal roles in providing services, alleviating poverty, and facilitating development. In relation to this responsiveness in which local government evaluations should focus, arguing that decentralization in a democratic context should lead to larger responsiveness to constituent demands so, the level of local political influence on allocations decisions and the level of civic participations in the decision making process are seen as two very main characteristics’ of the local government service provision process that relate to responsiveness. Where each is higher one can expect a higher level of local government response to citizen demands and in accordance with this notion accountability of local governments the required is the information citizens have regarding local governance (governance transparency), the access citizens have to the governance process and their ability to express their voice to officials (Huther and Shah, 2003).

Local governance, therefore, includes the diverse objectives of energetic, living, working, and environmentally preserved self-governing communities. Good local governance is not mere of delivering services but also about protecting the life and liberty of local residents; creating space for democratic participation and civic dialogue; environmentally sustainable local development; and facilitating outcomes.
that enhance the quality of life of local residents of the given locality (Shah, nd).

Similarly Miller (2002) also argue that Local Government is often portrayed as representing the highest form of decentralization, i.e. the devolution model, but this is not always so. Where local governments operate essentially as agents of central government rather than as instruments of local self-expression, this in reality Constitutes deconcentration rather than the devolution. This distinction is very relevant in the Caribbean, as most local governments in the region operate as agents of central government, in that they have limited scope for locally influenced decision-making, and are very strongly controlled from the centre in respect of financing, staffing and exercise of their legal powers. Like decentralization local governance is being popularized in a number of African countries because it is believed that it enables people in grass root and communities to participate in the alleviation of poverty (Kauzya, n.d).

Local governments are strategic partners in the decentralization process: on one hand, receiving the transfer of tasks and responsibilities from central government, on the other hand, creating encouraging environment for development and resource mobilization for the implementation of new infrastructure services on a scale that is mostly far beyond their capacity. Intensifying the institutional, financial and professional capacity for the implementation of the relevant policies becomes requirement that must not be obviated in any way (Wellington and Innocent, 2009).

The service provision function has been recognized as the raison d'être for the existence of local governments. On the other hand, the degree to which any local government is able to deliver services is highly political, depending on the administrative mechanisms in place. The primary great advantage of local government relies in the power of the accessibility and stanza of the local knowledge it possesses; local area and population is small enough for the officials as well as the councilors to know it thoroughly. In the smallest authorities ratepayers and councilors or officials interrelate well even at personal levels giving an intimate environment of local administration (ibid, 2009). Decentralization has become the foundation for development reforms in many countries. The focus on decentralization is the consequence of the debate in today's literature that suggests that ineffective public service delivery in many developing countries is largely because of governance failures emanating from lack of strong accountability to citizens. The normative rationale for decentralization comes from many areas of economics and political science literature wherein it is argued that physical closeness between principals and agents, better information available to the citizens and standard competition among local governments resulting from the decentralization of governance leads to better accountability and allocative efficiency (World Bank, 2009).

Moreover, decentralization reforms open the means for many level planning systems and new, non-hierarchical forms of inter-governmental harmonization as well as accountability of local governments both to the national government and local constituents. With new authority and resources to plan and provide services comes the opportunity for local authorities to adopt participatory systems to local level strategic planning, budgeting and capital works programmes. Decentralization can, therefore, lead to improved local governance with emphasis on partnerships between the local community and the private sector (Romeo, 2000) in Greville (2004). Decentralization reforms have attracted significant attention as a way to promote good governance and accountability at the local level (World Bank, 2009).

Local governments required to be held accountable to guarantee that misconduct and
corruption are minimized in administrative functions, for example during procurement process and staff payments, and local government officials perform the job ascribed to them. The contracting and implementation of public works and services suffer from a high risk of corruption and mismanagement (World Bank, 2009).

In relation to this Osmani (2000) argued that one of the primary roles of local government is to secure the smooth and efficient implementation of the public services, which are generally managed by its technical-administrative machinery. As a matter of fact, this was one of the basic arguments of the first generation of decentralization proponents, who also upheld that it would be easier to adapt local-level services to local requirements and needs. Implicitly, however, this raises the question as to how such local needs and preferences are to be recognized. The current decentralization principle mainly holds that ‘the only viable way is to have a comprehensive process of local governance through which each section of the population can express and fight over their needs’.

Local governance can be influenced by decentralization processes - for example, if local governments are expected to provide services formerly provided through national organizations - it may or may not be accompanied by decentralization, representative or participatory democratic processes, transparency, accountability or other defining features of ‘good’ local governance. The very concept of ‘good governance’ at local levels shows quality, effectiveness and efficiency of local administration and public service delivery; the quality of local public policy and decision-making procedures, their inclusiveness, their transparency, and their accountability; and the manner in which power and authority are exercised at the local level. While local government is the necessary institutional element for local governance, the wider governance sphere includes a set of state and non-state institutions, mechanisms and processes, through which public goods and services are delivered to citizens and through which citizens can express their interests and needs, mediate their differences and exercise their rights and responsibilities (Wilde et al, nd).

Governance is about the processes by which public policy decisions are made and practiced. It is the result of interrelationships and networks between the different sectors (government, public sector, private sector and civil society) and involves decisions, negotiation, and different power relations between stakeholders to determine who gets what, when and how. The relations between government and different sectors of society decide how things are done, and how services are delivered. Governance is therefore much more than government or ‘good government’ and shapes the way a service or set of services are planned, managed and regulated within a set of political social and economic systems (Wilde et al, nd).

With the regard to the interplay between decentralization ,local governance and good governance MOFED (2009) puts  that decentralization program gives an opportunity to enhance transparency and accountability at local level. The good governance package has solidifies the decentralization program’s role to improve local governance. It has contributed to improvement in the understanding and knowledge of good governance at all levels, and local structures and mechanisms are being developed to interpret the principles and values into implementations, making a positive difference to citizens. The Government introduced the package after a thorough discussion with members of the public. The package attempts to promote good governance including participation, consensus building, gender equality, responsiveness, transparency, accountability, equity and fairness, the rule of law and efficiency and effectiveness. A number
of measures were taken to enhance local governance including awareness raising campaign, issuing orders and codes of conduct, changing the number and composition of councilors, deployment of Kebele managers, complaints handling officers, and participation of membership-based grass root organizations.

Democratic local governance is independent levels of local government, lies with authority and resources that operate in a democratic way, that is, they are accountable and transparent, and include citizens and the institutions of civil society in the decision-making process (Heywood, 2003 ibid). Local governance looks beyond local government administration and service delivery to institutions and structures that enable people to decide things for themselves. It gives a due focus on the presence of devices for fair political competition, transparency, and accountability, government processes that are open to the public, responsible to the public, and governed by the rule of law (Barnett et al, 1997).

Local governance and decentralization can importantly enhance the common good of people at the local level, promote human development, and contribute for the solidarity of democracy. To enable the government to engage with, represent and be responsive to its citizens, societies and institutions must be adequately empowered at all levels of society. The pillar components of good local governance include citizen participation, partnerships among key actors at the local level, capacity of local actors throughout all sectors, multiple flows of information, institutions of accountability, and a pro poor orientation (Peace building Commission,2007).

Decentralization, by putting government closer to the people, enhances greater responsiveness of Policy-makers to the will of the citizenry and, it is argued that , results in a closer similarity between public needs and public policy. This is not only because decision-makers in decentralized units are likely to be more knowledgeable about and adjusted to the needs of their area than are centralized national-government decision-makers, but also because decentralization permits these decision-makers to be held directly accountable to the local community vis a vis local elections(Faguet,1997).

Local government has a chance to play a pivotal role in facilitating the roles of both interest-based and hope-based networks in improving social outcomes for local dwellers. To play such a role, local government should develop a strategic vision of how such partnerships can be shaped and continued. But then the local government needs a new local public management paradigm. Such a paradigm demands local government to separate policy advice from program implementation, assuming a role as a buyer of public services but not necessarily as a deliverer of them (Anwar shah,nd).

2.12 Municipal Governance

Now a day it becomes clear that the role of the district Municipality in the national imperative has given a due focus radically over the past few years. Parliament and provincial governments’ expectations of the district Municipality and of local municipalities have changed radically .The services that are provided has come to be seen as the engine that not only carries the ambitions of the people of a nation in delivering basic services but is also responsible for the consolidation of communities and the creation and expansion of job opportunities. As a result of this understanding and conceptualization government is clearly seen as an “enabler” of service delivery to its citizens. In this regard, Municipalities are regarded as pivotal engines for local economic development to bring about local development in the given locality and provide service. To deal with this Municipalities increasingly need to establish partnerships with
other key stakeholders in the provision of services through ensuring interaction and communication, and build alliances around local development for betterment of the general public and effective service delivery (Pretorius and Schurink, 2007).

In accordance to this as part and parcel of local government and decentralized governance Municipal governance becomes an agenda as far as local government concerned. Municipal governance is much broader than what municipal governments do as a result. Cities are increasingly becoming multi-governmental and the effective management of cities needs multi-pronged partnerships and the involvement of many key stakeholders. The key stakeholders in the urban context include: municipal appointed officials and non-officials, Council and Committees, employees and their trade unions, para-statals, Government departments, ratepayers’ associations, resident welfare groups, Chamber of Commerce, business associations, NGOs, CBOs, neighborhood committees, self-help groups, professional organizations, the media and the like. So, municipal governance can be effective and efficient if different stakeholders play their part and as a result the desired goals of providing basic infrastructure and effective and efficient services to the dwellers in open (transparent) and accountable manner (Pretorius and Schurink, 2007).

Accordingly, city administrators in municipal government generally address the issues of good governance in cities and towns in terms of building good institutions and enhancement of capacities of municipal non-officials and officials. Accountability in service provision is pivotal for effectiveness and efficiency. Accordingly, Municipal accountability manifested in two-ways - upward accountability to the state government and downward accountability to the people. The state governments usually control the activities of municipalities through the following channels in the following manner power to dissolve Municipal Councils; approval of staff strength, deputation and transfer of top level management staff; approval of budgets, taxes, fees, charges, rates, etc.; approval of municipal land use/development plans; provision of inter-governmental transfers, including funds for infrastructure development; restrictions on municipal borrowing and guaranteeing the same when permitted; audit; and reserved power to take over administration of particular services (Mohanty, nd).

Effectiveness of municipal governance institutions is a precondition in order for any country to reap the benefits of decentralized good governance (Olowu and Wunsch, 2004:9 cited Sansom et al, 2009) remark that: weak authority and defective institutional and operational rules can make the decisions made weak which leads to, failure in devising policy and weakened local governance. By the same token (Olowu and Wunsch, 2004:9) pointed out the transformation of local government governance systems introduced new systems of executive leadership in municipalities. These new method have radically changed the profile of a municipality and the preferred correlation between its political and administrative elements.

Beside to this, several groups are now using Community Score Cards to evaluate the performance of local public services. Community Score Cards are a fusion of citizen report cards, community monitoring and social audits. Beside, assessing levels of service satisfaction by users, the Community Scorecard process involves community meetings in which performance of public services is discussed among providers, users and other stakeholders and includes self-evaluation of their own performance by providers as well as formulating an action plan based on scorecard outputs.

Similarly Joshi (2010) argue that key feature distinguishing Community Scorecards is the
collective engagement of both providers and users, in designing, implementing and use of the Cards. Pretorius and Schurink (2007) found that the key to improving service delivery is the transformation of the institution and re-organization of powers between the District Municipality and the local municipalities. This provides an opportunity for the District Municipality to deliver quality and equitable services to the communities that it serves through designed coordination of local municipality programmes. To operationalize these principles and therefore implement the political mandate requires a financially stable municipality and a viable economic environment. The core programme that could deal with these challenges is the Integrated Development Plan.

Coming our country with regard to municipal (local) governance, Ethiopia had a tradition of centralist government structures until 1991. Municipal structures were established in some cities, but the mayors were centrally appointed and municipalities were basically treated as branches of central government. When the current government came to power in 1991 it proclaimed a decentralised form of government and developed a constitution that established a Federal Democratic Republic, consisting of Nine Regional States, the federal capital Addis Ababa, and the special administrative region of Dire Dawa. The government structure has four tiers – federal, regional, woreda (or city administration/government) and kebele (neighbourhood). The nine regional states have their own constitutions. Ethiopia introduces an fundamental change with regard to the traditions of governance. And this enable regional states to decide matters that concern them and it enhances the situation of (Ministry of works and urban development, 2005/06-2009/10).

In accordance with this, in the past, most urban areas were governed by a parallel system of municipal government in which institutional structures, rights and responsibilities were assigned in legislation dating from 1945. Under the highly centralised Derg regime (GC 1975 to 1991), Ethiopia’s municipalities were marginalised and did not function as independent local governors. However, since 2000 national decentralisation policies have formed part of a large scale reform of government resulting in the creation of institutional and legal frameworks for urban local government authorities. The objective has been to create and strengthen urban local government that will ensure public participation, democratization; and enhance decentralized service delivery through institutional reforms, capacity building, systems development and training (ibid, 2005/06-2009/10).

The present Government has issued three proclamations directly related to municipalities and urban areas. Proclamations No. 41 of 1991 and No. 4 of 1995 gave the Ministry of Works and Urban Development big powers and responsibilities for urban development and assigned key responsibilities for municipalities to regional governments. Proclamation No. 87 of 1997 chartered Addis Ababa as a city government and defined in detail its organization and functions. Much of the recent legislation and preparatory action pertaining to municipalities has been at the regional level. Oromia and Amhara are two regions that have legally established their municipalities. Specifically, Oromia has issued regional proclamation no. 26/1999 providing for the establishment of urban administrations. Amhara has issued regional proclamation no. 43/2000 to provide for the establishment, reorganization and definition of powers and duties of the municipalities in its jurisdiction (Gulyani et al, 2001).

The Federal Ministry of Works and Urban Development (MWUD) previously had significant responsibilities for municipalities, but new regulations assign them only a few key
related tasks. MWUD is expected to carry out studies related to broad urbanization patterns, to provide an environment favorable to urban development (including the development of proper training), and to define standards for the categorization of urban centers. The National Urban Planning Institute, which is under MWUD, has been heavily concerned with preparing urban physical development plans, and they are likely to continue to play some responsibility in this area because of poor local and regional capacity (Gulyani et al, 2001).

In most regions, the Bureau of Works and Urban Development is responsible for urban management and development issues within the boundary of Regional government. All nine Regional States have adopted “City” Proclamations creating urban local government (or city) authorities with an urban governance model that follows the elected council, elected mayor, Mayor’s Committee and city manager system. Accordingly, Tigray Regional State: Tigray’s first regional City Proclamation was no. 65/2003 (EC 1995).

Urban reform in Tigray Regional State is guided by the Tigray revised City Proclamation 107/2006 (EC 1998) (Ministry of works and urban development, 2005/06-2009/10)

2.14 Powers and Functions of Local Government in Ethiopia

Article 50(4) of the 1995 Constitution permits each regional state to decide on its own local government structure so that the local governance system of each region could be ingrained in its socio-economic conditions. Yet the right of regional states to decide on their local government structure is restricted by an attendant obligation to create an autonomous local government as contrasted to their own administrative arms. At present, regional states have established rural and urban local government: woredas (districts) in rural areas and city administrations in urban areas. There is a representative council in each woreda and city administration whose members are directly elected by the local people. There is also an executive council which is lead by a chief administrator (for woreda) or a mayor (for city administrations). Furthermore, different sectoral offices have been established to deal with the bureaucratic works of woredas and city administrations. The regional constitutions and the city proclamations authorize the woredas and city administrations to decide on issues relating to their own social services and economic development, adopt their own budgets and hire and fire their administrative personnel. Nevertheless, there are a number of drawbacks in the regional constitutional and legal structure that render woredas and city administrations subordinate structures of the regional states. Three points are considered here (Zemelak, 2011).

The first is the lack of a clear division of powers between regional government and local government; specifically, between a regional government and a woreda. The second problem relates to the fact that city administrations are the design of ordinary regional statutes, not of regional constitutions. This has permitted regional states to easily modify the statutes dealing with city administration, often to the loss of the cities’ autonomy. The third shortcoming is that the regional constitutions and statutes dealing with local government uphold the old hierarchical structure in which woredas and city administrations are treated as subordinate structures of the regional states rather than autonomous governments (ibid, 2011). In relation to this, Local level decentralization, began at the drafting stage of the 1995 Constitution Presently Ethiopia has a three tiered local government; zonal, woreda and kebele administration; the kebele administration being the lowest level local administrative institution (Zemelak, 2009).

The Zonal administration acts with deconcentrated power, as agents of the regional government. Its main function is to synchronize the works of different woredas
under it and coordinate the regions and the woredas. The zonal administration that are established for regional minority ethnic groups in Amhara, Gambella and SNNPR though recognized as the highest political organ of the ethnic group concerned, have no clear competences, save determining the working language of the zone (Negalegn, 2001).

The regional constitutions regularly provide that the woreda and kebele administrations have the power to plan and implement their own plans regarding the woreda’s or the kebele’s economic development and social services and administrative issues. However the economic development and social service matters which are under the jurisdiction of the woreda and the kebele are not explicitly provided for in the constitutions. The difference between the competences of the regional administration, the woredas and the kebeles is unclear. In practice the woreda works in the area of primary education, primary health care, rural water supply and rural roads (Negalegn, 2001) and (Zemelak, 2009).

2.15 Attributes (key indicators) of Good Governance

Good governance is not merely for a type of government and its connected political values but also for certain kinds of additional elements. It implies government that is democratically organized within a democratic political culture and with efficient administrative organizations, plus the right policies, particularly in the economic sphere (Smith, 2007). At the constitutional level good governance needs changes that will reinforce the accountability of political leaders to the people, guarantee the respect for human rights, strengthen the rule of law and decentralize political authority. At another level which is administratively, good governance needs accountable and transparent public administration; and effective public management, including a capacity to devise good policies as well as to implement them (Smith, 2007). Without good governance the grass root development cannot be imagined. Corruptions, financial trouble, human rights violations, lack of accountability all the elements of good governance need at local level public institution (Uddin, 2010).

