

১৬৩

**Delivery of Services in Government Department/
Organization/ Office: A Study on Agriculture and
Fisheries Department in Some Selected Upazilas**

Bangladesh Public Administration Training Centre
Savar, Dhaka-1343

**Delivery of Services in Government Department/
Organization/ Office: A Study on Agriculture and
Fisheries Department in Some Selected Upazilas**

Bangladesh Public Administration Training Centre
Savar, Dhaka-1343

**Delivery of Services in Government Department/
Organization/ Office: A Study on Agriculture and
Fisheries Department in Some Selected Upazilas**

*Md. Didarul Alam ·
S. M. Zobayer Enamul Karim
Md. Shah Alam Gazi*

Bangladesh Public Administration Training Centre
Savar, Dhaka-1343

PREFACE

There is a general consensus between all political economists and social scientists that, various Ministries/Divisions situated in and outside of the Secretariat and also with their Departments, Directorates, Corporations, Autonomous bodies and other offices situated in different parts of Bangladesh; public service is the only logic for existence of these organizations. But fact is that instead of public service, in many cases people face the experience of sufferings and harassment. In many cases there is no arrangement for accountability of these service-providing agencies. It has been experienced that lack of accountability in public service is gradually becoming a common practice beginning from the Secretariat—the highest level to Upazila, Union or Ward- the lowest level. Government departments have been generally characterized as being rigid, nonresponsive, inefficient and ineffective pre-occupied with process rather than results, driven by obsolete rules and regulations. Now a days people are being more vocal about the service delivered by government departments; Upazila Agriculture and Fisheries departments are no more exception in this respect. Keeping all these practical situations and issues in mind, a study is conducted about the problems and prospects of service delivery by the Agriculture and Fisheries department at Upazila level.

This study aims to highlight the present situation of delivery of services of Upazila Agriculture and Fisheries departments and to find-out the ways & means to improve the existing situation in these areas.

We are thankful to all the persons and departments who took pains for co-operating us to make the study a success. It is needless to mention that without their assistance, this study could not see the light of the day.

Md. Didarul Alam
S.M. Zobayer Enamul Karim
Md. Shah Alam Gazi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This report is the outcome of a study undertaken as a part of the research program of the revenue budget of Bangladesh Public Administration Training Centre. Hence, we express our deep gratitude and thanks to the authority of the Centre, who extended their cooperation to the research team in the form of administrative and financial support to make the study a success. The researchers received assistance from many individuals in order to accomplish this report. We have been highly benefited from the opinions, suggestions and comments of the respondents of Upazila Agriculture Officer and Upazila Fisheries Officer, Agriculture Extension Officer, Assistant Fisheries Officer, Members of the Civil Society and the Clientele (Farmers and Fishermen) who attended for service at Upazila; they were kind enough to provide primary and secondary information and to give their valuable opinions. The researchers convey their thanks to the mentioned respondents for their sincere cooperation. The concerned Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNOs) were very cooperative in this connection. Hence, they also deserve thanks and we are also grateful to them. Mr. Rezwanul Karim, Mr. Delwar Hossain, Mr. Mahmud Hasan and Mrs. Rowshana Noor took a lot of pains in collecting & processing data. We are thankful to them for the arduous job they have done. We also convey thank to Mr. Md. Helal Uddin, word processor, for typing the report. However, the responsibility of mistakes, if any lies with the researchers.

August 2006

Researchers
BPATC, Savar, Dhaka

ACRONYMS

ACAD	:	Advanced Course on Administration and Development
AEO	:	Agriculture Extension Officer
AUAO	:	Additional Upazila Agriculture Officer
AUFO	:	Assistant Upazila Fisheries Officer
AUAO	:	Additional Upazila Agriculture Officer
FTC	:	Foundation Training Course
NGO	:	Non-Governmental Organization
PARC	:	Public Administration Reform Commission
PR	:	Public Representatives
SUFO	:	Senior Upazilas Upazila Fisheries Officer
UAO	:	Upazila Agriculture Officer
UAU	:	Upazila Agriculture Unit
UFO	:	Upazila Fisheries Officer
UFU	:	Upazila Fisheries Unit
UNO	:	Upazila Nirbahi Officer
UP	:	Union Parishad

