

Comparative Analysis of Institutional Capacity Self-Assessment among Local Governments in Dhankuta

Nodanath Trital¹

Abstract

This study compares local governments' institutional capacity self-assessment (LISA) scores in Dhankuta over four fiscal years. The objective is to compare and analyze the LISA scores and determine the status of institutional capacity of local governments to service delivery in Dhankuta. It focuses on comparative analysis of institutional capacity self-assessment. The methodology used in this study is descriptive and analytical approach. The secondary data from self-assessment reports are collected and analyzed with comparing the data of all local governments in Dhankuta over the four fiscal years. This study adopts an analytical descriptive approach and uses document review. The finding reveals that the overall status of local governments has gradually increased in LISA scores over the period. The findings reveal that Pakhribas municipality, Mahalaxmi municipality and Chhatar Jorpati rural municipality have claimed the highest institutional capacity in service delivery area with more than 90 percent self-assessed scores. Similarly, Pakhribas municipality has self-assessed the highest institutional capacity in overall score in FY 2077-78. Shahidbhumi rural municipality has self-assessed the highest process score in FY 2079-80. The Chhatar Jorpati rural municipality has self-assessed the highest quantitative scores among the local governments in FY 2079-80 among all the fiscal years.

Keywords: Institutional capacity, public service, self-assessment, service delivery

Introduction

Local Government Institutional Capacity Self-Assessment (LISA) Scores are collected and presented in four categories: the average, overall, process, and quantitative status. There are ten core areas of institutional capacity in local government determined to be assessed by self-assessment. Government management, organization, and administration, yearly budget and planning management, financial management, service delivery, judicial performance, physical infrastructure, social inclusion, environment protection, disaster management, and cooperation and coordination are the areas determined for self-assessment by Local-level Institutional Capacity Self-assessment (LISA) working procedure-2020 which was first implemented for this process since 2020 AD.

This study aims to compare and analyze the status of institutional capacity self-assessment of local governments in Dhankuta. The analytical comparative model is used in this

¹ Mr. Trital is a Section Officer at Curriculum Development Center, Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur, Nepal.
Email: noda.trital@tu.edu.np

study. It has been studied with document review and data analysis of secondary sources. Few researches have been carried out on the issues of indicators of local governments' institutional performance on service delivery, self-assessment provision, and indicators of LISA for local governments. Local people in Dhankuta have few insights about the status of local governments' institutional capacity for service delivery which has been self-assessed by the local governments and released by the MoFAGA. The status of effectiveness and quality of public service delivery at local governments in Dhankuta has not been studied, compared, and analyzed yet. The study endeavors to fill this gap by comparing the self-assessed scores of service delivery area and overall status of institutional capacity self-assessment results of local governments in the Dhankuta district. The status of core areas of local governments in Dhankuta district in the LISA report has not yet been compared and analyzed through the research. So, the issue of LISA has been identified for the study to reveal the facts of the local government's overall institutional capacity.

LISA reports have provided feedback to improve the institutional capacity and quality of services of local governments. The effectiveness of public service delivery depends on the capability, resources, inputs, and motivation of service providers in local government (Kharel, 2018). LISA report has focused the highest priority on service delivery with sixteen percent weightage. Information Communication and Technology (ICTs) can provide efficiency by decreasing costs and increasing productivity to enhance better-quality services for the citizens (Canares, 2016). Government management and organization and administration are the major areas of LISA assessment for efficient and effective service delivery. Sound political management is key to enhancing municipal service delivery and good local governance and has to translate to an improved quality of life for local communities. Good local government is vital with the popular saying that if local government fails, South Africa fails (Reddy, 2016). The provision of LISA has adopted the procedure to improve the institutional capacity of service delivery at the local level. Adeyemi (2013) states that local government in Nigeria is the third tier of government whose responsibility is to ensure effective service delivery to the people, and also enhance sustainable development at the grassroots. Hassan, Roberts & Joy (2013) have revealed that Ofu local government's performance by all indices does not justify the financial resources it has received from the federation account because the under-performance ranges from corruption to slow and inefficient administrative processes and inputs of people left out in policy designs.