Good governance" is a normative conception of the values according to which the act of governance is realized, and the method by which groups of social actors interact in a certain social context. Even if good governance is subjected to different conceptualization there are common principles for good governance. The most often enlisted principles include: participation, rule of law, transparency of decision making or openness, accountability, predictability or coherence, and effectiveness. The international donor community generally shares the view that these principles stand at the foundation of sustainable development (Report of the commission on global governance, 1995)

According to UNESCFAFP (nd) Good governance has 8 major characteristics. It is participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive and follows the rule of law. It assures that corruption is decreased the views of minorities are taken into account and that the voices of the most vulnerable in society are heard in decision making. It is also responsive to the present and future needs of society. They will be presented as follows:-

2.16.1 Participation

Within the issue of participation as one part and parcel of good governance Mezgebe (2007) argue that Participation by both men and women is a key cornerstone of good governance. Participation could be either direct or through legitimate intermediate institutions or representatives. Participation refers to the involvement of citizens in the development and governing process. Citizens could participate either directly or through legitimate institutions or representatives to effect decisions regarding their country’s affairs. Participation by all
citizens is pivotal to the existence of good
governance. All men and women should have
asay in decision-making, either directly or
through lawful intermediate institutions that
stand for their wellbeing. Such wide
participation is built on freedom of association
and speech, as well as capabilities to
participate constructively (UNDP, nd).
Participatory governance offers citizens
with access not only to information, but also to
decision-making and power to influence public
choices. It means access not only for a
fortunate few, but for all, including those who
are still too often excluded from the benefits of
development, particularly the poor, the
marginalized, and vulnerable groups. At the
national level, it means increasing the very
concept of governance, know that protection of
the public interest is a responsibility not only of
the government and the political process, but
also of civil society and the private sector
(UN, 2005).

The constitution of the Federal Democratic
Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE) provides the legal basis for assuring Citizens’
Voice and participation in socio-economic and
political processes. Legal and institutional
plannings aimed at ensuring interface between
the governments and Ethiopians are stipulated
in the Constitution. Article 43(sub-article 2)
clarify that citizens have the right to participate
in countrywide development and in particular, to
be consulted with respect to policies and
projects affecting their society (FDRE
Constitution, 1995).

Parallel with the above he also argued that
Participation by all citizens is pivotal to the
existence of good governance. For instance,
among the 529 total seats of the House of
Peoples’ Representatives, 116 (22%) are
occupied by women representatives.

Considering the roughly one to one male to
female ratio in Ethiopia, a 22 percent female
participation in the legislation process is a good
start and it must be encouraged. In contrast, as
of 2007, the 110th United States Congress is
comprised of 84 percent male, and 16 percent
female (ibid, 2007).

According to Kaufmann et al (2007)
participation needs that all people have a say
indecision-making, either directly or through
legitimate institutions that represent their
interests. They have also added that
participation involves consultation, cooperation
and collaboration, representativeness and
interactive approaches to decision making, and
is built on freedom of
association and speech. By the same token
Blair (2000) argues that participation creates
representation, which is a key indicator of
empowerment, and therefore the extents to
which people have asay on issues that concern
their future.

2.16.2 Rule of law

Good governance requires fair legal
frameworks that are enforced impartially. It also
requires full protection of human rights,
particularly those of minorities. Impartial
enforcement of laws requires an independent
judiciary and an impartial and incorruptible
police force (UNESCFAP, nd).

Good governance needs fair legal frameworks
that are enforced impartially. It also needs full
protection of human rights, particularly those of
minorities and marginalized sections of
societies. Impartial enforcement of laws
requires an independent judiciary and an
impartial and incorruptible police force
(Negalegen, 2010).

The notion of rule of law shows that everything
is done consistently with the law, and that there
exists a judicial system capable of assuring the
impartiality of the law as well as the protection
of the rights and freedoms of individuals and
groups. The author defined the term rule of
law as the capacity of legal rules, standards or
principles to direct people in the conduct of their
affairs, stability, the supremacy of legal
authority for both citizens and government
actors; and the availability of impartial institutions of enforcement (Singh, 2007).

2.16.3 Transparency

Article 8 of the Constitution asserts that sovereignty resides in nations, nationalities and peoples of Ethiopia who exercise this power through their elected representatives. Citizens are also legally authorized to recall their elected representatives if the latter’s behaviors’ and actions are contrary to their responsibilities and mandates (FDRE, 1995).

To UNESCFAP (nd) transparency means that decisions taken and their enforcement are done in a manner that follows rules and regulations. It also means that information is freely available and directly accessible to those who will be affected by such decisions and their enforcement. It also means that enough information is provided and that it is provided in easily understandable forms and media.

According to Azfar (1999) access to information on the actions and performance of government is critical for the promotion of government accountability. Unless the public knows what goods and services are provided by the government, how well they are provided, who the beneficiaries are, and how much they cost, it cannot demand effective government. Also, the central government needs to be able to monitor the performance of lower level governments, and there are good reasons for the latter to be fully informed about the actions of the central government. Access to information, by allowing the public to monitor government’s subsequent actions, also enhances the impact of participation by creating a pressure on the government to take into account citizen preferences in decision-making.

Transparency stipulates that decisions made by governmental and non-governmental authorities are openly communicated, and their enforcement is conducted in accordance with established rules and regulations. It also requires that information is freely available and easily accessible to those who will be affected by such decisions and their enforcement. In short, transparency refers to the availability of information to the general public and clarity about government rules, regulations, and decisions. The result: inhibition of corruption among public officials and reduction of distrust among their constituents (UNESCFAP, nd). Similarly Mezgebe(2007) argued that transparency is a prerequisite for an effective enforcement of accountability. Attempting to implement accountability in the absence of transparency is the same as to shooting in the dark.

By the same token Uddin (2010) argue transparency implies to the availability of information to the general public and clarity about government rules, regulations and decisions. Thus, it both harmonizes and reinforces predictability. The difficulty with ensuring transparency is that only the initiator of information may know about it, and may bound access to it.

By the same token Mezgebe (2007) also argued that transparency refers to the accessibility of information to the general public and clarity about government rules, regulations, and decisions. The result: inhibition of corruption among public officials and reduction of distrust among their constituents. Adhering to the principles of transparency is no simple task, especially in developing countries such as Ethiopia. Moreover, in this era of national and international unrest, some information could be classified as sensitive, and may not be distributed to the public. However, the Ethiopian government seems to have recognized the importance of transparency for economic development, and has been doing its best to achieve that goal. The Constitution a covenant of governance is the guiding document for decision-making (ibid,2007).

In regard to transparency the experience in Ethiopia reveal problems of constraints on information access for service delivery, depicted as institutional and technical
challenges. The rules of the public's appointment of authorities are still weak and rudimentary. The governance deficit has implications for the quality and reliability of information. Specifically, because information about government policies, behavior, and performance is typically generated in political environments that are polarized and contested, assures that information is not for narrow legitimation and propagandist ends is a central mystery in fostering good governance. While there are many similarities in the patterns of governance, the Ethiopian and Kenyan examples disclose sharp and distinctive modes of transitions to participatory, transparent, and responsive political systems. These transitions are central to the debates on decentralization, privatization, and public-private sector partnership (Kpundeh and Khadiagala, 2008).

Transparency and accountability are interrelated and mutually reinforcing concepts. Without transparency, that is, free access to timely and dependable information on decisions and performance, it would be complicated to identify public sector entities to account. Unless there is accountability, that is, mechanisms to report on the usage of public resources and consequences for failing to meet stated performance objectives, transparency would be of small value. The prevalence of both conditions is a precondition to effective, efficient and equitable management in public institution (UNESC, 2006).

To UN (2005) transparent governance implies openness of the governance system through clear processes and procedures enabling good access by citizens to public information. High levels of transparency stimulate awareness of responsibilities and standards in public service through information sharing, which ultimately ensures the accountability of individuals and organizations that handle resources and/or hold public office for their performance. Transparency, or “open government” which provides citizens full information on what is being decided and how, is a kind of public accountability mechanism which only functions in systems which already have the basics of democratic accountability in place (Crook, ND).

2.16.4 Responsiveness

With regard to responsiveness of government Mezgebe (2007) further argued that Good governance needs that institutions and processes try to serve all stakeholders within a reasonable timeframe. Responsiveness implies the receptiveness of institutions to the demands of their stakeholders. Institutions should be approachable to their clients and serve them within a reasonable time frame.

By the same token to Yacob et al (2010) Responsiveness' implies to how the state and other public institutions perform in responding to the requirements and rights of citizens. For instance, how does the state act in service provision? Are people treated equally? Or are certain needs prioritized over others? And responsiveness aims for governments to do the right things for the people and the services to be delivered must be consistent with the citizens desires and needs (Shah, nd).

Good governance is credited for responsiveness to the preferences of the large population mainly the poor and vulnerable sections who normally benefit from pro-poor policies and programmes. Equity and social justice are also pivotal principles under a democratic/well governed government (Sebudubudu, 2010). Responsiveness can be measured in terms of public officials ability to listen the demands and voice of citizens, easy access of complaints for service users and whom to contact with the suggestion to change, the ability of councils decision to reflect the demands of public etc (Negalegn, 2010).

It seems that the responsiveness of the local government is supposed by citizens to be particularly significant. The supposed responsiveness to complaints, for example, was largely interrelated with satisfaction levels.
It also seems that those who are most likely to visit the local government are people of higher income, men, and older adults. Encourage the establishment of systems to collect and respond to complaints. These can be as simple as a sign on a door or the placement of a box that is clearly labeled “Complaints or Suggestions.” Complaints should be logged and responded to in a timely manner. To be sure these are actions that have been undertaken as part of the civil service reform programme across the nation. As a result of the implementation of the package in urban and rural woredas and kebeles, Information, Customer and Complaint Handling Desks were created and staffed. The information desk is meant to deliver timely information to the society while Complaint Handling Desk is to actively listen and solve public Complaints. Therefore, woreda and kebele administration need to strengthen their system and communicate to the citizens about the available opportunities. Steps might also be taken to encourage marginalized groups (youth, poor people, and women) to visit (MOFED, 2009).

2.16.5 Consensus oriented

There are several performers and as many perspectives in a given community. Good governance needs mediation of the diverse interests in society to reach a broad consensus in society on what is in the best interest of the whole community and how this can be achieved. It also requires a broad and long-term perspective on what is needed for sustainable human development and how to achieve the goals of such development. This can only result from an understanding of the historical, cultural and social contexts of a given society or community (UNESCFAP, 2003).

By the same token a study conducted by C. Misuraca (2007) shows that Good governance needs mediation of the different preferences in a given community to come up with a broad consensus on what is in the best interest of the whole community and how this can be attained. It needs a broad and long-term standpoint on what is needed for sustainable human development and how to attain the goals of such development. This can only results from an understanding of the historical, cultural and social situations of a given society or community. To UNDP (nd) Good governance mediates conflicting interests to reach a broad consensus on what is in the best interest of the group, and where possible, on policies and procedures.

By the same token Robertson (nd) argued through broad-based-consensus-building processes, communities need to build up their own visions of good governance and intended to define which of the main features are most vital to them and what the best balance between the state, the market and society is for them. The bottlenecks for all communities is to create a system of governance that promotes, supports and sustains human development to realize the highest potential of everyone and the well being of all, thus eliminating poverty and all other forms of exclusion.

2.16.6. Equity and inclusiveness

A society’s well being rely on ensuring that all its members feel that they have a stake in it and do not feel excluded from the majority of society. This requires all groups, but particularly the most marginalized, have opportunities to improve or maintain their well being (UNESCFAP, nd). All men and women have
chance to get better or maintain their well-being (UNDP, nd).

2.16.7. Effectiveness and Efficiency

Good governance means that processes and institutions produce results that meet the needs of society while making the best use of resources at their disposal. The concept of efficiency in the context of good governance also covers the sustainable use of natural resources and the protection of the environment (UNESCFAP, 2003)

2.16.8. Accountability

Accountability refers to the imperative to make public officials responsible for government performance as well as responsive to the body from which they get their authority (Waheduzzaman, nd). Accountability is a key requirement of good governance. Not solely governmental institutions but also the private sector and civil society organizations must be answerable to the public and to their institutional stakeholders (UNESCFAP, 2003).

Accountability holds public officials responsible for government performance and make it essential for them to be responsive to the needs of the community. At the local level, it refers to the suppleness of structures that would allow recipients to enhance program/project design and implementation. It also entails the establishment of criteria to measure the performance of local officials and the creation of supervision mechanisms to assure that standards are meet (Manasani et al., 1999).

Less clear but equally destructive, governments that are not accountable to their communities and with incompetent bureaucracies and weak institutions are unwilling or unable to devise and implement pro-growth and pro-poor policies (Duvanova, 2008).

Who is accountable to whom varies depending on whether decisions or actions taken are internal or external to an organization or institution. In general an organization or an institution is accountable to those who will be affected by its decisions or actions. Accountability cannot be enforced without transparency and the rule of law. Accountability is responsible for the very existence of good governance. Governmental institutions as well as the private sector and civil society organizations must be accountable to their institutional stake-holders in particular and to the public in general. Overall, an organization or an institution is accountable to those who will be directly affected by its decisions (Mezgebe, 2007).

Similarly a study conducted by Tembo (2010) shows that State’s accountability to its citizens is a key aspect of improving governance. And accordingly, governments that can be held accountable for their actions are more likely to respond to the needs and demands of their citizens. Improving the way that citizens are empowered and able to demand accountability from their governments is a all-around and context-dependent process. There is no single way by which all citizens can make their voices heard to their governments and hold them to account. Nor is there any single method by which governments take voices of citizens into the policy-making and implementation processes.

Accountability is one of the precondition of good governance. It shows holding elected or appointed officials charged with a public mandate responsible and answerable for their actions, activities and decisions. It is the role of civil society to hold those in public office accountable. Accountability seeks to know who is responsible for what and what kind of behavior is illegal (UNESC, 2006).

Similarly evidence gained by Ekpo (2008) shows that the delivery of services needs strong relationships of accountability between the actors in the service delivery plan. The provision of public services involves at least two relationships of accountability. Clients as
citizens have to hold policy makers or politicians accountable for allocating resources towards these services and policy makers in return need to hold the service providers accountable for delivering the service.

In Ethiopian decentralization, it can be differentiated accountability between layers of government and between the government and the people. At the different tiers in Ethiopia, dual accountability exists. “Upward accountability” to higher tiers of government and “downward accountability” to people. Concerning the latter, the formal declaration of accountability is prevailed in the Constitution, which decides that sovereignty prevails in the nations, nationalities, and people of Ethiopia which is expressed through their elected representatives (Article 8). Similarly, the Constitution stipulates in Article 12 that the conduct of affairs of government shall be transparent, any public official is accountable for any malfunction in official duties, and in case of loss of confidence the people may recall an elected representative (FDRE, 1995). The Constitution therefore offers for the fundamental lawful foundation for political accountability (Dickovick and Tegegne, 2010).

2.16.9. Strategic vision: Leaders and the public have a broad and long-term perspective on good governance and human development, along with a sense of what is needed for such development. There is also an understanding of the historical, cultural and social difficulties in which that perspective is grounded (UNDP, nd). There are complexities’ between mentioned elements of good governance. In many ways some factors can be seen as preconditions of others, but also as important effects in the other direction. For examples, accountability is often connected to participation, and also to the expectedness and transparency. At the same time, predictability requires transparency, because it may difficult to ensure truthfulness without information about how equally situated individuals/communities have been treated (Damayanti, 2004).

Attributes of Good Governance
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Fig3. Source: United Nation’s Economic and Social Commission For Asia and the Pacific (2003)

Governance is the system of values, policies and institutions by which a society manages its economic, political and social issues through contacts within and among the state, civil society and private sector. The main features of good governance include participation, rule of law, transparency, responsiveness, consensus orientation, equity, effectiveness and efficiency,
accountability and strategic vision. Inter-related, these core characteristics are mutually reinforcing and cannot stand alone. For example, accessible information means more transparency, broader participation and more effective decision-making. Wide range participation contributes both to the exchange of information needed for effective decision-making and for the legitimacy of those decisions (Robertson, nd).

CHAPTER THREE
Methodology of the study
3.1 Site Selection and Description of the Study Area
Mekelle is one of the cities of Ethiopia found in the Northern part, in the Tigray National Regional State. Historically, Emperor Yohannis IV founded Mekelle as a capital of Ethiopian Emperor about 110 years ago (G/ Tsadkan, 2002).

According to Bryant (2009) Mekelle is the sixth largest city in Ethiopia. Since the country’s independence, Mekelle has been among the fastest growing regions of Ethiopia. The population has increased from 20,000 in the early 1970s to 215,546 by 2007 census. The city lies in the Ethiopian highlands 780 km north of Addis Ababa. The city has a temperate climate and low malaria prevalence due to its elevation (over 2,200 meters). Astronomically, Mekelle is located at 130 32’ N latitude and 390 33’ E longitudes (G/ Tsadkan, 2002). The city consisted of seven local administrative areas namely Hawelti, Aider, Adi-haki, Semien, Hadnet, Kedamey weyane and Quiha (Genessa et al, 2009).

The rationale behind the selection of the study area is that the city is the capital city of Tigray region because relatively there are more service users comparing to the other cities of the regional state. With regard to the sample selection, two sub cities selected. In selection of the two subcities things that are taken in to account are service users and access to land. Because, with regard to land administration and urban planning and development offices in the selected sub cities there is access to land for expansion (urbanization) and as a result of this there are more service users comparing to the other sub cities. As per the pilot study conducted by the researcher in the city manucipality both document analysis and opinion of the service providers plays apivotal role in selection of the two sub cities.

Map1. Mekelle Administrative Map

Fig 4. Source: Moumié Maoulidi (MCI) and Tesfu Weldegerima (BOFED) cited in Genessa et al (2009)
3.2 Instruments of Data collection and Data Sources

Both primary and secondary sources were used for the successful accomplishment of this study. Information was gathered through, personal observations, questionnaires’ and interview methods of data gathering were used as a primary data sources and primary data had been collected from administrators (service providers), service users from the office of land administration and urban planning and development of city Municipality. The service users were individuals who were users from the respective offices. And different reports, such government reports, U.N. agencies and other international organizations reports, research papers, articles etc had been used as secondary hand information for the accomplishment of the research because, secondary hand information enabled to have a clear understanding of theoretical and conceptual frame work for the literature which helps to investigate the problem in the given area as well as the social, economic, historical and physical back ground of the area in depth to investigate and understand the attitudes and behaviors of the city dwellers towards that of the situation of good governance and its practicality in the given city administration.