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The study entitled "*Delivery of Services in Government Department/Offices/Organization: A Study on Agriculture and Fisheries Department in Some Selected Upazilas*" was conducted under the revenue budget of BPATC. In this study the existing service delivery system at upazila agriculture and fisheries department has been reviewed, the opinions of the respondents have been gathered, the problems associated with the service delivery system have been identified and some ways and means have been suggested to improve the overall situation of service delivery.

OBJECTIVES: This study highlights the following objectives: to examine and detect the existing provisions/nature, weaknesses and flaws of service delivery of Upazila agriculture and fisheries department and make recommendations/suggestions to overcome the problems.

METHODOLOGY: This is a case study type of research. A case study was undertaken in selected six Upazila agriculture and fisheries department-viz. Ghior of Manikgonj, Chandina of Comilla, Paba of Rajshahi, Rampal of Bagerhat, Mathbaria of Pirojpur and Golapgonj of Sylhet district of Bangladesh. Twelve agriculture officials who are posted at Upazilas as Upazila Agriculture Officer (UAO), Additional Upazila Agriculture Officer (AUAO), Agriculture Extension Officer (AEO) & Block Supervisor (Agriculture) and ten fisheries officials- posted at Upazilas as Senior Upazila Fisheries Officer, Upazila Fisheries Officer (UFO) & Assistant Upazila Fisheries Officer (AUFO) were the official respondents. Apart from these respondents, seventy-two public representatives (UP Chairmen and Members) and one hundred-twenty farmers & fishermen were asked to provide their opinions and suggestions-who knew about the status of service delivery of the agriculture and fisheries department of Upazila to improve service delivery at the grass root level. The total respondents of the six samples Upazila were 214. Random & purposive samplings have been followed to collect data from different levels of respondents. Three sets of interview schedule have been administered for collection of primary data. Schedule-I covered the opinions and views of the agriculture and fisheries department of Upazila officials regarding various dimensions of service delivery and its inherent barriers. Schedule-II & III have been used for collecting views/opinions and information of the farmers & fisherman/public representatives regarding the extent of delivery of service. Information not covered in the schedules have been collected with the help of suitably prepared checklist. Besides these, relevant records have been reviewed to reach the aims of the study. Apart from interview schedules and checklist, the researchers have made observations in respect of service delivery of the sample areas. Data have been collected after immediate approval of the study proposal by the concerned authority (during March 2005 to September 2005). Collected data have been presented through various techniques. Data were tabulated and analyzed with the help of some statistical methods like percentage, mean, median etc.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Basic Information about the Sample Upazilas: Chandina thana is the biggest Upazila in terms of population having 2,69,878 population of which 51.18 percent are male and 49.82 percent are female followed by 50.13% and 49.87% male and female respectively in Mathbaria Upazila comprising 2,53,915 population. Among the sample Upazila, Ghior Upazila of Manikgonj was the smaller one having 1,27,521 population. The male and female

distribution rate of the six Upazila is almost unique in nature. It is noticed that in terms of area, Mathbaria possesses the highest land area (353.25 sq.km), whereas, for Ghior Upazila this figure is the lowest (145.95 sq. kilometer).

Demographic Characteristics: Highest percentage (40.10%) of the respondents belonged to the age group of 40-49 years. It is shown 91.15% of the respondents belonged to the active age group of 15 to 59 years. It is revealed that majority of the respondents (55.21%) belonged to the illiterate to junior high school level of education followed by 18.23% higher secondary and 15.62 secondary level and only 7.81% of the respondents were bachelor degree holder; 26.39% of the public representatives have higher secondary certificate. In respect to the occupation of the client (farmers and fishermen) it is observed that 37.25% and 15.83% of them had the agriculture farming and agriculture day-labour as the principal occupation respectively, i.e. 53.08% client were directly related to agriculture followed by small business (10.00%).