This study has analyzed the overall, average, process, and quantitative status of institutional capacity self-assessment of local government and their performance in public service delivery during the LISA procedure in Dhankuta district. This study is limited to the status of district-level local governments in Dhankuta and particularly self-assessment scores self-assessed by local governments themselves and has compared the local governments' self-assessment reports of for four fiscal years published by the Ministry of Federal Affairs and General Administration (MoFAGA).

Some empirical researches are related to local government, service delivery and governance. Sibanda (2012) debates that conceptually customer-focused quality service delivery might pull local government authorities out of the poor service delivery trench that has come to furnish some municipal authorities with ineffective, inefficient, and dysfunctional. Effective corporate governance strives for good institutional ethics focusing on quality service delivery, and taking responsibility for any activities with fairness action. Tshiyoyo & Koma (2011) states

that countries should focus on improving the effective legislative and regulatory frameworks; sound intergovernmental linkages and structures; constant drive to make the system of local government more efficient and effective; engaging civil society on issues about local government; promoting citizen participation; and ensuring an increased role of knowledge-bearing groups and universities to promote good governance. Organizational development is a recurring structured evidence-based cyclical process and consists of initiative, assessment, diagnosis, implementation, and evaluation.

Similarly, Lamothe, et al (2008) states that the previous delivery mode is a strong predictor of the current service delivery arrangement and the impact of the transaction cost nature of services on production choice is conditioned on past decisions. In this situation, the center-periphery model under dependency theory suggests a significant difference in the level of development and economic activities between the center and the periphery. As per the center-periphery model, the center attracts labor from the periphery, while the periphery depends on the capital from the center in the form of wages. Hooghe & Marks (2001) revealed that there is no convergence about how the governance should be organized for the re-allocation of authority upwards, downwards, and sideways from central states. They stated that two types of multi-level governance co-exist in different locations. Governance type one conceives of multi-task jurisdictions, mutually exclusive jurisdictions in a relatively stable system with an organized and limited number of jurisdictions that are intended to be permanent. Governance type two conceives an unlimited number of task-specific overlapping jurisdictions that are intended to be flexible. In another research, Briffault (1996) has stated that real local autonomy is constrained but the local government system fails to provide a means for addressing regional problems and has provided the solution for metropolitan governance problem as a mixed strategy that would both reduce the significance of existing local boundaries and create elected regionally bounded governments to address matters of regional significance. In this context, good corporate responsibility in practice may take a top-down approach to ethical conduct and engage the authority with a long-term strategy of the institution to reach the mission, vision, and goals.

In the above discussion, all researchers have focused on local government and governance for service delivery to the people. Local governments' institutional capacity self-assessment concept and provision has implemented recently in Nepal since 2020 AD. However, people feel the local government is the nearest government among the three tiers of government in the federal system. They are participated in the democratic electoral process to elect their representatives for local governments to deliver public services at the local level. Good governance expects effective and efficient public services from the government which depends on the effective leadership of people representatives. So, the rationale of this study is to compare and analyze the status of the institutional capacity of local governments using the LISA reports for four fiscal years.

Materials and Methods

The comparative analytical model is used in this study. It is based on a review of documents and data analysis of secondary sources. The quantitative research approach has been adopted using information from the LISA web portal during four fiscal years, i.e. FY 2076-77 up to FY 2079-80 and analyzed the data with a comparison of all indicators within the municipalities and rural municipalities of Dhankuta. The data has collected from secondary sources to gather necessary information and analyzed the data. A comparative method to analyze the information has been applied during the study. A document review of LISA Working Procedure-2020, Local Government Operation Act-2074, and other legal documents with some local government related empirical research literature.