3.3 Research Strategy and Design

The research strategies that were used in this study were both qualitative and quantitative method. Qualitative method had been used to a larger degree, but to reduce the limitation of single method both qualitative and quantitative was given due attention. The investigator was applied qualitative research method because, qualitative research was helped the researcher to interpret and better understand (conceptualize) the reality of a situation and the implications of quantitative data.

The research strategy that was undertaken depends on the situation of the problem, and as the result of the problem to what situation it leads and what is the expected out come. Qualitative research method was used to answer questions about the nature of phenomenon, often with a purpose of describing and understanding the phenomenon from the participant’s points of view. Since the research was conducted on the perception of the respondents on the situation (practice) of good governance and its practice in the given decentralized city administration, qualitative research method was important because, it seeks a better understanding of situations. Quantitative research was used in this research paper because; there is a general consensus that quantitative and qualitative researches had not been viewed as polar opposites or dichotomies.

3.4 Sampling Design, Procedures and Frame

The researcher has employed non-probabilistic sampling techniques. Accordingly, the researcher has used purposive and convenience sampling to select authorized persons (service providers) and town dwellers (ordinary individuals). The main reason for using of convenience sampling was because of the sampling procedure of obtaining the people or units were most conveniently available. The offices of land administration and urban planning and development were selected. Because, these public institutions were selected by giving a due consideration to the availability of the large number of users and access to land in addition with regard to land administration and urban planning and development offices in the selected sub cities and the respective ketenas there is access to land for expansion (urbanization) and as a result of this there were more service users comparing to the other sub cities.

The researcher was used about 153 respondents for his study. In selecting of respondents from each sub cities with their respective ketenas, the sample size was used Yamane formula cited in Mora and Kloet (2010) and uses eight percent(8%) level of significance (precision) because, it is possible for social
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science to use level of significance from one percent (1%) up to ten percent (10%). In selecting of respondents from the selected sub cities the researcher was used proportionate sampling technique which is used also by practionearies like Gebersellassie (2011) in SaesieTsaedamba Woreda. The researcher was conducted a pilot study to select Hawelti and Ayder Sub cities and their respective ketenas (Tabias) in the offices of land administration and urban planning and development of the city Municipality.

\[
n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}
\]

\[N=7195\]
\[1+7195(0.08)^2\]
\[n = 153\]

Where, \(n\)=Sample size (number of respondents), \(N\)= population size (Total population), \(e\) = Level of significance (precision)

### 3.4.1 Sampling Frame

| No. | Name of the city | Total Number of households of the (Mekelle) | Name of the selected sub cities | Total No. of households of the sub cities | Total no. of the households of the sub cities who posses land |
|-----|------------------|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| 1.  | Mekelle          | 215,000                                   | 1.Hawelti                       | 59,674                                   | Freehold=2516, Leasehold=7534, Total=10,050               |
|     |                  |                                           |                                 |                                          |                                                          |
| 2.  |                  |                                           | 2.Ayder                         | 46,614                                   | Freehold=9800, Leasehold=661=10,461                       |
|     |                  |                                           |                                 |                                          |                                                          |

| Selected sub cities | Selected Tabias(ketenas) | Selected ketenas | Total no of the population of the selected tabias(ketenas) | No. of house holds | Total Selected sample respondents |
|---------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1.Hawelti           | 1.Tabia(ketena) selam    |                  | 6381                                                         | 1276              | 28                               |
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The data that was collected through interview, questionnaires’ and personal observation were analyzed qualitatively. Qualitative approach was employed to grasp the attitude of respondents regarding the level and degree of transparency and responsiveness of the service providers in good governance processes and practices. In presenting and analyzing the data the researcher attempted to organize the data by descriptive statics like tabulation. The qualitative data was analyzed by making use of descriptions and interpretations.

4.1.2 Results and Discussions

The analysis part includes seven components. The first part deals with back ground information of the respondents. The study was all inclusive in which respondents from sex, educational level and age level were entertained from the sample sub cities. The second part deals with the perception of respondents on transparency of the land administration office to the public. The third part
deals with the perception of respondents on the responsiveness of the land administration office to the public. The fourth part deals with perception of the respondents on transparency in the office of urban planning and development. The fifth part deals with the perception of respondents’ on responsiveness in the office of urban planning and development. The sixth part deals with the challenges of good governance in the achievement of good governance in the offices of land administration and urban planning and development. Part seven deals with the measures taken to consolidate good governance in the sphere of service provision in the selected public offices.

### 4.2. General Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The main intention of this study is to assess the practice of Good governance in decentralized city administration in the selected city administration particularly in the given subcities. First hand data was obtained via questioner and interview. The demographic characteristics of the respondents such as their ages, sex and educational level had been analyzed as followed in the table. The study was conducted in two sub cities that are Ayder and Hawelti.

#### Table1: Respondents profile classified by Age, Sex and Educational level

| Item               | description | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------|---------|
| 1.sex              | Male        | 107       | 69.9    |
|                    | Female      | 46        | 30.1    |
|                    | Total       | 153       | 100.0   |
| 2.Age              | 20-35       | 74        | 48.4    |
|                    | 36-51       | 47        | 30.7    |
|                    | 52-67       | 31        | 20.3    |
|                    | >67         | 1         | .7      |
|                    | Total       | 153       | 100.0   |
| 3.Educational Level| Illiterate  | 34        | 22.2    |
|                    | 1-4         | 7         | 4.6     |
|                    | 5-8         | 17        | 11.1    |
|                    | 9-12        | 29        | 19.0    |
|                    | Diploma     | 37        | 24.2    |
|                    | Degree and above | 29 | 19.0 |
|                    | Total       | 153       | 100.0   |

Source: Survey, 2013
The first section of the analysis part is concerning the demographic characteristics of the respondents. As shown in the above table, 107 (69.9%) of respondents were male where as the remaining 46 (30.1%) of the respondents are female. The overwhelming majority of respondents were male dominated. Most of the respondents lay in between the age of 20-35 who are an estimate of 74 (48.4%).

Accordingly regarding their educational level, 34 (22.2%) of the respondents were illiterate and the remaining 119 (77.9) were literate even if there is a variation in their educational level. The potential respondents of the paper were heads of households. So Table 1 reflects 107 (69%) of the respondents were male headed households and the remaining 46 (30.1%) were female.

### 4.3 Transparency in Land Administration

#### 4.3.1. Transparency

| Item                                                                 | Description                           | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. The office is open to its decisions                               | Never                                 | 76        | 49.7    |
|                                                                      | Rarely                                | 50        | 32.7    |
|                                                                      | I cannot decide                       | 15        | 9.8     |
|                                                                      | Sometimes                             | 7         | 4.6     |
|                                                                      | Always                                | 5         | 3.3     |
|                                                                      | Total                                 | 153       | 100.0   |

| Item                                                                 | Never                                 | 60        | 39.2    |
|                                                                      | rarely                                | 54        | 35.3    |
|                                                                      | I cannot decide                       | 8         | 5.2     |
|                                                                      | sometimes                             | 11        | 7.2     |
|                                                                      | always                                | 20        | 13.1    |
|                                                                      | Total                                 | 153       | 100.0   |

| Item                                                                 | Never                                 | 82        | 53.6    |
|                                                                      | Rarely                                | 33        | 21.6    |
|                                                                      | I cannot determine                    | 21        | 13.7    |

Transparency and responsiveness are the main principles of good governance. Transparency is pivotal for decision making to be open and clear for stake holders and it encourages stake holder's participation in decision making. Generally, transparency here is important to assess openness and clarity of information, processes, institutional rules and decisions to community members and the general public in land administration and the urban planning and development. Moreover, it is also important to tackle corruption because corruption emanates from lack of transparent authorities (service providers).

This part deals with the overall condition of the office of land administration. This includes issues such as the openness, information flow to the general public and the relevancy of the information flow to the service users.

Table 2: Perception of respondents on openness, information flow and relevancy of the information
Openness is one manifestation (measurement) of transparency. Openness is pivotal to all public institutions to be truthful in front of the service users and it is also help full for a given service providers to shoulder their responsibilities in a transparent manner to the clients and helps for the clients to have a confidence and trust on the service providers and openness plays a pivotal role in minimizing corruption because if service providers be open they are manifesting transparency. Respondents were requested how they perceive the openness of the institution to the public. As it is shown in table 2, with regard to the issue of openness of the office decision to the service users most of the respondents which are around 76 (49.7%) sample respondents were replied that the office of the land administration never becomes open to its decision. Around 50 (32.7%) sample respondents were reported that the office is open to its decisions on rare occasions and around 15 (9.8%) reported that they cannot decide whether the office is open to the clients or not to its decisions and an estimate of 7(4.6%) sample respondents reported that the office is open some times to the service users whereas around 5 (3.3%) replied that the office is always open on decisions to the service users. Hence, the largest percentage of the respondents’ response lies within never and rarely regarding the openness of the office to its decisions.

So from this one can understand that there is problem of openness on what kind of decisions to be made on land delivery with regard to the workings of service provision in the land administration in regard to what kind of services? to whom? how? and on what time to be delivered as well as . What the researcher understands from this was that, most of the respondents, believed that the office is largely lagging behind to be open and trust worthy for the respective service users. This situation negatively affects for effective and efficient service delivery and the endeavor made for upgrading good governance and particularly that of transparency in the given sub cities and the service users largely lose their confidence and trust on the respective service providers. Lack of openness in the given office may pave the way for corruption.

In contrary to this a study conducted by UNESCFAP (2003) shows that transparency stipulates that decisions made by governmental and non-governmental authorities are openly communicated, and their enforcement is conducted in accordance with established rules and regulations.

Similarly a Study conducted by Arko et al (2010) shows that the processes and methods of gaining quality services need to be open for the constituents’ and any decisions made need to be open for the service users.

Accessibility of information is one manifestation of transparency in a given public office and has a greater role in fostering transparency and generally that of good governance. Information flow in a freely (directly) accessible manner to those who will be affected by decisions is one manifestation of transparency and it plays a crucial role to improve the atmosphere of good governance in the given public office. The other question which was solicited to know the perception of the respondents on the condition of the office was, whether information flows
freely or directly accessible to those who will be affected by such decisions or enforcement. As shown in the above table 1 around 60 (39.2%) respondents confirmed that the information never flows freely about 54 (35.3%) reported that the free flow of information is on rare occasions. Around 8 (5.2%) replied that they cannot decide whether information flows freely or not. Around 11 (7.2%) reported that sometimes information flows freely while as about 5 (3.3%) replied that there is a free flow of information always. Hence, the largest percentage of the respondents’ response lies within never and rarely. So what the researcher understands from this was that, most of the respondents, believed that information did not flows directly to those who will be affected by such decisions. This situation has a serious implication on effective and efficient service provision and it negatively affected the office from being transparent and for upgrading good governance. As a result of this the given public office was lagged behind in improving good governance.

In contrary to this a study conducted by UNESCFAP (2003) shows that transparency requires that information is freely available and easily accessible to those who will be affected by such decisions and their enforcement. In a similar fashion Uddin (2010) argued transparency implies to the prevalence of information to the general public and clarity about government rules, regulations and decisions. Thus, it both harmonizes and reinforces predictability. The difficulty with ensuring transparency is that only the initiator of information may know about it, and may bound access to it.

Ensuring that all relevant information is accessible to the society is one manifestation of transparency and generally that of good governance. Ensuring that all relevant information is accessible to the society is pivotal for developing of an awareness of Stakeholders. Accessibility in this regard mean how the service providers can communicate with the clients which helps to express (suggest), to appeal, to make decision, for ward comment and for service providers to accept recommendations which is help full to improve the prevailing system of service delivery or to introduce new system of service delivery. As it is shown in the third question respondents were requested on whether the office is ensuring that all relevant information is accessible to the society.

As it can be seen about 82 (53.6%) respondents which were the overwhelming majority replied that the office never ensures the accessibility of all relevant information to the society. About 33 (21.6%) replied that the office ensures the accessibility of all relevant information to the society on rare occasions. While around 21 (13.7%) responded that they can’t determine whether the office ensures that all relevant information is accessible to the constituents or not and around 9 (5.9%) respond that the office ensures that all relevant information is accessible to the society some times while about 8 (5.2%) sample respondents replied that the office ensures the accessibility of relevant information to the service users Always. They said during land distribution there are occasions land is distributed without the knowledge of the clients. So, from this it can be said that, the societies have no well developed the understanding about the rules and regulations, proclamations and policy governing the land administration. This implies that there are citizens which did not know their obligations and rights which negatively affects the rights and responsibilities of the clients. This situation shows that it was hard to get informed citizens with regard to the workings of the office. This situation negatively affects for the effective and efficient service provision and endangered the strive for improving good governance particularly transparency because this manifestation of transparency got compromised in the given
public office. This implied that the office is lagging behind in ensuring transparency through checking whether all relevant information was accessible to the society and in improving good governance atmosphere in the given office.

Similar to this a study conducted by Kpundeh and Khadiagala (2008) found that the governance deficit has implications for the quality and reliability of information. Specifically, because information about government policies, behavior, and performance is typically generated in political environments that are polarized and contested, assures that information is not for narrow legitimation and propagandist ends is a central mystery in consolidating good governance. While there are many similarities in the patterns of governance, the Ethiopian and Kenyan examples disclose sharp and distinctive modes of transitions to participatory, transparent, and responsive political systems. These transitions are central to the debates on decentralization.

In contrary to this study conducted by V. K. Parigi, et al (2004) shows that information is crucial to good governance as it reflects and captures government activities and processes. Every citizen of the state has right to access information under the control of public authorities consistent with public interest. The main objective of governments providing information to its citizens is not only to promote openness, transparency and accountability in administration, but also to ensure participation of people in all matters related to governance.

Key informants of interview said that information was made accessible through meeting, through people who are responsible for mobilizing the community, through developmental group (agent) (Lemeatawi Gugele) and by preparing questioner to the community which helps the clients to express their perception freely.

**Table 3 Perceptions of Respondents on the Provision of Information and Means of Communication**

| Item | Description | Frequency | Percent |
|------|-------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. The office provides enough information for the public | never | 77 | 50.3 |
| | Rarely | 59 | 38.6 |
| | I can’t decide | 1 | 7 |
| | Sometimes | 5 | 3.3 |
| | Always | 11 | 7.2 |
| | Total | 153 | 100.0 |
| 2. The information is communicated in easily understandable forms | Never | 80 | 52.3 |
| | rarely | 31 | 20.3 |
| | I cannot decide | 21 | 13.7 |
Providing enough information for the public is one manifestation of transparency in which without it transparency cannot be ensured in the public office and generally that of good governance. Information provision to the constituents’ plays a pivotal role to create informed citizens. Provision of enough information helps the service users to know what is going on in the public institution. Providing enough information helps to deliver services in efficient and effective manner to the constituents’.

As it was shown in table 3 respondents were requested whether the office provides enough information for the service users. Accordingly around 77(50%) of the sample respondents replied that the office never provides enough information for the service users. About 59(38.6) respondents responded that the office provides enough information for the service users on rare occasions. On the other hand about 5(3.3%) replied that the office provides enough information some times while around 11(7.2%) sample respondents reported that always there is enough information provision in the office.

From this the researcher understands that the overwhelming majority of the sample respondents lies with hin never and rarely. Provision of enough information for the public is crucial because it is pivotal in creating informed citizen. Especially it is very crucial for the constituents’ because they directly affected by the decisions given from the above. From this survey the researcher understands that most of the service users with regard to the sample respondents were not provided with enough information. And the survey shows that they cannot decide upon themselves and participate in the decisions given by the authorities because they fail to be informed and awareness as a result of lack of enough information provision. And it also reveals that enough information was not provided to the general public in general and those who will be affected by decisions made on the land issue. In the study area people were not well informed and did not provided with enough information. So from this one can understand that people were not well informed and were not making informed decisions because they do not have enough information which is helpful to them so as to make informed decisions and even they do not have ability to question on decisions made. Since the people were not having enough information, they were not capable of participating in the issue and practice and the endeavor made for good governance in the land administration and its related workings.

Contrary to the result of the survey a study conducted by UN-HABITAT (2007) found that access to information has been sighted as a remedy to the increasing incidence of bribery and corruption associated with resource management. Added to this, the institution shows that transparency needs that processes, institutions and information are directly accessible to those concerned with them, and enough information is delivered to understand and check them.

In a similar way a study conducted by UNDP (2003) shows that information paves the way
for empowerment. Empowerment means that people can make informed decisions based on what information they gain, they will have knowledge and capacity to participate, and are able to question decisions which may affect them. UNDP added that as it is particularly relevant to the poor who often lack vital information, communication mechanisms and visibility to voice their concerns broad access to information is also critical for policy making. It also means that information is freely available and directly accessible to those who will be affected by such decisions and their enforcement (UNESCFAP, 2003).

Similar to the result a study undertaken by Azfar (1999) mentions that access to information on the actions and performance of government is critical for the promotion of government accountability. Unless the public knows what goods and services are provided by the government, how well they are provided, who the beneficiaries are, and how much they cost, it cannot demand effective government. Also, the central government needs to be able to monitor the performance of sub national governments, and there are good reasons for the latter to be fully informed about the actions of the central government. Access to information, by allowing the public to monitor government’s subsequent actions, also enhances the impact of participation by creating a pressure on the government to take into account citizen preferences in decision-making.

The second question requested to the respondents in Table 3 was whether information communicated in easily understandable forms. This is helpful in popularizing information to the general public through media in which large sections of the people will acquire information easily and in understandable manner and as a result of this it is helpful in creating informed citizens in the given society. In this regard about 80(52.3%) respondents replied that the office of land administration never communicates the information in easy manner to the general public. Around 31(20.3%) responded that the office is communicating information in easy manner on rare occasions and around 21(13.7%) replied that they cannot decide whether there is information communication in easy manner or not and about 12(7.8%) responded that sometimes there is information communication in easy manner while about 9(5.9%) replied the office is communicating information in easy manner always.