Information Provided by Sample Upazila Officials: It is depicted that in most of the Upazila Agriculture Unit (UAU), there is no shortage of class-I Officers except Rampal of Bagerhat. It was observed that average vacant post of agriculture department for all four categories of manpower for the three Upazila is 9.49% (Table-3. 5). It is noticed that there is no provision of class-II officer in the sample Upazila Fisheries Unit (UFU). In most of the UFUs, there is insignificant shortage of class-I Officers except Rampal of Bagerhat; only 14.28% of the post of class-I Officer is vacant, The average vacant post of Fisheries department for all four categories of manpower for the four Upazila is 4.35% (Table-3. 5). As for physical infrastructures of Agriculture/Fisheries department, 100%, 75.00% and 62.50% respondents respectively informed that office room & furniture and residential accommodation for staffs were insufficient (Table-3.6). It may be noted that 100 percent respondent mentioned the insufficiency of allocation of annual fund to provide service and this insufficiency is 37.50 percent of the total requirements. In the Agricultural development projects in 3 upazilas, 160 development projects were implemented in which the total investment was 25,06,200/-. The per capita expense of the projects was Tk. 4.29/-. Again a sum total of Taka 9,30,678/- were spent for implementing 23 development projects of fisheries sectors in 4 upazilas. The per capita expense of these project was Taka 1.09. It indicates the poor investment status in Agriculture and Fisheries sectors at upazila level. In most of the upazilas, the records of providing service are not maintained properly. It is found that in Ghior and Golapgonj upazilas no data were available, only in Paba and Motbaria upazila the services provided by Agriculture and Fisheries department were available in which it was found that agriculture sector was in advance position rather than fisheries sector as the major service provider. The farmers at grass root level have been acquainted with new technology and it helped a lot to boost up production level. The upazila officials of Agriculture and Fisheries department rarely visit the stakeholders at grass root level. On the otherhand, the farmers or fishermen who are considered to be the direct beneficiaries of the services also have poor contact with the service provider.

Opinion of the Clientele about Delivery of Services: The beneficiaries were although satisfied with the behaviour of upazila officials but maximum respondents expressed their views negatively regarding counseling made by the upazila officials. 62% respondents opined that they did not get any counseling service from the upazila officials. It is observed that no established and formal system works for dissemination of knowledge and skill about improved system, in most cases the farmers and fishermen derive knowledge about improved system through informal method of interaction with the neighboring farmer. It is observed

that in establishing nursery, tube well maintenance, training and counseling to farmers, supply of fertilizer and pesticides; the union parishad did not get expected services. But in other components such as establishment of demonstration farm, pump machine installation and maintenance and especially in distribution of agricultural inputs the delivery of services were quite satisfactory. It is observed that the different types of service delivery provided by the upazila fisheries department to union parishad were not up to the expectation and in most cases the beneficiaries did not get the benefit of services provided by the concerned department. The analysis shows that in cases of training of fishermen, establishments of demonstration farm and nursery, digging of ponds and counseling services, the performances of fisheries unit were very poor. The respondents opined that the receipt of inputs such as fertilizer, seed, irrigation equipment pesticides and fish fry were very poor. Maximum respondents did not receive any input, which actually could be taken into account. Regarding the quality of inputs they received were by and large up to the satisfaction. It is portrayed that the beneficiaries received 34.17% services and satisfaction out of their total expectations. 60.83% respondents opined that they did not receive proper services, 75.85% respondents expressed their dissatisfaction on the fact that they did not receive required inputs, 53.33% respondents were deprived of the service due to complex procedures on the other hand 52.50% respondents could not avail of the service as per their expectation. In order to activate the service delivery system to the expectation of the respondent's, 55.00% of them opined that the public representatives should be involved in day-to-day monitoring of the departmental service. The satisfaction rate of receiving agriculture/fisheries inputs by the beneficiaries (farmers & fishermen) was 25.53% in average. On the otherhand, the satisfaction level of the officials regarding their own performance was 50.00%. It is evident that satisfaction level of all the group of the respondents is comparatively low.