The study area is chosen in Dhankuta district, located in the Koshi province of Nepal. It is divided into three urban municipalities and four rural municipalities. The area and population of the two censuses are presented in the table below:

Table 1

Division of local governments in Dhankuta

Type	Name	Area	Population in 2011	Population in 2021
Urban	Dhankuta	111	36,619	35983
Urban	Pakhribas	144.29	22078	19104
Urban	Mahalaxmi	129	24,800	22182
Rural	Sangurigadhi	147.6	21,536	19561
Rural	Chaubise	147.6	19,283	17677
Rural	Shahidbhumi	99.55	18,760	17767
Rural	Chhathar Jorpati	102.83	18,322	16456
Others	Organizational		2,014	1869
District	Dhankuta	892	163,412	150599

Note. Census report, 2011, 2021

Table 1 shows the comparison of the population status of Dhankuta. There was one lakh 63 thousand 4 hundred 12 population living in Dhankuta in the census report of 2011 but the number of the population decreased to 1 lakh 50 thousand 5 hundred 99 in the 2021 census report. The Dhankuta municipality has the highest population followed by Mahalaxmi municipality during a decade. This data shows the decreasing status of the population in the district.

Provision of assessment level and weightage ratio

There are three levels of assessment category for the LISA process that are determined in the working procedure. Quantitative status has allocated 45 percent weightage followed by process status with 34 percent weightage and overall status has allocated 21 percent weightage. The emphasis on service delivery during the self-assessment has been given the most and provided the largest weightage score and most indicators included followed by the physical infrastructure area with the second largest weightage score.

Table 2

The weightage ration at assessment levels

Assessment level	Weightage ratio	Basis of result analysis and weightage determination
Overall status	21 percentage	Conditions for each indicator: Condition 1 : 0, Condition 2: 0.5, Condition 3: 0.75, Condition 4: 1
Process status	34 percentage	Conditions for each indicator: Weak: 0, Normal: 0.5, Best: 1
Quantitative status	45 percentage	Conditions for each indicator: Weak: 0, Normal: 0.5, Best: 1

Note. Local level self-assessment working procedure-2020 (Annex-1)

Table 2 shows the weightage ratio at assessment levels. Three assessment levels are determined in the working procedure. Quantitative status has allocated 45 percent weightage followed by process status with 34 percent weightage and overall status has allocated 21 percent

weightage. The process status is observed by daily administration and service delivery and process-related indicators of local concerns. Quantitative status is related to quantitative indicators to compare and measure the areas of self-assessment. Process status and quantitative status are analyzed and determined with three conditions for each indicator weak, normal, and best conditions.

Weightage score of indicators of LISA

Local Government Institutional Capacity Self-Assessment (LISA) Scores are collected and presented in four categories: the average, overall, process, and quantitative status. The weightage to each indicator has been allocated in the working procedure. There are ten core areas of local government determined to assess institutional capacity by self-assessment. Government management, organization and administration, yearly budget and planning management, financial management, service delivery, judicial performance, physical infrastructure, social inclusion, environment protection and disaster management, and cooperation and coordination are the areas determined for self-assessment by the procedure. Service delivery is one of the areas among them emphasized with the highest 16 percent weightage for self-assessment.

Table 3

Weightage score of indicators of LISA

Indicators	Weightage score
Government Management	9
Organization and Administration	8
Yearly Budget and Planning Management	11
Financial Management	11
Service Delivery	16
Judicial Performance	7
Physical Infrastructure	13
Social Inclusion	10
Environment Protection and Disaster Management	9
Cooperation and Coordination	6
Total:	100

Note. Local Government Institutional Capacity Self-Assessment (LISA)

Table 3 shows that there are ten core indicators with different weights. The highest weightage, i.e. 16 percent, has been given to the institutional capacity area of service delivery. The second priority with 13 percent weightage has been given to the institutional capacity of physical infrastructure. Yearly budget and planning management and financial management have been given equally 11 percent weightage followed by social inclusion with 10 percent.

Processes of institutional capacity self-assessment

All local governments should follow the working procedure to examine the process of self-assessment to allocate scores. Informing the objective and procedure of self-assessment of

all elected public representatives and employees is the first step of this process. The involvement of related departments, divisions, and sections of related subject areas for self-assessment is another step of the process. The chief administrative officer should appoint an officer as a contact person for coordination with all departments, divisions, and sections of local government. The contact person regularly receives the progress report of the related subject areas from all departments, divisions, and sections.