The survey shows that the overwhelming majority replied never as well as rarely. From this survey one can understand that the office is lagging behind in communicating information in easy and understandable manner to the service users which negatively affects in creating informed citizens in the realm of service provision.

In contrary to this a study conducted by UNESCFAP (2003) shows that enough information needed to be provided and in easily understandable forms.

Table 4: Perception of respondents on the consultation, capacity for information dissemination and obtaining the rules and regulations in decision making

| Item                                                                 | Description | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. You have ever consulted by the office before a program or policy related to land is implemented | never       | 67        | 43.8    |
|                                                                      | rarely      | 61        | 39.9    |
|                                                                      | I cannot   | 4         | 2.6     |
Consultation by the office before a program or policy related to land is implemented is crucial in that it helps for the public to know what will be done with regard to workings of the office in the realm of service delivery to the constituents. Data acquired with regard to consultation of the public reflects that around 67(43.8%) respondents replied that the office never consults the community before a program or policy related to land is implemented. About 61(39.9%) responded that they consulted by the office before a program or policy related to land is implemented on rare occasions and about 16 (10.5%) responded that sometimes the office consults the clients before a program or policy related to land is implemented while 5(3.3%) respondents’ replied that the office consults the clients always. The involvement of public is capacity for the dissemination of information to the public about the various land administration reform programs and proclamations.
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various section of the society is necessary to include their needs and preferences in to planning, different programs on land and project designing related to land as well as decision making process.

But the survey conducted contradicts with this. Larger size of the respondents replied that the office did not involve (consulted) the public in the program. The consultation of the public when land related programs enacted which are helpful in getting different ideas that will be used as an input to create sound programs that maximizes the benefit of the community and the improvement of governance and administration of land. If the communities get consulted in the policies and programs the society will forward policy options and will strive for the better implementations of the policies and programs and they feel sense of ownership. However, as it can be seen from the survey result the people were not consulted by the office. So based on the above result it can be said that, the office was not taking the options from the given community during program designing. The office fails to use the opportunity that will come from different corners that enables to design better programs as it has been said above. Beside to this, the policy options and desires of the society were not included and the community fails to contribute for its implementation of the program.

In contrary to this a study conducted by Robert S. Chase and Anushay Anjum (2008) shows that Consultation includes wider continuous process of participation of all stakeholders in the decisions throughout the formulation and execution of a project leading to sustainable development for the population in the area. In practice it is a tool for managing two-way communication between the planner and the public, in general, and the local community, in particular. Consultation should be understood as a means to attain certain goals and not as a goal in itself. Its basic aim is to enhance decision-making, and build understanding; by actively participating individuals and organizations with a stake in the project. This participation can increase a project’s long-term feasibility and enhance its benefits to locally-impacted people and other stakeholders. Participation and consultation are key ingredients of the demand for good governance in any program, initiative, project and partnership at various levels of involvement. These terms can vary from time to time in how they are defined but it is without a doubt that for empowerment and engagement of all stakeholders in any project, participatory methods must be effectively applied.

As per to the second question for respondents focused on whether the office has a capacity to disseminate information on land or not. Capacity refers to the ability, competency, and efficiency of sub national governments to plan, implement, manage, and evaluate policies, strategies, or programs designed to impact on social conditions in the jurisdiction.

As it can be seen an estimate of 98(58.7%) respondents which were the overwhelming majority responded that the office do not have a capacity to disseminate information. Around 22(14.4%) reported that the office have a capacity to disseminate information on rare occasions. About 9(5.9%) replied that they cannot decide whether the office have a capacity to disseminate information or not and 11(7.2%) respond the office have a capacity to disseminate information some times on the other hand around 13(8.5%) respondents replied that the office is capable of disseminating information always.

According to the key informants of the interview the office lacks institutional capacity to perform its tasks which is related to lack of technical instruments , poor data recording system and poor involvement from the part of the society which are help full for effective and efficient service provision.. Due to institutional capacity constraints, the pro-poor agenda ends up facing challenges. So, this situation has a
serious implication for effective and efficient local service delivery and local development at large.

From this result of analysis one can understand that the office lacks competency in undertaking the overall workings within the office. So the above situations influenced the endeavors' made for fostering good governance in land administration.

This finding is confirmed by Devas (2005). Study conducted by the author revealed that Local governments often suffer from weak institutional capacity. Decision making processes are unsystematic, mechanisms of transparency among officials and elected representatives are inadequate, and there is a shortage of officials with the necessary technical, managerial and financial skills. This is often due to the lack of financial resources to attract and retain high caliber staff. Salary levels for local government staff in Africa are often a fraction of what people could earn in the private sector. Very low wages also mean that staffs are preoccupied with searching for other income opportunities, whether corrupt or simply dysfunctional.

In a similar way ADR (2005) cited in Gebresellassie (2011) research finding indicates that there is little current capacity in Ethiopia for the dissemination of information to the public about land rights and land administration generally since insufficient effort has been made to inform the public about land policy, regulations, and land administration systems already in place.

Similar to this research finding according to Kpundeh and Khadiagala (2008) in regard to transparency the experience in Ethiopia reveal problems of constraints (capacity) on information access for service delivery, depicted as institutional and technical challenges. The rules of the public's appointment of authorities are still weak and rudimentary.

According to Key informants of the interview there is a big problem which is related to both human and material capacity notably financial restraints, shortage of skilled human power, incapacitated man power, unbalance between the number of service users and the respective assigned employees and low capacity of follow up and punishing for illegal service users who illegally took land and construct houses. Because of these listed reasons the office lacks enough capacity to undertake the responsibilities assigned to it. To deal with these problems the office takes measures to minimize these problems.

Regarding to the easily accessibility of rules and regulations of the land administration by the residents respondents were requested whether obtaining the rules and regulations of the land administration are easily accessible. Accessibility of laws, regulations and policies is pivotal to enhance awareness or increase the knowledge of the public. Because the more the rules become accessible for the general public the more the public knows, follows and abides by the rules and regulations of the land administration and strives for the successful implementation. And it helps for the public to acquire public service in accordance with the established rules, regulations as well as proclamations and to be informed about the established rules and regulations.

The result of this study as shown in Table 4 ,around 79 (51.6%) respondents which were the overwhelming majority replied that the rules and regulations of the land administration are never become easily accessible to the clients on rare occasions. On the other hand about 6(3.9%) replied that they cannot decide with the idea that whether the rules and regulations are easily accessible or not and about 15 (9.8%) reported that the office made the rules and regulations accessible to the public some times while around 3(2%) reported
that rules and regulations are easily accessible always. So from this survey one can understand that the rules, regulations and proclamations of the land administration are far from being easily accessible. This implied that the office is lagging behind in making the rules and regulations easily accessible which plays its part in hindering the office from being transparent. This situation influences the strive made for improving enough governance. As a result of this the society does not know what is expected from him (her) and the right he (she) supposed to get.

In contrary to this a study conducted by UNESCFAP (2003) shows transparency requires that information is freely available and easily accessible to the public and availability of information to the general public and clarity about government rules, regulations, and decisions.

The fourth question asked whether the decision given by the land administration committee is transparent. Transparency in decision making is critical in which it helps to foster good governance for effective and efficient service provision and it is beneficial for the community to know, aware and evaluate the decision given by the committee and abide by them and strive for the successfulness. As it shown in the above table the result shows that about 97(63.4%) which were the overwhelming majority replied that the committee has never become transparent on the decisions made and about 39(25.5%) reported that the decision given by the land administration committee is transparent on rare occasions and around 4(2.6%) responded that they cannot decide whether the decision given by the land administration committee is transparent or not on the other hand about 9(5.9%) replied that the decision given by the land administration committee is transparent some times while 4(2.6%) replied that the decision given by the land administration committee is transparent always. As it can be shown in the survey the researcher understands that the committee is not transparent for its decision in which the public become not aware and non evaluative because of lack of transparent decision by the respective authorities in which it plays its part in lagging behind the strive for consolidating good governance.

This finding is confirmed by Kpundeh and Khadiagala (2008) Studies conducted by these authors revealed that in regard to transparency the experience in Ethiopia reveal problems of constraints on information access for service delivery, depicted as institutional and technical challenges. The rules of the public’s appointment of authorities are still weak and elementary. The governance deficit has consequences for the quality and reliability of information. This situation has created a serious challenge for getting local services delivered and also for the local development of the given sub cities.

In contrary to this survey according to UN (2005) transparent governance implies openness of the governance system through clear processes and procedures enabling good access by citizens to public information. High levels of transparency stimulate awareness of responsibilities and standards in public service through information sharing.

Similarly a study conducted by Crook (2005) shows that transparency, or “open government” which provides citizens full information on what is being decided and how, is a kind of public accountability mechanism which only functions in systems which already have the basics of democratic accountability in place.

Similarly according to UNESCFAP (2003) transparency stipulates that decisions made by governmental and non-governmental authorities are openly communicated, and their enforcement is conducted in accordance with established rules and regulations. It also requires that information is freely available and easily accessible to those who will be affected by such decisions and their enforcement.
Transparency is built on the principle of the free flow of information between stakeholders (Kaufmann et al., 2007). Although transparency can be addressed from several perspectives in the design of land administration institutions accessibility, clarity and openness are crucial for assessing transparency (UN-HABITAT, 2007).

Similarly V. K. Parigi et al. (2004) research findings reveals that transparency means that decisions taken and their enforcement are done in a manner that follows rules and regulations. It also means that information is freely available and directly accessible to those who will be affected by such decisions and their enforcement. Transparency ensures that enough information is provided and that it is provided in easily understandable forms.

According to the key informants of interview land and its administration is problematic because the community are not satisfied by the administration of land and its provision of services in the selected sub cities for the decisions given by the service providers in the land administration before the new land administration proclamations amended. For example previously taken house by the local government because of unpaid tax now clients are claiming to posses it. As a result of this the public is complaining every day. So, this situation created a big problem in handling clients because the land proclamation is already amended.

According to the key informants of interview of the sub cities this problem emanated from the mismatch of the previous land administration system and its proclamations and to days administration system and its proclamations. So, service users are not satisfied because of the new system of land administration. Lack of awareness from the side of the community which emanated from the wrong perception of the community that land administration is administered by the service providers (employees) not by the rules, regulations and proclamations is also a big problem. There was problem from the part of service providers in making the users aware of the benefit of the rules, regulations and proclamations of the land administration to them.

### Table 5: Perception of respondents on awareness raising activities in the Municipality

| Item                                                                 | Description                  | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. Your city administration train community (sub-city) members      | Never                        | 64        | 41.8    |
|                                                                   | Rarely                       | 50        | 32.7    |
|                                                                   | I can’t decide               | 9         | 5.9     |
|                                                                   | Sometimes                    | 18        | 11.8    |
|                                                                   | Always                       | 12        | 7.8     |
|                                                                   | Total                        | 153       | 100.0   |

Source: Survey, 2013

Training the public about how can they get services delivered to them, how to get information that help them to use service delivered and the established rules, regulations
as well as proclamations governing the land administration system is critical issue to create awareness among the constituents' which helps the constituents' to govern by the rules and regulations and it is pivotal to build the capacity and knowhow of the service users how to handle and use their land properly and solving possible conflicts that can be caused because of land and its administration system. Respondents therefore asked whether they were get training or not concerning land administration activities.

Training community in the sub city helps the public to be informed citizens. As it shown in the above table around 64(41.8%) respondents replied that the city administration never trains the community (sub-city) members in information that support land administration activities and an estimates of 50(32.7%) responded that the office trains the community on rare occasions and about 18(11.8%) responded that the office is training the community on some occasions and around 12(7.8%) reported that there is training always. From this one can understand that the public office is not training the constituents' about the overall functioning of the office and how can the constituents' can shoulder their rights and responsibilities.

This finding is confirmed by ADR (2005). Study conducted by ADR revealed that there is little current capacity in Ethiopia for the dissemination of information to the public about land rights and land administration generally since inadequate endeavor has been made to update the community about land policy, regulations, and land administration systems already in place. Even if Programs are needed that inform the public of the land administration proclamation and registration to the acceptance and ultimate success of the programs, few resources are currently being made available to undertake this public information campaign as the finding of the research indicates.

4.4 Responsiveness in land administration office

Responsiveness is main element of good governance. As a principle it helps public feedbacks and complaints to be solved within a specified time frame at possible cost. It implies also for decisions to be given needs to consider the needs and interests of different stakeholders and public institutions need to be approachable to the respective service users.

Table 6. Perception of respondents on a delay of justice, timeless of response on problems, conflicts and complaints in the realm of service provision

| Item                                                                 | Description       | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. You have ever observed a delay of justice from the administrators when land caused conflicts occur | Never             | 28        | 18.3    |
|                                                                     | Rarely            | 40        | 26.1    |
|                                                                     | I can’t decide    | 8         | 5.2     |
|                                                                     | sometimes         | 18        | 11.8    |
|                                                                     | Always            | 59        | 38.6    |
|                                                                     | Total             | 153       | 100.0   |

Source: Survey, 2013
Serving the community on time is one manifestation of responsiveness. Especially, when land related conflicts happen it needs a quick fixation so as to minimize the possible future inconsistency and problem in order not to reach at maximum level which highly can affect the conflicting parties. In relation to the first question asked to see the perception of respondents' whether the office is serving the clients on the specified time table in time of land related conflicts to the general public.

The result of the survey shows that, out of the total respondents around 28(18.3%) reported that the office never delays in justice to the conflicts caused by conflicts and an estimate of 40(26.1%) respond that the office serves the community on rare occasions and about 8(5.2%) reported that they cannot decide whether the office serves them on time or not. On the other hand around 18(11.8%) responded that the office serves them some times while about 59 (38.6%) replied that the office serves them always.

There is a delay of justice from the respective managers in time of land related conflicts arise always. From this result one can understand that the office was failed to ensure responsiveness in relation to on time response to the stake holders. As a result of this people become dissatisfied and angry because the office delays to serve the stake holders on the specified time table. In this regard we can say that the office lags behind in ensuring responsiveness. This affects the strive for enhancing good governance in land administration in the realm of service provision as far as responsiveness is one element of it in regard to on time response to the general public.

In contrary to this Mezgebe (2007) argued that Good governance needs that institutions and processes try to serve all stakeholders within a reasonable timeframe and receptiveness of institutions to the demands of their stakeholders. Institutions should be approachable to their clients and serve them within a reasonable time frame.

| Item                                                                 | Description          | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. The sub city administration solves the most important land problems you identified | very fast             | 5         | 3.3     |
|                                                                      | Very slow            | 92        | 60.1    |
|                                                                      | Fast                 | 9         | 5.9     |
|                                                                      | slow                 | 47        | 30.7    |
|                                                                      | Total                | 153       | 100.0   |
| 2. The services delivered are consistent with the citizens desires and preferences (prioritizes needs) | Never                | 91        | 59.5    |
|                                                                      | Rarely               | 31        | 20.3    |
|                                                                      | I can't decide       | 13        | 8.5     |
|                                                                      | Some times           | 16        | 10.5    |
|                                                                      | Always               | 2         | 1.3     |
|                                                                      | Total                | 153       | 100.0   |

Source: Survey, 2013
Solving the most important land problems is one manifestation of responsiveness in a given public offices which plays its part in improving good governance. As it can be shown in the above survey around 5(3.3%) replied that the office solves most important problem very fast and an estimate of 92(60.1%) the that the office solves most important land related problems of the clients very slowly. on the other hand about 9(5.9%) that the office solves the most important land related problems of the clients in a fast manner while around 47(30.7) respond that the office solves it in a slow manner. The overwhelming majority of the respondents replied in between slow and very slow. From this one can understand that the office is lagging behind in solving the most important land problems and to deal with the problem in a fast manner.

In contrary to this study conducted by Negalegn (2010) shows that responsiveness can be measured in terms of public officials ability to listen the demands and voice of citizens, easy access of complaints for service users and whom to contact with the suggestion to change, the ability of councils decision to reflect the demands of public etc.

In line with the above idea in the second question respondents were also asked whether the services delivered are consistent with the citizens’ desires and preferences. As it was shown in the above table around 91(59.5%) respondents’ reported that the office never delivers a service consistently with the citizens desires and preferences and an estimate of 31(20.3%) responded on rare occasions the office delivers a service consistently with the citizens desires and preferences on the other hand about 13(8.5%) reported that they cannot decide whether the service provision is consistent or not and an estimate of 16 (10.5%) replied sometimes with regard to the consistency of service provision. Larger number of respondents’ lay in between never and rarely. From this result of the survey the researcher understands that the situation of consistency which means taking in to account the desires and preferences of the service users is at a big problem. The respective authority neglects the desires and preferences of the citizens and simply carry out their duties by dis regarding the desires and preferences.

In contrary to this result a study conducted by Grindle (2010) shows that good governance incorporates ideas of equity and fairness, protection for the poor, for minorities, and for women, and a positive role for the state. For many others found along the continuum from right to left, the concept is attractive for its concern about order, decency and justice.

In contrary Sebudubudu (2010) on his paper argued that good governance is credited for responsiveness to the preferences of the large population mainly the poor and vulnerable sections who normally benefit from pro-poor policies and programmes. Similar to this argument Negalegn (2010) on his study further argued that equity and social justice are also pivotal principles under a democratic/well governed government. Responsiveness can be measured in terms of public officials ability to listen the demands and voice of citizens, easy access of complaints for service users and whom to contact with the suggestion to change, the ability of councils decision to reflect the demands of public etc.

In contrary to this survey Shah (2002) argued responsiveness aims for governments to do the right things for the people and the services to be delivered must be consistent with the citizens’ desires and needs. In this regard the marginalized sections of the society need to be entertained. Steps might also be taken to encourage marginalized groups (youth, poor people, and women) to visit (MOFED,2009). Responsiveness is one element of good governance which implies for institutions to be
receptive, serving all stakeholders, accommodating needs and interests, serve the people within a reasonable time frame, responding to the requirements and rights of citizens and soon.