Problems Identified by Respondents: Lack of trained/skilled professional manpower, lack of required infrastructure for storage and other required rooms, poor departmental budget/insufficient ADP allocation, insufficient logistic supports (transport etc.), complex government rules/procedures, absence of bill-board mentioning the service available in offices, administrative complexity and lack of coordination at local level, lack of availability of computer & IT, lack of accountability of officers & other employees of agriculture and fisheries department, excessive frequency of middle-men, lack of supervision by local representatives, insufficient allocation of money, lack of rapid promotional scope of officers, existance of discrimination and lack of proper adjustment & coordination regarding training, career planning, promotion, facilities relating services, working environment among the members of different cadre, ignorance of the people etc. were identified as the major problems to provide services to people.

Suggestions of the Respondents: On an average 46.76% of the respondents advocated in favor of skill/trained manpower to ensure services and 37.345% of the respondents suggested ensuring necessary physical infrastructure in upazila agriculture and fisheries unit. About one-fourth of the respondents suggested to provide modern training equipments and fill up the vacant post immediately. 74.50% of respondents suggested increasing supply of input; on the other hand, display of billboard showing the services available in the concerned units has been suggested by 65.47% of the respondents. The clientele are the worst sufferer by the evil role played by the middlemen, so 40.73% of them suggested punishing the middlemen. Provision of supervision by local representatives was favored by 72.50% of the respondents from clientele group (farmers and fishermen). However, 79.16% of the respondents from the public representatives also endorsed the view. But only 27.27% of the officials want supervision by the local representatives, which means maximum officials do not want any

external control. 91.66% of the respondents suggested to enhance monitory allocation. 82.40% of the respondents in general and 100% of the officials suggested rapid promotion scope to be undertaken which they believed to have positive effect on improvement of quality service. On the other hand 86.50% of the respondents suggested to formulate appropriate policy, regarding training, career planning, promotion, working environment, etc. 72.14% of the respondents suggested to introduce IT facilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The manpower strength especially of fisheries department of upazila level may be streamlined and increased to ensure better service delivery. More development projects under annual development plan may be undertaken and executed at upazila level, which will enhance flow of resources, advanced knowledge, skill and modern technology at upazila level. Modern record management system may be introduced. The service providing agencies may be activated to undertake extension work as well as to establish regular contact with the stakeholders, highest priority may be given to formalize the training system. There should be co-ordination between the activities of government and non-government organizations, price of agricultural inputs should be subsidized and the supply should be uninterrupted, the traditional methods of production may be replaced by modernization of production methods; power tillers and pump machines, may be imported duty free and expansion of rural electrification is necessary to boost up production facilities provided by government departments and the procedure to avail of the facilities may be displayed through billboards to provide necessary information to the clientele, complaints and allegations may be addressed properly and with utmost transparency. Separate supervisory committee comprised of both the public representatives and government officials to monitor execution of government policy and programs. An inspectorial service may be developed by the concerned departments to ensure accountability of the officials. Well articulated career development policy may be formulated to ensure higher mobility of the officials as well as incentive provisions may be created alongwith reward and punishment provisions. The gap between public officials and the clientele groups may be minimized and the public officials should frequently visit the beneficiaries to develop a healthy and smooth relation between the service providers and recipient.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	i
Acknowledgement	ii
Acronyms	iii
Executive Summary	iv
List of Tables	ix
CHAPTER-I:	1
INTRODUCTION:	
Meaning of Service	2
Key Attributes of Service	3
Rationale of the Study	4
Objective of the Study	5
Scope of the Study	5
Expected Benefit from the Research Study	5
CHAPTER-II:	7
METHODOLOGY:	
Nature of Research	7
Sample Size & Sample Areas	7
Sampling Procedures	8
Techniques of Data Collection	8
Data Collectors and Data Collection Period	9
Data Processing and Analysis	9
Report of Plan	9
Limitations of the Study	9
CHAPTER-III:	10
DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS:	
Basic Information about the Sample Upazilas	10
Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents	11
Information Provided by Upazila Officials	13
Opinion of the Clientele (Farmers/Fishermen and Public Representative)	18
Problems and Suggestions Identified by the Respondents to Improve the	
Delivery System of Services	27
Findings of the Study	33
CHAPTER-IV:	35
RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION:	
Recommendations	35
Conclusion	37
Bibliography	38
Appendices (A,B,C&D)	39