Table 4*Self-assessment work plan of local government*

S.N.	Activities	Timetable
1.	Include activities of LISA in yearly program	Within Ashad 10 (Deadline of yearly development program)
2.	Appoint focal person under section three	First week of Shrawan
3.	Collection of all means of verification of initial self-assess report in coordination with contact person and concerned units. It is continuous process to submit data in the system via IT.	Continuous
4.	Conduct preparatory meeting for local government self-assessment to ensure means of verifications.	Within last day of Shrawan
5.	Orientation program to disseminate objective, method and system of LISA under section three	Within last day of Kartik
6.	Prepare initial report on the basis of participatory discussion and analysis to determine weightage	Within 15 th of Mangsir
7.	Send initial report to district coordination committee (DCC) for feedback	Within last day of Mangsir
8.	Submit final draft of initial report after incorporating feedback of DCC to municipal executive meeting	Within 15 th of Poush
9.	Approval/acceptance of final initial result of self-assessment from municipal executive	Within last day of Poush
10.	Overall review of final self-assessment result to identify strength and weakness, compare the result with last year's result and other local governments' results within the year and make work plan to improve the weaknesses.	Within last day of Poush
11.	Publish the result of LISA via website and notice board after acceptance of municipal executive	Within first week of Magh
12.	Table the final result of LISA to municipal assembly	Rural/Municipal assembly time

Note. Local level self-assessment working procedure-2020 (Annex-4)

Table 4 shows that the chief administrative officer get the integrated initial report proposal from a focal person. The chief administrative officer is responsible for submitting the initial report for discussion as an agenda to the municipal executive meeting. The municipal executive meeting will discuss and analyze the initial report to determine the real scoring of concerned areas and finally decide the final self-assessment result. The assessment result should

be published on the website and official notice board within seven days after the executive meeting decides the results. The local government should send the result to the related district coordination committee, the chief minister of the provincial government, the council of ministers of the provincial government, and the concerned ministry. Finally, the municipal assembly discusses the results of the self-assessment. The self-assessment process for the previous fiscal year should be completed every year by the middle of January.

Provision for reporting of LISA score

The district coordination committee assesses the quality of the institutional self-assessment scores of local governments and provides feedback for improvement in weakened areas. The ministry prepares the integrated report of all self-assessment reports of local government and publishes the report province-wise and district-wise separately. The ministry analyzes all self-assessment reports received from the local governments to identify the weaknesses and support them in strengthening capacity development by providing feedback. The ministry informs the district coordination committees about the feedback provided to local governments. The ministry reviews the report yearly in each province. The ministry declares the best local governments based on this report. The declaration is separated into municipalities and rural municipalities. The ministry manages the quality assurance evaluation of the self-assessment result itself, by the district coordination committee, or by providing responsibility to a third party.

Result and Discussion

The ministry has implemented a Local-level Institutional Capacity Self-assessment (LISA) working procedure (2020) for the assessment process. It has been implemented to evaluate the local governments' institutional capacity for core areas. The working procedure aims to identify the strengths and weaknesses of local government institutional capacity and inform the weakness of good governance by appraisal of core areas. The expected goal of this self-assessment is to find out the overall institutional capacity for public service delivery and to make local government institutions efficient and effective through competitive improvement which helps to get the basis of periodic review. The areas of institutional capacity self-assessment and indicators for the evaluation of local governments have been described in the working procedure. All local-level governments have followed this working procedure to assess their institutional capacity and discuss it with local executives under the provision of the working procedure. The result of comparison of LISA scores is presented as follows:

Comparison of scores of institutional capacity for service delivery area

The self-assessed scores of local governments' institutional capacity for service delivery are varied over the years. The weightage given to this area is sixteen. The following table presents the self-assessed scores in percentage for this area:

Table 5

Self-assessment score on service delivery area

Local Government	Self-assessment score on service delivery area (In percentage)
------------------	---