Table 8: Perception of respondents on responsiveness

| Item                                                                 | Description | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. How can you rate the sub city land administration office in terms of responsiveness? | Excellent   | 12        | 7.8     |
|                                                                      | very good   | 21        | 13.7    |
|                                                                      | Fair        | 15        | 9.8     |
|                                                                      | poor        | 72        | 47.1    |
|                                                                      | very poor   | 33        | 21.6    |
|                                                                      | Total       | 153       | 100.0   |

Source: Survey, 2013

Respondents were asked whether the sub cities land administration office is responsive or not. As the result of the survey shown in the above Table 8 an estimate of 12(7.8%) replied that the office is excellent in manifesting responsiveness and about 21(13.7%) responded that the office is very good in exercising /manifesting responsiveness to the clients and around 15(9.8%) reported that the office is fair in exercising /manifesting responsiveness and an estimate of 72(47.1%) responded that the office is poor in exercising /manifesting responsiveness on the other hand around 33(21.6%) reported that the office is very poor in exercising /manifesting responsiveness. The overwhelming majority of the respondents reported in between poor and very poor. From this the researcher understands that the office fails to ensure responsiveness and fostering responsiveness in the realm of service delivery to the public.

According to key informants of interview there is a good move to ensure responsiveness but there is a problem in free hold which emanated from serving the citizens effectively and efficiently. The office is undertaking its workings to deal with the previous mistakes by evaluating the functions carried out so far monthly, weekly, in three months, in six months as well as yearly. As a result of this now a day there is encouragable result.

In contrary to the this result a study conducted by MOFED (2009) shows responsiveness of the local government is supposed by citizens to be particularly significant. The supposed responsiveness to complaints, for example, was largely interrelated with satisfaction levels. It also seems that those who are most likely to visit the local government are people of higher income, men, and older adults. Encourage the establishment of systems to collect and respond to complaints. These can be as simple as a sign on a door or the placement of a box that is clearly labeled.

In a similar fashion Mezgebe (2007) further argued that good governance needs that institutions and processes try to serve all stakeholders within a reasonable timeframe.
Responsiveness implies the receptiveness of institutions to the demands of their stakeholders. Institutions should be approachable to their clients and serve them within a reasonable time frame.

Table 9: Perception of respondents on the complaints redressing mechanism

| Item                                                                 | Description | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|---------|
| 1.Is the office having suggestion box in handling grievances?        | No          | 41        | 26.8    |
|                                                                      | Yes         | 112       | 73.2    |
| Total                                                               |             | 153       | 100.0   |

Source: Survey, 2013

Grievances handling in the form of suggestion box is pivotal in which it helps to incorporate the suggestions for warded by the community so as to entertain divergent opinions which is help full to incorporate them in the program or policy implementation of the land administration. In relation to this respondents asked to whether the land administration office have a suggestion box. Accordingly an estimate of 41(26.8%) replied that the office do not have a suggestion box on the other hand around 112(73.2%) reported that the office have a suggestion box in handling grievances. Even if the overwhelming majority of respondents responded that the office have a suggestion box they argue that no one checks what exists in the suggestion box. From this one can understand that the mere prevalence of suggestion box cannot guarantee the entertainment of the various suggestions of the public. This negatively affects responsiveness of the public office because it do not incorporates the divergent suggestions of the public in to the programs, plans, projects and procedures of the office. So, the office fails to accommodate and incorporate the ideas which endangered the responsiveness and generally the endeavor made for improving good governance in the public institution. The office need to check the opinions in the box and need to entertain the suggestions so as to include them in the various plans, programs, projects and procedures of the workings of the office. In relation to this survey MOFED (2009) encourage the establishment of systems to collect and respond to complaints. These can be as simple as a sign on a door or the placement of a box that is clearly labeled “Complaints or Suggestions.” Complaints should be logged and responded to in a timely manner. To be sure these actions that have been undertaken as part of the civil service reform programme across the nation. As a result of the implementation of the package in urban and rural woredas and kebeles, Information, Customer and Complaint Handling Desks were created and staffed. The information desk is meant to deliver timely information to the society while Complaint Handling Desk is to actively listen and solve public Complaints.

4.5 Transparency in urban planning and development office in the realm of service provision

Providing effective and efficient service to the community in a clear way is one manifestation of transparency and generally that of good...
It helps for the service users to have a confidence on the service providers and in its part it plays a significant role in fostering good governance. As it was shown in the above table question was raised to see whether the urban planning and development office distribute land for investment and urbanization in a clear way for the general public.

Table 10: Perception of respondents on Clearness, Transparency and openness of the office to the public

| Item                                                                 | Description                                                                 | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. The urban planning and development office distribute land for investment and urbanization in a clear way for the general public | Never                                                                       | 84        | 54.9    |
|                                                                      | Rarely                                                                       | 49        | 32.0    |
|                                                                      | I can't decide                                                               | 5         | 3.3     |
|                                                                      | some times                                                                   | 10        | 6.5     |
|                                                                      | Always                                                                       | 5         | 3.3     |
|                                                                      | Total                                                                        | 153       | 100.0   |
| 2. The urban planning and development office Provides Services to all through a transparent manner | Never                                                                       | 90        | 58.8    |
|                                                                      | Rarely                                                                       | 34        | 22.2    |
|                                                                      | I can't decide                                                               | 7         | 4.6     |
|                                                                      | some times                                                                   | 16        | 10.5    |
|                                                                      | Always                                                                       | 6         | 3.9     |
|                                                                      | Total                                                                        | 153       | 100.0   |
| 3. Is the office is open to its decisions on urban planning and its development (expansion)? | Yes                                                                          | 77        | 50.3    |
|                                                                      | No                                                                           | 76        | 49.7    |
|                                                                      | Total                                                                        | 153       | 100.0   |
| 4. If your answer for question yes, decisions on?                    | Registering excess land                                                      | 10        | 6.5     |
|                                                                      | Providing Ownership data                                                     | 28        | 18.3    |
|                                                                      | Giving site plans                                                           | 7         | 4.6     |
|                                                                      | Data on unallocated land                                                     | 24        | 15.7    |
|                                                                      | Giving clearance                                                            | 5         | 3.3     |
|                                                                      | Opening new files                                                           | 3         | 2.0     |
|                                                                      | Total                                                                        | 77        | 50.3    |

Source: Survey, 2013
Accordingly, an estimate of 84(54.9%) respondents responded that the office never provides service in a clear way and around 49(32.2%) replied that the office provides service in a clear way on rare occasions on the other hand about 10(6.5%) responded that the office never provides service in a clear way some times while an estimate of 5(3.3%) replied that the office provides service in a clear way always. From this survey one can understand that the overwhelming majority of respondents were in between never and rarely. So, the office of urban development fails to ensure clearness in distributing land for investment and urbanization in a clear way for the general public. This becomes one main obstacle in ensuring good governance in the given public office because; as a result of lack of clearness the office fails to be transparent.

In contrary to the result of the analysis according to Katsriku (2012) each public service agency must be clear about the purpose of the organization, objectives and its intended services to the citizens and make sure that all employees in the organization understand them. This will ensure that citizens receive high quality service and that the taxpayer receives value for money in service delivery.

In contrary to this survey Mezgebe (2007) argued that transparency manifested in accessibility of information to the general public and clarity about government rules, regulations, and decisions. The office need to have clarity during distribution of land whether for investment and urbanization to the general public. Such as clarity of land delivery processes and urban planning and development for investment and urbanization are critical for improving transparency in land administration institutions. In short, transparency refers to the availability of information to the general public and clarity about government rules, regulations, and decisions (UNESCFAP,2003).

The second question requested the respondents to respond whether the urban planning and development office Provides services to all through a transparent manner. As it can be shown in the survey about 90(58.8%) respondents’ replied the office never becomes transparent on its service delivery and around 34(22.2%) replied that the office is transparent on rare occasions and on the other hand an estimate of 16(10.5%) replied that sometimes the office is transparent in service delivery to the clients while around 6(3.9%) respondents responded that the office is transparent always. Larger sizes of respondents lay in between never and rarely. From this the researcher perceives that the public institution lags behind from being transparent to the community. A lack of transparency paves the way for the spread of and opportunities of government corruption and decreases public sector efficiency.

In this regard the respondents said that the office do not try to take enough measures to improve transparency in general. They said that the office sometimes take measures for example by punishing the service providers (civil servants) those who fail to be transparent for the service users. But they did not satisfied by the punishments taken by the respective authorities. Because, the measures taken were not on time. They add that the service providers used to say we will take measures for every failure happened because of the service providers but, the reality in the ground is quite different to mean they (respective authorities) do not take satisfactory measures to punish for those who do not carry out their responsibilities accordingly.

According to the key informants of interview there is a problem of serving the community in a transparent manner this problem mainly prevailed in the office of urban planning. Again they said that the prime core function of the office is making the community (service users) aware of the rules, regulation and
proclamations because this move is helpful in undertaking the workings in a transparent manner. But this does not mean that the problem of transparency is totally ensured. Still this problem prevailed in the office. Additionally key informants also added that there were problems of transparency which is mainly related to rent seeking behavior from the side of the employees.

In contrary to this survey a study undertaken by UN (2005) reveals that transparent governance implies openness of the governance system through clear processes and procedures enabling good access by citizens to public information. High levels of transparency stimulate awareness of responsibilities and standards in public service through information sharing, which ultimately ensures the accountability of individuals and organizations that handle resources and/or hold public office for their performance. Transparency refers how accessible, open and clear are informations, processes, institutional rules and decisions to community members and the general public (Arko, et al 2010).

This finding is confirmed by Kpundeh and Khadiagala (2008). Studies conducted by these authors revealed that in regard to transparency the experience in Ethiopia reveal problems of constraints on information access for service delivery, depicted as institutional and technical challenges. The rules of the public’s appointment of authorities are still weak and rudimentary. The governance deficit has implications for the quality and reliability of information. Specifically, because information about government policies, behavior, and performance is typically generated in political environments that are polarized and contested, assures that information is not for narrow legitimation and propagandist ends is a central mystery in fostering good governance.

In contrary to this result of the analysis UNHSP (2004) found that transparency has been acknowledging for guaranteeing an informed citizenry and for following a collective vision by exposing the public space by making every stakeholder to remain aware of achievements and setbacks of the government and thus it limits corruption, which tends to flourish in closed systems that are ridden with ambiguity and open behavior.

In contrary to this result of the analysis to UNESCAP (2003) Transparency means that decisions taken and their enforcement are done in a manner that follows rules and regulations. It also means that information is freely available and directly accessible to those who will be affected by such decisions and their enforcement. It also means that enough information is provided and that it is provided in easily understandable forms and media.

The third question requested the respondents to respond whether the office is open to its decisions on urban planning and its development (expansion). Accordingly, around 77(5.3%) replied that the office is open to its decisions on the other hand an estimate of 76(5.3%) responded that the office is not open to its decisions.

In connection to this question which was asked in the fourth question that is if your answer for question no 12 is yes, decisions on around 10(6.5%) respondents reported that the office is open in its decision in registering excess land on the other hand an estimate of 28(18.3%) reported that there is openness in providing ownership data for the public and about 24(15.7%) reported that the office is open in giving clearance to the public and around 3(2%) respond that the public institution is open to the community in opening new files to the service users. From this the researcher understands that the office is relatively open as the survey reflected.
According to key informants of interview the office is open to its decisions and whenever the service users who did not satisfied by the decisions made they complain and appeal to higher body. But there are service users who complain by disregarding the rules which are expected from them. Others said there are reluctant service providers who refrain from being open to their decisions. Other informants said there is a system of passing decisions and making them open to the public through committee, cabinet members and process council.

In relation to this survey to UN (2005) transparent governance implies openness of the governance system through clear processes and procedures enabling good access by citizens to public information. High levels of transparency stimulate awareness of responsibilities and standards in public service through information sharing, which ultimately ensures the accountability of individuals and organizations that handle resources and/or hold public office for their performance.

By the same token Crook (ND) argues that “open government” provides citizens full information on what is being decided and how, is a kind of public accountability mechanism which only functions in systems which already have the basics of democratic accountability in place.

### Table 11: Perception of respondents on the level of corruption

| Item                                                                 | Description                  | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. The urban planning and development is free from rent seeking activities | Never                        | 105       | 68.6    |
|                                                                     | Rarely                       | 28        | 18.3    |
|                                                                     | I can’t decide               | 11        | 7.2     |
|                                                                     | some times                   | 4         | 2.6     |
|                                                                     | Always                       | 5         | 3.3     |
|                                                                     | Total                        | 153       | 100.0   |

Source: Survey, 2013

Corruption emanates from lack of transparent authorities. The more individuals become non transparent the more they tend to be corruptors. With regard to this respondents' requested about their perception on the situation of corruption in the study area. An estimate of 105(68.6%) respondents replied that the office is not free from rent seeking. There is a wide spread of rent seekers. Around 28(18.3%) replied that there is rent seeking behavior from the side of service providers on rare occasions. On the other hand about 11(7.2%) responded that they cannot decide whether there are rent seekers in the office or not. On the other hand an estimate of 4(2.6%) replied that there are rent seekers some times while an estimate of 5(3.3%) replied that always there are rent seekers in the office. From this one can understand that the extent of rent seeking is rampant. Moreover, respondents had been said that rent seeking activities had been the main challenges in the urban planning and development in the given sub cities. They had been said major areas of corruption are
manifested in the form of nepotism, delaying decisions, and unequal treatment among service users, nepotism, bribes and prioritizing self advantage.

Additionally, the respondents have also said there are problems of corruption and partiality in the administration of the land. There are service providers, who put to those they have friendship and family tie to the front and tried make them to get the services first. The services favor the people who have tie with them.

There is also partiality in delivering service to the community. People who have tie and familiarity with the service providers will be beneficial from the service provision but those who have not relationship; they will not get land and other services timely and appropriately.

In addition to this respondents said that whenever you want to get something, you have to do corruption which is given in the form of money which emanated from not knowing the right of getting efficient and efficient service from the respective service providers. Therefore, the affluent can afford to pay it not the poor. Therefore; this implies that there was unfair treatment of individuals. The affluent have been assuring their right of getting service by buying it which mean committing illegal act that corruption. This shows us that transparency is getting compromised because of the prevalence of rent seekers in the given public office.

According to the key informants of interview in the office of urban planning previously corruption was rampant but now a day there is a sign of decrement but it does not mean that it was totally alleviated. The problem is related with unequal treatment of service users, delaying (un proper usage of time), not serving the clients properly and at the right time and absence of employees during working hours and the strive for fighting it is not a such satisfactory. Rent seeking behavior from the side of engineers is rampant. In the office of land administration there is problem of rent seeking behavior related to land but the problem is not rampant like that in the previous time because of the strive made to minimize it.

According to FAO cited in Palmer (2007) corruption hits those who lack the ability to pay the bribes to get the services and legal protection, particularly to defend their rights to land. Weak governance may promote inequality as the rich are able to benefit from the opportunities. Self-enrichment while the poor may lose their rights to land and common property resources such as communal grazing areas and forests. The poor who cannot afford the formal legal services are doomed to rely on informal and extralegal arrangements, becoming effectively excluded from the protection and reach of the law. Politically the consequences can be severe, as grievances may fuel violent conflict. The result is inhibition of corruption among public officials and reduction of distrust among their constituents’ (UNESCFAP, 2003).

According to transparency international (2006) Corruption is defined as the abuse of delegated power and resource for personal advantage. Corruption vitiates and obliterates the key ingredients of social capital, without which the machinery of governance cannot function.

Anello (2006 ) further argued that it has become a moral imperative that all sectors of society should address and resolve the problem of corruption. There is a variation in the level of Corruption individually and institutionally.

Prevalence of information desk is critical in a given office to prevail. Because, service users can easily and quickly get the respective service provider (authorized) person and it helps them to finish their task quickly. The prevalence of information desk in a given office is one manifestation of transparency as far as information dissemination is the concern of transparency. Respondents were asked whether the office has an information service/desk. As it was shown in the above
table an estimate of 97(63.4%) respondents replied the office has an information desk and as per personal observation conducted the office has information desk while around 56(36.6%) replied that the office has not information desk. From this one can understand that the office has an information desk for the service users. confirmed by Arko, et al (2010) Studies conducted by these authors revealed that access to information also depends on the availability of mechanism for recording and maintaining information. Thus institutions should put in place instruments that help for maintaining urban planning and development information and information-desks where users from this public institution can easily interact with institutions.

Information can be made access to the public using various mechanisms. As it was shown in the above table the second question was asked to the respondents. Accordingly, an estimate of 105(68.6%) replied that the public institution has a means of publicizing information. In relation to this question again respondents were also asked what kind of system the office has to publicize the information. Accordingly around 26(17%) of the respondents said that the office publicize the information through hard copy to the service users `and about 12(7.8%) respondents` said that the office is publicizing information through on line and on the other hand an estimate of 45(29.4%) replied that the office is publicizing information via meeting while 19(12.4%) responded that the office is publicizing information in the form of notice board to the clients. From this one can understand that the most common mechanisms uses to publicize information are through conducting meetings and on notice boards. Around 51(33.3%) however replied that as there is No means of publicization information in the office. From this result of the survey as well as the in accordance with the personal observation conducted the office of urban planning and development publicizes information mostly via conducting meetings and notice board. This move helps the clients to be informed about the services that are going to be delivered since information is power.