	FY 2080-81	FY 2079-80	FY 2078-79	FY 2077-078	FY 2076-077
Dhankuta Municipality	76.56	81.25	78.13	71.88	59.38
Mahalaxmi Municipality	92.19	93.75	93.75	40.63	9.38
Pakhribas Municipality	75.00	78.13	81.25	93.75	62.50
Chaubise Rural Municipality	82.81	87.50	84.38	75.00	40.63
Chhatar Jorpati Rural Municipality	92.19	93.75	93.75	84.38	71.88
Sahidbhumi Rural Municipality	76.56	81.25	70.31	46.88	35.94
Sangurigadhi Rural Municipality	78.13	78.13	65.63	34.38	31.25

Note. Local Government Institutional Capacity Self-Assessment (LISA)

Table 5 shows that Mahalaxmi municipality and Chhatar Jorpati rural municipality have self-assessed this area with the highest score in FY 2078-79 and FY 2079-80. Pakhribas municipality has also self-assessed this area with the highest score in FY 2077-78. Mahalaxmi municipality and Chhatar Jorpati rural municipality have equally self-assessed the highest score in FY 2080-81. Pakhribas municipality has the lowest score in FY 2080-81.

Comparison of average scores of LISA

The LISA process has determined the average score of local governments. The average score of Nepal is 72.58 percent and Koshi province's average score is 73.21 percent. Dhankuta has obtained a 74.46 percent average score in the LISA report.

Table 6

Comparison of average scores of LISA in Dhankuta

Name of institution	Obtained average score (In percentage)			
	FY 2079-80	FY 2078-79	FY 2077-078	FY 2076-077
Nepal	72.58	64.36	59.11	51.97
Koshi Province	73.21	66.34	59.26	49.31
Dhankuta District	74.46	72.86	65.57	44.46
Dhankuta Municipality	62.50	66.50	64.00	52.00
Mahalaxmi Municipality	69.00	73.25	54.50	13.00
Pakhribas Municipality	71.00	75.25	84.00	63.75
Chaubise Rural Municipality	77.00	78.00	72.25	38.00
Chhatar Jorpati Rural Municipality	86.00	87.00	79.25	65.50

Name of institution	Obtained average score (In percentage)			
	FY 2079-80	FY 2078-79	FY 2077-078	FY 2076-077
Sahidbhumi Rural Municipality	82.75	62.50	57.00	42.50
Sangurigadhi Rural Municipality	73.00	67.50	48.00	36.50

Note. Local Government Institutional Capacity Self-Assessment (LISA)

Table 6 shows the average score of Chhathar Jorpati RM is assessed with the highest score of 87 percent in FY 2078-79 and 86 percent in FY 2079-80. Pakhribas municipality has obtained the highest score of 63.75 percent in FY 2076-77 and 84 percent in FY 2077-78. Similarly, Sangurigadhi RM has self-assessed the lowest score of 36.5 percent among the FYs. However, local governments have improved their status of process scores since FY 2076-77.

Comparison of overall scores of LISA

In Dhankuta district, different local governments have assessed their performance differently among the FYs. The overall average score of Dhankuta district is 76.20 percent which is greater than the score of 73.35 of Koshi province. Pakhribas municipality has self-assessed the highest overall score with 95.24 percent in FY 2077-78. Mahalaxmi municipality has self-assessed the lowest score of 9.52 in FY 2076-77.

Table 7

Comparison of overall scores of LISA in Dhankuta

Name of local government	Obtained overall score (In percentage)			
	FY 2079-80	FY 2078-79	FY 2077-078	FY 2076-077
Nepal	73.75	64.56	60.10	53.05
Koshi Province	73.35	65.57	60.43	51.10
Dhankuta District	76.02	71.09	68.03	45.41
Dhankuta Municipality	71.43	61.90	69.05	61.90
Mahalaxmi Municipality	61.9	70.24	54.76	9.52
Pakhribas Municipality	73.81	82.14	95.24	58.33
Chaubise Rural Municipality	76.19	76.19	65.48	38.10
Chhatar Jorpati Rural Municipality	90.48	90.48	82.14	66.67
Sahidbhumi Rural Municipality	86.9	54.76	59.52	50.00
Sangurigadhi Rural Municipality	71.43	61.90	50.00	33.33

Note. Local Government Institutional Capacity Self-Assessment (LISA)

Table 7 shows that Chhatar Jorpati RM has self-assessed the highest score of 66.67 percent in FY 2076-77 followed by Dhankuta municipality with a score of 61.90. Chhatar Jorpati RM has self-assessed 90.48 percent in FY 2078-79 and FY 2079-80 followed by Pakhribas municipality with an 82.14 percent score in FY 2078-79. However, all local governments have gradually improved their status of process scores than FY 2076-77.