Table12: Perception of respondents on the Information service /desk, publicizing information and means of publicizing (accessing) information.

| Item                                                                 | Description     | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. Is here is information services/desk in the office of urban planning and development? | Yes             | 97        | 63.4    |
|                                                                      | No              | 56        | 36.6    |
|                                                                      | Total           | 153       | 100.0   |
| 2. Is there any means of publicizing information on urban planning and development office? | YES             | 102       | 68.6    |
|                                                                      | No              | 51        | 33.3    |
|                                                                      | Total           | 153       | 100.0   |
| 3. If your answer for question no 2 is yes, the institution makes information access using | Hard copy       | 26        | 17.0    |
|                                                                      | online          | 12        | 7.8     |
|                                                                      | Meeting         | 45        | 29.4    |
|                                                                      | Notice board    | 19        | 12.4    |
|                                                                      | Total           | 102       |         |

Source: Survey, 2013
This finding is

**Table 13: Perception of respondents on clearness for acquiring services and measures to improve transparency**

| Item                                                                 | Description       | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. Procedures for acquiring services are clear to all stakeholders  | Never             | 66        | 43.1    |
|                                                                      | Rarely            | 63        | 41.2    |
|                                                                      | I can’t decide    | 8         | 5.2     |
|                                                                      | some times        | 10        | 6.5     |
|                                                                      | Always            | 6         | 3.9     |
|                                                                      | Total             | 153       | 100.0   |
| 2. The office tries to take measures to improve transparency in general | never             | 68        | 44.4    |
|                                                                      | rarely            | 61        | 39.9    |
|                                                                      | I can’t decide    | 4         | 2.6     |
|                                                                      | Some times        | 16        | 10.5    |
|                                                                      | always            | 3         | 2.0     |
|                                                                      | Uncertain         | 1         | .7      |
|                                                                      | Total             | 153       | 100.0   |

Source: Survey, 2013

Clearness in procedures for acquiring services to the public is critical in improving good governance and particularly transparency. As it can be shown in the table 13 an estimate of 66 (43.1%) respondents replied that the office never makes the procedures clear for acquiring services and on the other hand around 63 (41.2%) replied that the offices procedures for acquiring services are clear to all stakeholders on rare occasions and about 8 (5.2%) responded that they cannot decide whether procedures for acquiring services are clear to all stakeholders on rare occasions. About 10 (6.5%) replied procedures for acquiring services are clear to all stakeholders some times while around 6 (3.9%) responded that the procedures for acquiring services are always clear. From this survey the researcher understands that the office is lagging behind in making the procedures and process for acquiring services clear to the community. In this regard this situation plays a role in diminishing the strive for improving good governance and in particular reference to transparency in the given public institution. The clarity of procedures in land administration will help clients to easily identify the steps to pass the hierarchies to possess land and this in its part play a great role in minimizing the intense bureaucracies.

This finding is confirmed by Custovic. Study conducted by the author revealed that citizens in Croatia are less informed about procedures and find procedures too long and too complex for citizens and they recommended publishing of manual that would include all steps needed to perform the registration.
In contrary to this a study conducted by Oviasuyi, et al (2010) shows that Good governance needs that all the actors engaged in the governance process follow well-defined codes of conduct and their public issues are subject to examination by the public under legally predetermined procedures.

Contrary to the result of the analysis UN (2005) mentions’ that transparency implies openness of the governance system through clear processes and the procedures enabling good access by citizens to public information and the clarification of the procedures in acquiring the available services to the community.

Arko, et al. (2010) argues that the process for possessing land need to be via clear rules and regulations and it need to be clear and open to all the concerned service users.

Taking measures when a problem of transparency happens is one manifestation of improving governance in the given office. In the second question respondents requested to know whether the office is trying to take measures to improve transparency in general. Accordingly an estimate of 68(44.4%) reported that the office never takes measures when ever problem of transparency happens and about 61(39.9%) replied the office takes measures on rare occasions when ever problem of transparency happens and around and about 16(10.5%) responded that sometimes the office takes measures and around 3(2%) replied that the office always takes measures when ever problem of transparency happens. Large number of respondents lay in between rarely and never. From this the researcher understands that the office is not (lagged behind) to improve the atmosphere of transparency of the office so, this situation restricts the strive for improving transparency and generally enough governance in the given public office.

In contrary to this finding according to UNESCFAP (2003) Transparency stipulates that decisions made by governmental and non-governmental authorities are openly communicated, and their enforcement is conducted in accordance with established rules and regulations. It also requires that information is freely available and easily accessible to those who will be affected by such decisions and their enforcement. In short, transparency refers to the availability of information to the general public and clarity about government rules, regulations, and decisions. If this is not the case lack of transparency will result in inhibition of corruption among public officials and reduction of distrust among their constituents.

### Table 14: Perception of respondents on petition (appeal) in decisions made

| Item                                                                 | Description                           | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. There are mechanisms for community members to petition (appeal) against the decision made by the authorities | Never                                 | 73        | 47.7    |
|                                                                       | Rarely                                | 49        | 32.0    |
|                                                                       | I can’t decide                        | 7         | 4.6     |
|                                                                       | some times                           | 16        | 10.5    |
|                                                                       | Always                               | 8         | 5.2     |
|                                                                       | Total                                | 153       | 100.0   |

Source: Survey, 2013

Respondents were asked whether there are mechanisms for community members to petition (appeal) against the decision made by the authorities. Regarding mechanisms for
community members to petition (appeal) against the decision made by the authorities an estimate of 73(47.7%) respondents replied that there are no mechanisms for community members to petition (appeal) against the decision made by the authorities and about 49(32.%) reported that there are mechanisms for community members to petition on rare occasion on the other hand around 7(4.6%) reported that they Can't decide whether the office has mechanisms to appeal against decisions made or not and about 16(10.5%) reported that sometimes the office has mechanisms for community members to petition. On the other hand around 8(5.2%) responded that in the office always there are mechanisms for community members to petition. From this one can understand that the office lags behind in accepting the petitions' of the respective service users. From this survey the researcher understands that this situation affects the atmosphere of the strive for ensuring good governance.

According to the key informants of interview in regard to this they said that there is no specified time frame for accepting complaints and help citizens to appeal their concern to the higher body. Other key informants of interview said that there is a specified time frame for service users to present their complaints and appeal to the higher body and there are days which help citizens to present their complaints that are on Monday, Wednesday and Friday but there are times in which citizens are not served in these specified time frame because of unexpected and urgent meetings in the office.

Again according to some informants they said that an effort had been made in accepting complaints and appeal and solving them on time and properly but, there is a problem if the complaints and appeal presented by the service users are to be solved with other stakeholders who are responsible (assigned) for this task which is emanated from a problem of giving timely and proper response to the respective service users.

This finding confirmed by MOFED (2009). A study conducted by MOFED (2009) shows that the supposed responsiveness to complaints, for example, is largely interrelated with satisfaction levels. It also seems that those who are most likely to visit the local government are people of higher income, men, and older adults. Encourage the establishment of systems to collect and respond to complaints. These can be as simple as a sign on a door or the placement of a box that is clearly labeled “Complaints or Suggestions.” Complaints should be logged and responded to in a timely manner.

| Item                                                                 | Description                        | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. Decisions are taken and enforced in accordance with the rules and regulations given | Yes                                 | 63        | 41.2    |
|                                                                     | No                                 | 90        | 58.8    |
|                                                                     | Total                              | 153       | 100.0   |

Source: Survey, 2013
The enforcement of decisions in the realm of service provision in any public office need to be in accordance to the established laws, rules as well as regulations because, this is one manifestation of transparent governance in public offices and the established law of the land also says so. In regard to this respondents were asked whether decisions are taken and enforced in accordance with the established rules and regulations given. Accordingly an estimate of 63(41.2%) reported that decisions are enforced accordingly on the other hand around 90(58.8%) replied that decisions are not taken and enforced in accordance with the rules and regulations given. From this one can understand that there is a big problem in enforcing decisions in accordance with the established rules and regulations. Decisions are getting enforced arbitrarily in the given public office.

The respondents said that decisions are made in the wish and willing of the respective authorities not in accordance with the given rules. So in this case the researcher perceives that decisions are made arbitrarily. This situation highly damages the endeavor towards improving good governance (transparency and responsiveness) in the given public office. They added that in the given public offices authorities made decisions based on their interest and not in accordance to the established rules and regulations as well as with the interest of the general public.

In contrary to this Mezgebe (2007) found that transparency stipulates that decisions made by governmental and non-governmental authorities are openly communicated, and their enforcement is conducted in accordance with established rules and regulations.

4.6 Responsiveness in the office of urban planning and development

Table 16: Perception of respondents on assessing needs and preferences, considering needs and means’s of assessing the needs and preferences

| Item | Description | Frequency | Percent |
|------|-------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. The office assesses the needs and preferences of different stakeholders’ | Never | 88 | 57.5 |
| | Rarely | 18 | 11.8 |
| | I Can’t decide | 11 | 7.2 |
| | some times | 2 | 1.3 |
| | Always | 34 | 22.2 |
| | Total | 153 | 100.0 |
| 2. If your answer for question no. 1 is yes, using what mechanism? | Meeting | 12 | 7.8 |
| | Suggestion box | 19 | 12.4 |
| | Questioner | 3 | |
| | Total | 34 | 22.2 |
| | strongly | 13 | 8.5 |
Question was raised to know the perception of respondents on whether the offices assess the needs and preferences of different stakeholders. Accordingly 88 (57.5%) of the respondents reported that, the office never assess the needs and preferences of different stakeholders and on the other hand an estimate of 18 (11.8%) responded that the office assesses needs and preferences on rare occasion and about 11 (7.2%) reported that they can’t decide whether the office assess the needs and preferences of different stakeholders or not and an estimate of 2 (1.3%) reported the office assess needs and preferences some times while around 34 (22.2%) responded that the office assess needs and preferences always. It is critical to know the needs and preferences of the constituents’. However, as the result of the survey indicates most of the respondents replied that the office does not assess the needs and preferences. So what we can understand from this is that the office does not know clearly the needs and preferences of the society. If it does not clearly identify these needs and preferences it does not correctly include in to plans and projects. If the office does not assess the needs and preferences of the society, these needs and preferences will not take into plans and projects. Hence these plans and projects will not be up on the needs and preferences but the needs of the people participate in planning and in designing projects. The office is lagging behind in improving enough governance by assessing the diverse needs and preferences during project designing and planning. To this end if the needs and preferences of the people do not well assessed and examined the people will not have confidence up on the administration system and participate in the overall governance of land administration. This situation has a serious implication on effective and efficient service provision as well as on local level developments and in general on the effort for improving enough governance.

On the other hand an estimate of 34 (22.2%) replied that the office assess the needs and preferences of service users via different mechanisms. Accordingly, from 34 (22.2%) respondents an estimate of 12 (7.8%) respondents reported that the office assess the needs and preferences of the service users through Meeting and on the other hand about 19 (12.4%) replied the office assess the needs through suggestion box and an estimate of 3 (2%) reported the office assess the needs through distributing questioner to the clients.

In the third question respondents were asked whether the office considers the needs and preferences of the public during project

| 41. The program implementation considers the needs and preferences of the public during project designing and planning. | agree | strongly disagree | Disagree | Uncertain | I can’t decide | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| agree | 19 | 30.1 |
| strongly disagree | 46 | 34.6 |
| Disagree | 53 | 9.8 |
| Uncertain | 15 | 4.6 |
| I can’t decide | 7 | 100.0 |

Source: Survey, 2013
designing and planning in program implementation sections of the community in project designing and implementing. Accordingly an estimate of 13 (8.5%) respondents replied that they strongly agree in that the program implementation includes the needs and desires of different stake holders in project designing and implementation on the other around 19(12.4%) replied that they agree in that the program implementation includes the needs of the constituents’ and about 46(30.1%) reported that they strongly dis agree in that the program implementation includes the needs and around 53(34.6%) reported that they dis agree in that the program implementation includes the needs and an estimate 15(9.8%) replied Uncertain about program implementation.

From this one can understand that the office did not takes in consideration the various needs and desires of different sections of society and this was affecting the governance of the office of urban planning and development . Good land administration needs the assessment of needs and preferences of the people and the incorporation of these needs and preferences according to the priority given by the society. If the need and preferences did not incorporated during project designing and planning fruit full results cannot be achieved.

In this regard plans and projects done are not solving the demands of the people because the various needs and preferences of the constituents’ do not well assessed. In every project designing and planning and implementation the needs need to be included and the policies need to be devised and adjusted to the circumstances of the community and every planning and designing need to be pro poor and marginalized sections of the society. But the office lags behind in undertaking its responsiveness in such away.

In contrary to the survey Negalegn and Sebudubudu (2010) on their paper argued that good governance is credited for responsiveness to the preferences of the large population mainly the poor and vulnerable sections that normally benefit from pro-poor policies and programmes. Equity and social justice are also pivotal principles under a democratic/well governed government Responsiveness can be measured in terms of public officials ability to listen the demands and voice of citizens especially those who are vulnerable and poor, easy access of complaints for service users and whom to contact with the suggestion to change, the ability of councils decision to reflect the demands of the public etc

By the same token Siri Gloppen (2000) on his paper further argued that responsiveness implies to the method in which decision-makers – public or private– identifies the needs and preferences replies to the demands of certain groups, such as the poor and the vulnerable sections of society.

Similarly a study conducted by Oviasuyi, et al (2010) further argued that Government policy decisions and enforcements should be represent adequate responses to society needs and opportunities as good governance desires the basic needs, interests and the critical purpose that indicates policies ,programs and activities of government must represent enough response to the genuine and legitimate needs of the people.

Table 17: Perception of respondents on the responsiveness of the office

| Item | Description | Frequency | Percent |
|------|-------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. How can you rate the office in terms of | Excellent | 14 | 9.2 |
| | Very good | 9 | 5.9 |
It seems that the responsiveness of the local government is supposed by citizens to be particularly significant. Respondents were asked to know their perception on the responsiveness of the office to the community. Responsiveness is one critical component of good governance in which without responsiveness ensuring enough governance becomes unthinkable. As it can be shown in the above table 17 respondents rank the level of responsiveness in the given office. Accordingly an estimate 14(9.2%) sample respondents rated the offices responsiveness as it is Excellent and around 9(5.9%) respondents reported that the offices responsiveness is good on the other hand about of 14(9.2%) sample respondents reported that the office is good in manifesting responsiveness and around 35(22.9%) respondents responded that the office is fair in exercising responsiveness and about 53(34.6%) reported that the office is poor in manifesting responsiveness while an estimate of 28(18.3%) respondents replied that the office is very good in terms of responsiveness to the general public. From this survey one can understand that the office is lagging behind in ensuring responsiveness because large size of respondents replied in between very poor and poor. In this regard responsiveness was got compromised in the given public institution.

With regard to this according to the key informants of interview they said that in the office of urban planning and development there is a problem of responsiveness which is manifested by a problem of on time and proper (appropriate) response to the clients. Others said there is a problem in which there were previously unsolved issues and now it creates a big problem in solving them in possible time frame and again they said even if this thing creates problem we are doing our best to deal with the prevailed problems. There is also a problem from the road engineers in giving appropriate and on time response and every time they confront with the respective authorities who provide mater plans to the service users. In contrary to this survey according Yacob et al (2010) Responsiveness’ implies to how the state and other public institutions perform in responding to the requirements and rights of citizens. For instance, how does the state act in service provision? Are people treated equally? Or are certain needs prioritized over others?

In relation to this argument Shah (nd) further argued that responsiveness aims for governments to do the right things for the people and the services to be delivered must be consistent with the citizens’ desires and needs. With regard to responsiveness Tim (2003) similarly argued that the closeness of local government to service users means that, provided that they have enough autonomy, they can be more responsive to local needs than central government.

**Table 18: perceptions of the respondents on the appropriateness of the responses**

| Item | Description | Frequency | Percent |
|------|-------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. The office give appropriate response | Never | 71 | 46.4 |
| | Rarely | 52 | 34.0 |
Giving appropriate responses to the service users is one manifestation of responsiveness in which it plays its role in ensuring and sustaining the atmosphere of good governance and particularly that of responsiveness. In relation to this respondents asked to know their perception on whether the responses given to the community are appropriate or not. Accordingly an estimate of 71(46.4%) respondents replied that the office never gives an appropriate response to the constituents’ and around 52(34.%) reported that the office gives appropriate response to the community on rare occasions and on the other hand an estimate of 8(5.2%) respondents reported that they can’t decide whether the office gives proper response or not and an estimate of 18(11.8%) sample respondents responded that that sometimes the office gives appropriate response to the clients while around 4(2.6%) respondents’ replied that the office always gives proper responses to the community. From this survey the researcher understands that the office lags behind in giving proper responses to the service recipients as far as the overwhelming majority of the responses lay in between never and rarely. This situation plays its role in undermining the strive for the consolidation of good governance and particularly that of responsiveness in the office of urban planning and development. As a result of this situation the community loses its trust and confidence upon the service providers.

In relation to this respondents said that this big problem prevails because there are irresponsive public managers which emanated because of different reasons and they list the reasons behind why irresponsive managers existed and the reasons are they do not get to their office on time, they do not give proper response, they did not give response on time as well as they are not willing to serve the community. In this regard the service users did not deny that there are responsive leaders in providing quick response to the service users unlike that of the irresponsive authorities.

### Table 19: Perception of respondents on the timeliness of service provision to the community with regard to the procedures’ of workings

| Item | Description | Frequency | Percent |
|------|-------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. service is timely given to the community with regard to the procedures’ of workings | Never | 61 | 39.9 |
| | Rarely | 56 | 36.6 |
| | I can’t decide | 6 | 3.9 |
| | Sometimes | 21 | 13.7 |
| | Always | 9 | 5.9 |
Delivering services to the clients within reasonable time frame with regard to the procedures of workings is one manifestation of being responsive to the demands of the service recipients. In relation to this respondents asked whether the service given timely to the community with regard to the procedures’ of workings. Accordingly an estimate of 61(39.9%) respondents replied that the public institution never gives a timely service to the service recipients with regard to the procedures’ of workings and around 56(36.6%) replied the office gives a timely service to the constituents’ on rare occasions and on the other hand around 6(3.9%) responded that they can’t decide whether the office gives a timely service to the constituents’ or not and about 21(13.7%) reported that the office gives a timely service to the constituents’ some times while around 9(5.9%) reported that the office gives a timely service to the constituents’ always. From this the researcher understands that the office lags behind in delivering effective and efficient services within reasonable time frame with regard to the procedures of workings. And this affects the governance system in the realm of service provision.

In contrary to this survey Mezgebe (2007) argued that institutions should be approachable to their clients and serve them within a reasonable time frame and the procedures of workings need to be on time.

**Table 20: Perception of respondents on how likely is the city’s urban planning and development office solves the most important problems**

| Item                                                                 | Description   | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. How likely is the city’s urban planning and development office solves the most important urban planning and development problems you identified? | Very fast     | 12        | 7.8     |
|                                                                      | Fast          | 26        | 17.0    |
|                                                                      | Very slow     | 55        | 35.9    |
|                                                                      | Slow          | 50        | 32.7    |
|                                                                      | Medium        | 10        | 6.5     |
|                                                                      | Total         | 153       | 100.0   |

Source: Survey, 2013

Prioritizing problems that need quick fixation and urgent response are critical in improving governance in service delivery. And it helps for the policy makers (service providers) to devise policies so as to adjust the policies in order to deal with the most important problems. In relation to this respondents were requested to know whether the office solves the most important problems related to its workings. So, an estimate of 12(7.8%) respondents reported that the office solves most important problems related to its workings always and about 26(17%) respondents reported that the office solves most important problems in a fast manner and on the other hand around 55(35.9%) replied that the office solves most important problems very slowly and about 50 (32.7) reported that it solves the problem slowly.
and around 10(6.5%) reported that the office is medium in solving most important problems. From this one can understand that the overwhelming majority of respondents lay in between slow and very slow. This shows that the office lags behind in identifying and solving the most important problems related to the workings of the office which has negatively affects the workings of the office to undertake the responsibilities in a transparent manner. This situation creates a problem in ensuring good atmosphere for the strive of consolidating the practice of good governance in the given office. The office need to prioritize the most important problems related to the functioning of the office so as to pave the way for practicing good governance.

According to the personal observation conducted the office is very slow in fixing the most important problems related to the workings of the office quickly.

Mechanism to accept suggestions from the community

Table 21: Perception of respondents on mechanism to accept suggestions from the community

| Item                          | Description | Frequency | Percent |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. Is the office having suggestion box? | Yes         | 98        | 64.1    |
|                               | No          | 55        | 35.9    |
| Total                         |             | 153       | 100.0   |

Source: Survey, 2013

Having suggestion box in a given office is crucial in that it helps to accept the suggestions given in the box and to entertain the diverse suggestions and opinions for warded by the constituents which is crucial to include the suggestions given in the plans and programs and more importantly to adjust (modify) the plans, programs and general workings of the office by taking in to account the suggested ideas and it plays its role in fostering responsiveness and generally that of enough governance .As the result in the above survey shows an estimate of 98(64.1%) respondents replied that the office has a suggestion box. So from the above result of the survey the researcher understand that the office has a suggestion box. But this situation is subjected to whether the service users have an exposer in service using to the office. The result on the second question in the above table shows 55(35.9%) of the respondents responded as the office does not have a suggestion box. From this one can understand that the office has a mechanism of accepting the suggestions of clients using suggestion box. But, the respondents said that even if this is so the office did not see what was suggested in the box and collect it on the specified time frame. As a result of this it did not entertain the diverse suggestions given by the clients in the box. This situation has a serious implication in which it undermines the effective and efficient service delivery. This situation on its part plays its part in hindering the strive for enhancing enough governance and particularly that of responsiveness.

4.7 Impediments of good governance and measures taken to improve good governance

As literatures pointed out there are different bottle necks in the strive for fostering good governance mainly in local level governments which is mostly related to administrative problems, Capacity and technical problems as well as rent seeking behavior and corruption from the part of the service providers as well as
unfair treatment of among the service recipients by the service providers.

Table 22: Perception of respondents on impediments of good governance and measures taken to improve good governance in the realm of service provision

| Item                                                                 | Description         | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|---------|
| 1. Are there impediments that influence good governance with regard to transparency and responsiveness in the office of land administration? | Never               | 23        | 15.0    |
|                                                                      | Rarely              | 30        | 19.6    |
|                                                                      | I can't decide      | 6         | 3.9     |
|                                                                      | Some times          | 34        | 22.2    |
|                                                                      | Always              | 60        | 39.2    |
|                                                                      | Total               | 153       | 100.0   |
| 2. The land administration office takes measures when ever problems encountered | Never               | 106       | 69.3    |
|                                                                      | Rarely              | 29        | 19.0    |
|                                                                      | I can't decide      | 2         | 1.3     |
|                                                                      | Always              | 16        | 10.5    |
|                                                                      | Total               | 153       | 100.0   |
| 3. Are there obstacles that influence good governance (transparency and responsiveness) in the office of urban planning and development? | Never               | 21        | 13.7    |
|                                                                      | Rarely              | 27        | 17.6    |
|                                                                      | I can't decide      | 2         | 1.3     |
|                                                                      | Some times          | 25        | 16.3    |
|                                                                      | Always              | 78        | 51.0    |
|                                                                      | Total               | 153       | 100.0   |
| 4. The urban planning and development office takes measures when ever problems occurred | Never               | 72        | 47.1    |
|                                                                      | Rarely              | 47        | 30.7    |
|                                                                      | I can't decide      | 5         | 3.3     |
|                                                                      | Some times          | 25        | 16.3    |
|                                                                      | Always              | 4         | 2.6     |
|                                                                      | Total               | 153       | 100.0   |

Source: survey 2013

In relation to this in the above table respondents were asked whether there are challenges in the office of land administration. Accordingly 23(15%) of the respondents responded that the office never faces challenges and around 30(19.6%) replied that there are challenges in the office rarely and about 6(3.9%) responded that they can’t decide whether there are challenges in the office or not and on the other hand an estimate of 34(22.2%) reported that there are challenges in the office some times while around 60(39.2%) respondents reported that challenges prevail always. Large size of respondents lay in
between some times and mainly always. From this the researcher understands that there are impediments’ that influence good governance with regard to transparency and responsiveness in the office. They said the challenges are related to administrative problems, the service providers are not capacitated enough and technically the staff is not well equipped, the resource available is also not fair enough to carry out every workings related to the office.

There is also a problem of accessing information to the public so information if not reached to the society effectively and efficiently., un equal treatment of service recipients because there are service providers who serve they know firstly instead of serving all citizens impartially, rent seeking and corruption which is mostly related to nepotism, bribery and prioritizing self advantage technical problems and soon are main challenges.

In relation to this issue respondents also asked whether the office of land administration takes measures so as to tackle these problems. Accordingly an estimate of 106(69%) sample respondents reported that the office never takes measures in dealing with the challenges and about 29(19%) replied that the office takes measures rarely and around 2(1.3%) reported that they can’t decide whether the office takes measures or not and around 16(10.5%) replied that the office takes measures always. From this survey one can understand that the office is lagging behind in dealing with the prevailed challenges of good governance related to responsiveness and transparency. Hence, transparency and responsiveness had compromised in the selected sub cities which are the most critical elements of good governance.

In relation to the challenges of good governance Key informants of interview said there were certain challenges previously which are mostly related to the system of land distribution which previously distributed to the leaders of the Tabia in which they did not fulfilled the requirements to posses land which now created a big problem to fix this problem. So, land is a major factor to become fundamental factor in spoiling the system of governance in the sub cities.Inaddition to that issue informants also add that there was a challenge in assigning the right person in the right place which is related to capacity of the civil servants (service providers) and a problem not going in parallel with the Business Process Reengineering, lack of support and follow up to the service providers in relation to their duty.

From the side of service users there was a preparation by the service users to posses land by disregarding the established rules and regulations of the land administration and urban planning and possessing it in unlawful (illegal) manner , lack of genuine and committed civil servant (service provider) which is related to teaching the service users about the rules and regulations ,rent seeking behavior and corruption practice from the side of service providers which is mainly related to bribery, nepotism and discrimination, not serving individuals who present their dissatisfaction and complaints in proper way and on time, problem of prioritizing self advantage ( not putting citizens interest first),problem of work ethics and loving your job, lack of spirit of service giving, lack of awareness about the rights and responsibilities’ from the part of the community, the participation of the community was insignificant for improving the atmosphere of governance ,not solving the complaints of the users, the limited and even if the laws governing the system prevailed there is a big gap in implementing(enforcing) what was devised.

They added that low capacity which is related to limited technical and human resources ,low commitment from the side of service providers, corruptors, low payment for the employees and unfair treatment of service users by the providers are the main hindrances’ for
improving good governance (transparency and responsiveness). Generally the main reasons that hindered for improving the governance system of the land administration were shortage of material resources and human resources, low capacity or competence of the public office, skill and knowledge, dishonesty and irresponsiveness and corruption.

Similar to this result of the analysis Scott (2012) argued that improving the coverage of quality basic services is a major concern for states and donors. Some of the challenges to ensuring national, equitable coverage are a lack of skilled personnel and unsustainable financial provision.

By the same token Katsriku (2012) argued that good Governance demands of leadership, the commitment to ensuring that all employees have the skills, knowledge and experience that they require to perform well. This also means having the ability to develop and manage people and be able to assess their performance.

In the third question again respondents also requested which is related to whether there are challenges that influence good governance (responsiveness and transparency) in the office of urban planning and development. Accordingly, an estimate of 21(13.7%) respondents reported that the office never comes up with challenges that influence good governance (transparency and responsiveness) and on the other hand about 27(17.6%) reported that the office has challenges on rare occasions and around 25(16.3%) replied that sometimes the office has challenges and around 78(51%) reported the office comes up with good governance challenges always. From this the researcher understands that the office have a big problem of governance impediments’. The respondents said that the major good governance evil in the office of urban development is corruption and the rent seeking behavior of the service providers and they list others like administrative problem, lack of capacity among the service providers and the office is not well equipped in equipments and scarcity trained human resource. In relation to this respondents requested whether the office takes remedial measures when such challenges encountered.

Accordingly an estimate of 72(47.1%) reported that the public institution never takes measures in dealing with the listed bottle necks in the given office and on the other hand around 47(30.7%) respondents replied that the office takes measures on rare occasions and about 5(3.3%) replied that they can’t decide whether the office takes measures or not and around 25(16.3%) replied that the office takes measures some times and an estimate of 4(2.6%) responded that the office deals with the challenges always when ever every challenge encounters at the office. From this survey one can understand that the office is lagging behind in tackling the prevalent bottle necks which are already listed in the above discussions. The situation highly undermines the move towards intensifying the endeavor for ensuring good governance particularly that of responsiveness and transparency especially the wide spread of corruption and rent seeking in the public offices is a major problem which highly undermines the move towards improving enough governance. This situation has created a serious implication for effective and efficient service delivery and improvement in local development in the given sub cities. This situation needs to be tackled so as to minimize the challenges.

According to the key informants of interview they said the office made an endeavor to deal with the challenges of good governance (transparency and responsiveness) firstly by participating the community through aggressive mobilization so as to develop the feeling of sense of ownership as far as the public are advantageous (beneficial) when a good environment for good governance created and vice versa. And they said that they participate the community through carrying out successive
meetings and conducting panel discussions so as to identify the setbacks and training the community about the rules, regulations as well as the existing proclamations in relation to land administration and urban planning and with this regard they also said that a good move is also made through introducing and implementing Business Process Reengineering. They also add that to deal with the impediments so as to improve the situation of good governance (transparency and responsiveness) trainings were conducted to train the service providers (employees) in regard to how to handle the service users, how to improve service delivery system and provide them with the available information but problem of continuity prevailed.

On the other extreme according to other key informants of service providers especially in the office of urban planning and development informants said that in this office the service users are not satisfied because there is a delay of decisions, improper response by the service providers as a result of this situation people are complaining every day. And other informants said a good move had been achieved in bringing about good governance which is related to users previously who did not have owner ship data made to get an ownership data, accepting and responding to complaints, replacing the service providers (employees) especially engineers who spoil the system of workings which is mainly because of the rent seeking behavior and governance and more importantly participating the community in every affairs related to good governance at large.

They add that rent seeking is rampant in land administration and its related workings. Efforts had been made in regard to creating awareness, improving the skill and capacity of the employees and informing and training the community about the rules, regulations and proclamations, building the developmental agents (lematawi gugele), undertaking continuous evaluation of day to day result based performances with the employees, under taking trainings with community , using the aggressively mobilized community for further workings and questioning the service users through questioner so as to measure the level of their satisfaction and under taking a thorough discussions through meetings, panel discussions and others.But, still there is a big problem in sustaining what was performed so far. An agreement reached with the stake holders so as to improve good governance (transparency and responsiveness) with the government bodies of justice sector, security members and the police department but problems of sustainability remains a challenge.

In relation to this survey a study conducted by Serdar and Varsha (2008) confirmed that despite the fact that important progresses so far made the process of building good governance is at its early stage, which has been facing serious and complex bottlenecks. Major bottlenecks in good governance with regard to transparency and responsiveness include lack of adequate awareness about human rights among the public, the limited democratic culture and experience in the country, limited participation of citizens in governance, lack of adequate and appropriate laws and policies in some areas, capacity limitations of law enforcement and governance organs of the government, etc.

By the same token Zemelak (2009) asserts “The most serious bottleneck for Ethiopian good local governance is capacity and local government institutions of the country have high shortage of qualified man power.” Many weredas have been witnessing a deficiency in achieving feasible local development and delivering an efficient and effective service for their grass root people and marginalized sections of society (Helvetas, 2008).

In relation to this Yilmaz and Venugopal (2008) argued that Local administrations are simply overwhelmed with the high amounts of responsibilities and tasks they should
implement. Similarly the authors argued that these are topped by weak access to quality capacity building programs and a general lack of practical tools and procedures such as related to participatory planning, monitoring and evaluation and inexistent coordination and management, that lead to inefficient structures and procedures and lack of capacity on the part of councilors at local level to review the planning, budgeting and service delivery functions.

By the same token Dickovick and Tegegne (2010), on their paper argued that the capacity of local government in formulating policies, and implementing strategies and development activities is an essential part of the governance structure at local/regional level. Despite the fact that there is a clear capacity gap in running and managing different responsibilities under the umbrella of decentralized governance. Apart from financial and budgetary problems, woredas face serious lack of competent, trained personnel and availability of required number of staff in a particular situation.

Similarly a study by Meheret (2007) cited in Dickovick and Tegegne (2010), is indicative of the fact that though there are some variations among localities in this regard, local administrators and councilors repeatedly suggested that there are many vacant positions that remain unfilled in their respective localities; this has serious implications for local service delivery and local economic development. The reasons for the presence of vacant positions is the lack of adequate budget to hire new staff members and the inability to remunerate well any prospective staffers that might come to the woreda. This means the woredas lack competitiveness in service delivery and economic development.

Marito and Andrew (2008), in their study argued that many woredas lack skilled personnel since administrative and technical posts created to handle administrative responsibilities have not been fully filled or have been filled by untrained personnel with limited capacity.

4.24: Table 23 Performance report of the urban planning and development office (2004 and 2005 e.c) Report of nine months performances

| Objectives                                      | Measurement | Yearly plan | Plan of nine months | Performance of nine months |
|------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Giving site plans for gifted and sale       | Number 360  | 270         | 220                 | 238                       | 411                       |
| 2. Leaving the collateral given for guarantee to construct house | Number 324  | 390         | 247                 | 238                       | 486                       |
| 3. Giving work license for new beginners’ and renewal | Number 780  | 590         | 435                 | 254                       | 574                       |
| 4. Users who given other area                  | Number 96   | 66          | 96                  | 10                        | 156                       |
| 5. Giving site plans                           | Number 240  | 160         | 134                 | 100                       | 234                       |
| 6. Providing owner ship data                   | Number 840  | 180         | 498                 | 1.17                      | 322                       |
7. Observing the level of construction and Leaving the collateral given for it

| Number | 12 | 9 | 1 | _ |

8. Opening new files

| Number | 600 | 450 | 3501 | 123 | 674 |

9. Registering excess (undistributed) area

| Number | 48 | 32 | 32 | 29 | 5 |

10. Searching missed files and serving users

| Number | 12 | 8 | 12 | 17 | 47 |

11. Forming agreement on condominium construction

| Number | 309 | _ | 309 | _ | 294 |

Source: Ayder sub city office of urban planning and development (2005)

**Chapter Five: Conclusions and Recommendations**

**5.1 Conclusion**

Respondents were asked their perception on the practice of good governance with regard to the two key indicators of good governance that are transparency and responsiveness.

Their perception on responsiveness and transparency in the given public offices were assessed with regard to level of satisfaction on accessibility of information, clearness and openness from the public institution to the constituents’, responsiveness and transparency of the given public institutions to the given sub cities dwellers’, to what extent are the constituents are satisfied by the public institutions with regard to service delivery, the main hindrances’ that undermine for the practice of good governance (transparency and responsiveness).

Accordingly, based on the already analyzed data in chapter 4, the following conclusions are drawn.

For a given public office to be transparent in front of the constituents (service users) it must be open for its actions and a responsibility which is help full to be trusted, faith full and have a confidence on the service providers. For the service users to be transparent in shouldering their rights and responsibilities in a transparent manner. Openness is one manifestation of transparency plays a pivotal role in minimizing corruption because if service providers be open they are just manifesting transparency. However in the given study area the office of land administration as well as the office of urban planning and development are lagged behind in ensuring openness as a measurement of transparency. Generaly, the office did not do much to consolidate good governance in this regard. Accessibility of information will help the public to have all important information on land that equipped them to give appropriate decisions on land, builds informed citizens and helps to create awareness of the stake holders. But, in the selected public institutions there was inaccessibility of information concerning to those who will be affected by any decision and enforcements taken in the workings. Information was not freely and directly accessible to them. The office did not ensure whether relevant information on land is accessible to the public. In an overall the office does not make information concerning land accessible to community members and the general public. In addition the office did not have a capacity to disseminate information to the constituents.

These manifestations of transparency got compromised in the office of land administration and urban planning and development. This was affecting the atmosphere of governance of land
administration in the realm of service provision. Generally it can be concluded that the society in the given study area were not well informed about the land administration and urban planning and development in the sphere of service delivery and have not capacity to participate in decisions as a result of lack of enough information and with regard to these issues the offices did not ensure these manifestations of transparency and generally of good governance.