Comparison of process scores of LISA

The process score of LISA obtained by the Dhankuta district is 69.75 percent which is greater than the Koshi province score of 67.89 percent. Shahidbhumi RM has self-assessed the highest process score of 80.88 percent in FY 2079-80. Mahalaxmi municipality has self-assessed the lowest score of 7.35 percent in FY 2076-77.

Table 8

Comparison of process scores of LISA in Dhankuta

Name of local government	Obtained process score (In percentage)			
	FY 2079-80	FY 2078-79	FY 2077-078	FY 2076-077
Nepal	67.4	58.71	52.71	45.92
Koshi Province	67.89	61.14	52.91	43.31
Dhankuta District	69.75	65.55	57.77	38.45
Dhankuta Municipality	61.76	64.71	57.35	44.12
Mahalaxmi Municipality	67.65	64.71	48.53	7.35
Pakhribas Municipality	66.18	63.24	69.12	52.94
Chaubise Rural Municipality	73.53	75.00	67.65	39.71
Chhatar Jorpati Rural Municipality	76.47	76.47	72.06	55.88
Sahidbhumi Rural Municipality	80.88	60.29	50.00	35.29
Sangurigadhi Rural Municipality	61.76	54.41	39.71	33.82

Note. Local government institutional capacity self-assessment (LISA)

Table 8 shows that Chhatar Jorpati RM has self-assessed highest scores of 55.88 percent, 72.06 percent, and 76.47 percent in FY 2076-77, FY 2077-8, and FY 2078-79 respectively. Shahidbhumi RM has self-assessed the highest score of 80.88 percent followed by the equal lowest score of 61.76 of Dhankuta municipality and Sagurigadhi RM in FY 2079-80. Sangurigadhi RM has obtained FY 39.71 percent and 54.41 percent in FY 2077-78 & 2078-79 respectively.

Comparison of quantitative scores of LISA

The quantitative score of Dhankuta district is 77.3 which is nearly equal to the score of 77.17 in Koshi province. The score of 91.11 in FY 2079-80 by Chhatar Jorpati RM is the highest among the local governments during four FYs. Chaubise RM has self-assessed the lowest score of 36.67 percent in FY 2076-77 among the local governments in Dhankuta.

Table 9*Comparison of quantitative scores of LISA in Dhankuta*

Name of local government	Obtained quantitative score (In percentage)			
	FY 2079-80	FY 2078-79	FY 2077-078	FY 2076-077
Nepal	75.95	68.53	63.49	56.04
Koshi Province	77.17	70.62	63.51	53.00
Dhankuta District	77.3	79.21	70.32	48.57
Dhankuta Municipality	58.89	70.00	66.67	53.33
Mahalaxmi Municipality	73.33	81.11	58.89	18.89
Pakhribas Municipality	73.33	81.11	90.00	74.44
Chaubise Rural Municipality	80	81.11	78.89	36.67
Chhatar Jorpati Rural Municipality	91.11	93.33	83.33	72.22
Sahidbhumi Rural Municipality	82.22	67.78	61.11	44.44
Sangurigadhi Rural Municipality	82.22	80.00	53.33	40.00

Note. Local Government Institutional Capacity Self-Assessment (LISA)

Table 9 shows that Pakhribas municipality has obtained the highest score of 74.44 percent in FY 2076-77 and 90 percent in FY 2077-78. Similarly, Chhatar Jorpati RM has self-assessed 93.33 percent in FY 2078-79 and 91.11 percent in FY 2079-80. The lowest score of 18.89 is obtained by Mahalaxmi municipality in FY 2076-77. Similarly, Sagurigadhi RM has self-assessed the lowest score of 53.33 percent in FY 2077-78 and Sahidbhumi RM has self-assessed 67.78 percent in FY 2078-79.