Constituents (service users) in the given public offices were not communicated information in easily understandable forms and media. The office did not ensures communicating the information in easily understandable forms and media. From this survey one can understand that the office is lagging behind in communicating information in easy and understandable manner to the service users which negatively affects in creating informed citizens in the realm of service provision. If the communities get consulted in the policies and programs the society will forward policy options and will strive for the better implementations of the policies and programs and they feel sense of owner ship. The offices failed to use the opportunity that will come from different corners that enables to design better programs. Accordingly; the office is lagging behind to ensure good governance.

The office lacks institutional capacity to perform its tasks which is related to lack of technical instruments, poor data recording system and poor involvement from the part of the society which are help full for effective and efficient service provision as a result of this the office lacks competency in undertaking the overall workings within the office. The office is lagging behind in making the rules and regulations easily accessible which plays its part in hindering the office from being transparent. This situation influences the strive made for improving enough governance. As a result of this the society did not know what is expected from him (her) and the right he (she) supposed to get. The existing rules, regulations, proclamations and policies were not well organized and made accessible to increase the knowledge and awareness of the society concerning these rules, procedures, proclamations and policy on land administration in the realm of service provision. The office did not carry out discussions and consultations regarding to the rules and proclamations of the land and their contents and structures with the general public. The committee of the office of the given public offices are not transparent for their decisions mainly related to that the offices did not shoulder openness for its actions and responsibilities, not making the information accessible and lack of clearness in which the public become un aware and non evaluative because of lack of transparent decision by the respective authorities in which it plays its part in lagging behind the strive for consolidating (upgrading) good governance.

Responsiveness is one of the variables used to assess governance of the land administration and urban planning. Responsiveness of government means that institutions and processes try to serve all stakeholders within a reasonable timeframe. Responsiveness also implies the receptiveness of institutions to the demands of their stakeholders and institutions should be approachable to their clients and serve them within a reasonable time frame. In this study responsiveness used to assess timeless of response on problems, conflicts and complaints in the realm of service provision, prioritizing needs and desires of the general public (consistency), Grievances handling mechanism, Assessing needs and interests, Appropriateness of response and Prioritizing problems as well as preferences. Accordingly in these listed manifestations as the result of the survey shows that the offices does not tries to serve all constituents' with hin aspecified time frame. By the same token the offices are not receptive to the demands of their constituents’.
In the given study area the hindrances’ of good governance (transparency and responsiveness) were also assessed. Accordingly, according to the key informants of questioner and interview they said there are challenges that hinder for improving good governance in the given sub cities that are low commitment from the civil servants, not well trained staff (low capacity), technical and rampant rent seeking and corrupt behavior from the side of the employees which is mostly related to nepotism, bribery and a delay of decisions, discrimination (unfair treatment of the constituents’), limited technical and human resources, dishonesty, low skill and knowledge, delay on working hours, not putting citizens interest first (prioritizing self advantage), Good practices such as having suggestion box and information desk in the given offices were praised in this study. There were certain endeavours made for upgrading good governance in the given sub cities. But, the endeavours made are not satisfactory and fair enough.

5.2 Recommendations

- Based on the findings of the study and conclusions made the following recommendations and policy implications are forwarded to different level of decision makers and potential researchers in the area.
- The offices should be equipped with adequate human as well as materials resources that can facilitate the effective and efficient service provision as the same time structures of the workings of the offices need to be adjusted in order to be suited with the services that are going to be delivered. Enough equipments can be provided by the city municipality, city administration, via aggressive mobilization of the community to contribute at large and other stakeholders like NGOS. The offices need to recruit and assign well trained and professional civil servants/bureaucrats who follow and abide by ethical work conducts for effective, efficient provision of quality services to the constituents’.
- Maintaining skilled and knowledgeable staff through leadership, training, development and commitment to continuous improvement in the delivery of services which can be done via empowering and building the capacity of service providers which helps to assign the capacitated human power at the right place in the land administration and urban planning and development by giving long and short term training that helps them for providing effective and efficient services, consistent, transparent, responsive decisions and proportional decision. Accordingly, the city administration particularly the given sub cities in collaboration with higher level governments and other stakeholders for example NGOS should organize short and long term seminars for both service providers in the given offices in order to upgrade professional capabilities and provide efficient, effective, impartial and quality services to the constituents’.
- As it has been discussed in the conclusion part for a given office or institution to perform its tasks in general and to be transparent and responsive to its stakeholders and to the public in particular must be open for its actions and responsibilities to its stake holders. Provision of information is pivotal to make genuine decisions in land administration and urban planning and development to create an aware and informed community in general. So there is a need to make information accessible, relevant and enough to the public as well as training the community in information systems. Information can be communicated using different mechanisms to provide such as by conducting meetings and successive
panel discussions’ with the constituents’ by posting different in formations on notice board and applying the current systems of ICT for example by having web site which are help full to provide effective and efficient service provision.

• The communities need to be consulted, trained and informed in the policies , programs, rules, regulations as well as the proclamations and programs in relation to what goods and services are to be provided, who the beneficiaries are, how much they cost, how well they are provided and any other critical issues related to service provision through conducting awareness creation campaigns, through meetings and undertaking panel discussions and conducting extensive capacity building efforts via successive trainings for the service users which is help full for the constituents’ in order not to disregard the laws and abide by them as well as to forward policy options and strive for the better implementations of the policies and programs and feel sense of owner ship in the realm of service provision. The office need to prioritize the problems which need quick fixation and urgent response. This can be ensured/done by giving priority to the most important problems encountered’ as far as it is a critical element in improving good governance in service delivery and justice should reach at the door of the constituents’.

• The offices need to improve the capacity and ethical disposition of the respective administrators so that they are capable of providing easy, fast, accurate, quality and affordable services and build mutual trust between the government and the public through the provision of information with guaranteed easy access to accurate and adequate information. The offices need to conduct meetings and conferences where the general public can easily get and interactively provide information for decision making on service provision in the offices.

• There is a need for cleasness in rules and regulations which restricts the action of the bureaucrats in order not to abuse the rights of the constituents’ and their power. In order to improve the responsiveness’ of the office the bureaucrats should be at the work place on time and the responses they give should be proper. This can be done by devising strict regulatory mechanisms and evaluation system and performances need to be evaluated on the specified time frame.

• The diverse needs and preferences of the society should be assessed in order to clearly distinguish the desires and preferences of the constituents’ in which it can be carried out via meetings, by having suggestion box and the mare prevalence of this cannot guarantee it rather collecting the suggestions via meetings, panel discussions, questionnaire and suggestion box and giving quick response based on the specified time frame, through providing effective, efficient and quality services, by prioritizing problems, by preparing questionnaire so as to know and level the perception of constituents’ on service provision and also through interview mechanism. Having conducting these the offices need to incorporate and accommodate these needs and preferences in to plans and different projects by involving the public at large when plans and projects going to be done. The implementation of the office should also be according to these needs and preferences of the constituents’.

• The rules governing the workings of the two offices must be clear to all stakeholders before service has
undertaken in relation to how services to be delivered, what kind of services and to whom will be delivered and there should be a consensus on them. This can be done by announcing the public to discuss their concern on it by preparing meetings and so on. In addition to this the time for service provision must also clearly known by announcing on meetings, posting notices, preparing hard copies and disseminating to the constituents’ by broadcasting using microphones on the day that the service will be provided.

- The offices need to fight corruption and rent seeking behavior through aggressively mobilizing the community via conducting awareness creation programs and campaigns for both the bureaucrats/service providers and the constituents’ and awaring the constituents that getting efficient and effective services is their right and not to assure their right of getting services through bribery and other meanness and training and awaring other stake holders about the evils of corruption and taking measures for the bureaucrats who commit corruption and rent seeking.

- Enforcement of decisions should strictly made in accordance to the established laws, rules and regulations. In addition to this constituents’ should aware that they get services provided in accordance to the established laws, rules, regulations as well as proclamations. Because, good land administration and urban planning and development governance needs honest, participatory and serious application of certain principles to land and urban planning and development policy, land and urban planning related legislation, administration, management and reforms.

- The regional Government should assess critically the capacity constraint at the sub cities and should provide comprehensive capacity building to the sub cities. This will enable the lower Governments to develop their capacity in order to deliver effective quality service to the constituents’.

- The regional Government should assess critically the capacity constraint at the sub cities and should provide comprehensive capacity building to the sub cities. This will enable the lower Governments to develop their capacity in order to deliver effective quality service to the constituents’.

- The offices should strengthen their endeavor so as to consolidate and sustain the efforts made so far by incorporating the above details in to effect in the realm of service provision. The inter play of different stake holders for instance the city municipality, the sub cities administration and city administration as well is commendable to strengthen good governance in general and responsive governance practice in particular in the city.

- Little research had been done on the area of good governance at the local level more specifically with regard to transparency and responsiveness. The investigator had made a little progress in assessing the practice of good governance in the sub cities. The researcher therefore, advices for other researchers who have an interest to conduct their research on good governance in lower level administration by giving an attention on the selected public institutions.
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APPENDIX A: Questionnaire prepared for respondents

Dear respondents

The purpose of this study is to gather relevant data that can be used to assess the issue and practice of good governance in your city administration with specific regard to the city municipality. Your participation is very much appreciated and will allow the researcher to focus on critical issues related to the good governance practice in your city administration specifically the city municipality. Your responses have high importance for research purpose and may be important in prescribing policies to improve performance of good governance. This study is conducted as partial fulfillment of the requirement for MA degree in development studies.

The main intention of this questionnaire is to assess the practice of good governance in the city administration with specific regard to the city municipality. The study is purely an academic and in no way affects your personality. Your genuine view, frank opinion, and timely response are quite important in determining the success of this study. Therefore you are kindly requested to extend your cooperation by providing relevant information and filling the following questionnaire.

General Guidelines

- Make your response on the space provided by putting (□)
- Give your valuable suggestion for those questions
- Be aware that the study has nothing to do with any religious or political stand.
- No need of writing your name
- Please follow the instruction provided for each part
- Do not leave blanks
- Try to answer all questions
Thank you in advance. Have a nice time!

Part one: individual characteristic of the households
1. Sex: Male □ □ Female □ □
2. Age: ___ □ □
3. Education level
   3.1 Never enrolled in school □ □
   3.2 Grade 1 to 4 □ □
   3.3 Grade 5 to 8 □ □
   3.4 Grade 9 to 12 □ □
   3.5 Diploma □ □
   3.6 Degree and above □ □

Part two: Questions pertaining to transparency in Land Administration Office in the realm of service provision

1. The office is open to its decisions.
   □ □ □ □ □ I cannot decide
   □ □ □ □ □ Always
2. Information flow free or directly accessible to those who will be affected by such decisions or enforcement
   □ □ □ □ I cannot decide
   □ □ □ □ always
3. The office is ensuring that all relevant information is accessible to the society
   □ □ □ □ I cannot decide
   □ □ □ □ always
4. The office provides enough information for the public
   □ □ □ □ I cannot decide
   □ □ □ □ Always
5. The information communicated in easily understandable forms and media
   □ □ □ □ I cannot decide
6. You ever consulted by the office before a program or policy related to land is implemented

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Always

7. The land administration office has capacity for the dissemination of information to the public about the various land administration reform programs

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Always

8. You obtain easily the rules and regulations of the land administration

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Always

9. The decision given by the land administration committee is transparent

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Always

10. Enforcement is conducted in accordance with established rules and regulations.

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Always

11. You ever consulted about the land proclamation and its provisions

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Always

12. Do you believe land proclamation minimize rent seeking activities? Please elaborate your view

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
13. Your city administration train community (sub-city) members in information that support land administration activities.

☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ I cannot decide
☐ Sometimes ☐ Always

**Part three: Questions pertaining to Responsiveness in land administration in the sphere of service delivery**

1. The office is delivering a timely service when a land related conflicts are raised among the community members

☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ I cannot decide
☐ Sometimes ☐ Always

2. Public complaints solved on the specified time frame

☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ I cannot decide
☐ Sometimes ☐ Always

3. You ever observed a delay of justice from the administrators when land caused conflicts

Occur

☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ I cannot decide
☐ Sometimes ☐ always

4. The sub city administration solves the most important land problems you identified

☐ Very Fast ☐ Fast ☐ Very slow ☐ slow
5. How can you evaluate the sub city land administration office in terms of responsiveness?

- [ ] Excellent
- [ ] good
- [ ] Poor
- [ ] Very good
- [ ] Fair
- [ ] Very Poor

6. You have a confidence on the capacity of sub city land administration committee

- [ ] Never
- [ ] Rarely
- [ ] I cannot decide
- [ ] Sometimes
- [ ] Always

7. The office have a suggestion box in handling grievances

- [ ] Never
- [ ] Rarely
- [ ] I cannot decide
- [ ] Sometimes
- [ ] Always

8. The services delivered are consistent with the citizens desires and preferences (prioritizes needs)

- [ ] Never
- [ ] Rarely
- [ ] I cannot decide
- [ ] Sometimes
- [ ] Always

**Part four: Questions pertaining to transparency in urban planning and development office in the realm of service provision**

1. The urban planning and development office distribute land for investment and urbanization in a clear way for the general public
2. You ever consulted by the office before a program or policy related to urban planning and development is implemented

☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ I cannot decide ☐ Sometimes ☐ Always

3. The urban planning and development office Provides services to all through a transparent manner

☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ I cannot decide ☐ Sometimes ☐ Always

4. The urban planning and development is free of rent seeking activities

☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ I cannot decide ☐ Sometimes ☐ Always

5. The existing rules and regulations of the urban planning and development office minimizes nepotism

☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ I cannot decide ☐ Sometimes ☐ Always

6. The office have adequate materials and human resources for effective and efficient Service provision

Yes ☐ ☐
7. The institution makes the planning for urban planning and development accessible to community members
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. If your answer for question no 7 is yes, order in terms of their accessibility?
   1. Data on unallocated land
   2. Land-use plans
   3. Providing Ownership data
   4. Time for allocation
   5. Giving license
   6. Giving site plans
   7. Opening new files
   8. Giving clearance for urban development
   9. Registering excess land
   10. Searching missed files and serving properly
   11. Observing the degree (level) of the constructed building and leaving the collateral given for guarantee
   Others specify __________________________________________________________
                                                                                   __________________________________________________________

9. There is an information services/desk in the office of urban planning and development office
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

10. There is any means of publicizing information on urban planning and development office
    Yes [ ] No [ ]
11. If your answer for question no 10 is yes, the institution makes information access using:

☐ Hard copy ☐ on line ☐ Meeting ☐ Notice board

12. The office is open to its decisions on urban planning and its development (expansion).

☐ Yes ☐ No

13. If your answer for question no 12 is yes, decisions on?

☐ Registering excess land ☐ Providing Ownership data ☐ Giving clearance
☐ Data on unallocated land ☐ Giving site plans ☐ Opening new files

14. There are mechanisms for community members to petition (appeal) against the decision made by the authorities

☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ I cannot decide
☐ Sometimes ☐ Always

15. Procedures for acquiring services are clear to all stakeholders

☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ I cannot decide
☐ Sometimes ☐ Always

16. The election of urban planning and development managers (administrators) are clear to the general public
17. Decisions are taken and enforced in accordance with the rules and regulations given

☐ Yes ☐ No

18. If your answer for question no 17 is no, why?

______________________________________________________________________

19. The office tries to take measures to improve transparency in general

☐ Yes ☐ . No

20. If your answer is yes, what type of mechanisms?

______________________________________________________________________

Part five: Questions pertaining to responsiveness in urban planning and Development in the realm of service provision

1. The office assesses the needs and preferences of different stakeholders’

☐ Yes ☐
2. If your answer for question no. 1 is yes, using what mechanism?

☐ Meeting ☐ Questionnaire ☐ Interv ☐ Suggestion box

3. The program implementation considers the needs and preferences of the public during project designing and planning.

☐ Strongly agree ☐ uncertain ☐ Disagree

☐ Agree ☐ strongly disagree

4. The office gives a timely response to the demands of the public

☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ I cannot decide

☐ Sometimes ☐ always

5. The office gives proper response

☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ I cannot decide

☐ Sometimes ☐ always

6. How can you evaluate the office in terms of responsiveness?

☐ Excellent ☐ good ☐ poor

☐ Very good ☐ Fair ☐ Very Poor
7. Do you believe that, there are responsive leaders (managers) in the in urban planning and development offices?

☐ Yes  ☐ no

8. If your answer for question no 7 is no, what are the reasons behind it?

☐ They did not get to their office on time  ☐ they did not give response on time

☐ They did not give appropriate response  ☐ they are not willing to serve the people

9. The city’s urban planning and development office solves the most important urban planning and development problems

☐ Very fast  ☐ Fast  ☐ Very slow  ☐ Slow

10. The office has a suggestion box

☐ Yes  ☐ No

11. Information given timely given

☑ Never  ☐ Rarely  ☐ I cannot decide

☐ Sometimes  ☐ always

Part six: Bottle necks in the achievement of good governance in the offices of land administration and urban planning and development in the realm of service provision
1. Are there impediments that influence good governance with regard to transparency and responsiveness in the office of land administration? If yes, list

☐ Yes  ☐ No

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

2. Are there obstacles that influence good governance (transparency and responsiveness) in the office of urban planning and development? If yes, list

☐ Yes  ☐ No

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

Part seven: Measures by the offices to consolidate good governance in the sphere of service Provision

1. The land administration office takes measures when ever problems encountered

☐ Yes  ☐ No

If yes, state
2. The urban planning and development office takes measures whenever problems occurred

☐ Yes  ☐ No

If yes, state
Interview Guide

Interview guide for the service providers

1. What can you say about the situation (practice) of good governance in your city administration?
2. What are the main governance evils of your city administration?
3. Is complaints and grievances responded on a given time interval?
4. Are the decisions of public officials open to the stakeholders?
5. How can you evaluate the office of urban planning and development in terms of Responsiveness?
6. How can you evaluate land administration office in terms of transparency?
7. Is information’s easily accessible and relevant to the people?
8. How widespread are corruption and bribe-taking in your sub city?
9. What are the major endeavors being done by your office to improve good governance Problems in the sub city?
10. What do you think are the major factors or restraints of transparency in the sub city?
11. Is there any endeavor made by your office to promote the practice of good governance in the Realm of service provision in the sub city? If there, please explain?