Conclusion

There are three layers of government in the country. Among the federal, provincial, and local governments, local government is the nearest government to the local people. The governance policy of the local government is most important for public service delivery. The major focus of local government seems to be on the development of the villages by building physical infrastructures like roads, electricity, play sports, and water supply as well as human resource development like educational institutions development, health infrastructures development, sanitation, advanced farming for sustainable livelihood of the local people. Similarly, local governments are self-ruled autonomous governments, the closest government of the people, and the power exercise platform of the people's representatives. It has been found that the service delivery sector is the highest weightage burning issue for local governments and they should provide priority to this area using an ICT-based governance system. Physical infrastructure for delivering services is another important core area that should be improved at the core and

periphery areas of local government. Local governments are operated by multiple legislations, i.e. the local Government operational act and regulations to provide public services to the people. Improvement in all indicators of core areas has been revealed as positive during the analysis of the data. Local governments in Dhankuta are being improved in the core areas of institutional capacity self-assessment. It has been concluded that all local governments have been trying to improve their institutional capacity of service delivery status in the scores of all core areas since fiscal year 2076-077 up to fiscal year 2080-081. So, this study has analyzed the status of LISA scores comparatively in the Dhankuta district and found that all local governments in Dhankuta have improved their LISA scores in core areas and indicators in all four categories during the four fiscal years.

This study may be a vital reference for further researchers who want to conduct empirical research in local governments, social accountability, good governance, and transparency. The recommendation to the authority and people representatives of local government is to deliver public services transparently, become accountable towards the public service delivery among the people and regularly update the LISA report via the website and notice board as a provision made by the working procedure. So, new researchers may apply this model of research to find out the impact of service delivery on local areas and target groups. It will be fruitful to apply the LISA model to self-assess the institutional capacities of service delivery at other units of local governments, universities and other organizations.

References

- Adeyemi, O. (2013). Local government and the challenges of service delivery: The Nigeria experience. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 15 (7), 84-98.
- Briffault, R. (1996). The local government boundary problem in metropolitan areas. *Stanford Law Review*, 48, 1115-1171.
https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/faculty_scholarship/930
- Canares, M. P. (2016). Creating the enabling environment for more transparent and better-resourced local governments: A case of e-taxation in the Philippines. *Information Technology for Development*, 22 (1), 121–138. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02681102.2015.1121857>
- Central Bureau of Statistic (2011). *Census report of Nepal*.
- Hassan, A., Roberts, S. M., & Joy, A. U. (2013). Local government service delivery in Nigeria: An empirical comparison of government efforts and the people's expectations. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(6), 335-345. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2013.v4n6p335>
- Higher Education Reform Project (2019). *Tribhuvan University vision 2030*. Tribhuvan University.
- Hooghe, L. & Marks, G. (2001). Types of multi-level governance. *European Integration Online Papers*, 5 (11), 1-24.
- Kharel, S. (2018). Public service delivery of local government in Nepal in 2015. *Research Nepal Journal of Development Studies*, 1(1), 83-93.

Lamothe, S., Lamothe, M., and Feiock, R. C. (2008). Examining local government service delivery arrangements over time. *Urban Affairs Review*, 44, 27-56. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087408315801>

National Statistics Office (2021). *Summary of Census Report of Nepal*.

Nepal Law Commission (2064). *Right to information act*.

Nepal Law Commission (2072). *Constitution of Nepal*.

Nepal Law Commission (2074). *Local level government operational act-2074*.

Nepal Law Commission (2077). *Federation, province and local level (coordination and interrelationship) act-2077*.

Nepal Law Commission (2064). *Good governance act-2064*.

Reddy, P.S. (2016). The politics of service delivery in South Africa: The local government sphere in context. *The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa*, 12 (1), 1-8.

Sibanda, M. M. (2012). Monitoring customer-focused quality service delivery in local government: conceptual issues and perspectives for consideration. *Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review*, 4-26.

Tshiyoyo, M. M. & Koma, S. B. (2011). Local government public service delivery in Africa: A comparative perspective. *African Journal of Public Affairs*, 4 (2), 119-129.