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Title of the Table	Page No.
Table-2.1	Location of the Sample Area and Corresponding Respondents	7
Table-3.1	Basic Information about the Sample Upazila	11
Table-3.2	Age Distribution of the Respondents (Beneficiary--Farmers & Fishermen and the Public Representatives – Chairmen & Members of Union Parishad)	12
Table-3.3	Distribution of the Respondents (Beneficiary--Farmers & Fishermen and the Public Representatives – Chairmen & Members of Union Parishad) by Education	12
Table 3.4	Distribution of the Respondents (Beneficiary-Farmers & Fishermen and the Public Representatives (PR)–Chairmen & Members of Union Parishad) by Principal Occupation.	13
Table-3.5	Statement of Manpower (Human Resource) of the Sample Upazila Agriculture Unit/Fisheries Unit	14
Table-3.6	Opinion of the Officials about the Existing Facilities at Agriculture/Fisheries Department	15
Table-3.7	Statement of Investment in Development Projects by Agriculture and Fisheries Sectors of Upazila in 2004	15
Table-3.8	Statement of Actual Service Received by the Clientele/ Beneficiary in 2004 as Opined by the Officials	16
Table-3.9	Statement of the Positive and Negative Impact of the Development Project Viewed by the Officials of Upazila	17
Table-3.10	Opinion of the Officials Respondents about the Interaction with Beneficiaries	18
Table-3.11	Opinion of the Beneficiaries (Farmers/Fishermen) about the Behaviour/ Counseling by Upazila Officials	18
Table-3.12	Table-3.12: Source of Information of Beneficiaries (Farmers/Fishermen) about the knowledge of Improved System	19
Table-3.13	Statement of Service Delivery during Fiscal year 2003-04 from Upazila Agriculture Department to Union Parishad (Beneficiaries)	20
Table-3.14	Statement of Service Delivery during FY 2003-04 from Upazila Fisheries Department to Union Parishad (Beneficiaries)	21
Table-3.15	Opinion of the Respondents about Inputs Received from Upazila Administration	22
Table-3.16	Opinion about the Use of Modern/Improved Farming System by Beneficiaries (Farmers/Fishermen)	22
Table-3.17	Expectation of the Respondents (Farmers & Fishermen) from Agriculture and Fisheries Units of Upazila Administration	23
Table-3.18	Opinion of the Respondents (Farmers/Fishermen) about the Expected Service and Satisfaction Received from the Concerned Office	23
Table-3.19	Opinion of the Respondents (Farmers/Fishermen) about the Existing Service available & of Quality Service Delivered from the Concerned Office	24
Table-3.20	Opinion about the Availability of Input & the Rate of Satisfaction of the Respondents (Officials & Public Representatives (Chairman/Members of UP)	25
Table-3.21	Opinion of the Respondents (Officials & Public Representatives (Chairman/Members of UP) about the Existing system/pattern for promoting Delivery Service	27
Table-3.22	Problems/Limitations Detected by the Clientele to speed-up Delivery of Services	30
Table-3.23	Suggestions given by the Clientele to speed-up Services Delivery	32

CHAPTER - I

1.0 Introduction:

1.1 In our country, citizens are to communicate often with the officers and staff working at different levels in various Ministries/Divisions situated in and outside the Secretariat and also with their Departments, Directorates, Corporations, Autonomous bodies and other offices situated in different parts of Bangladesh. Public service is the only logic for existence of these organizations. But it is an undeniable fact that instead of public service in many cases people experience indescribable sufferings and harassment. In many cases there is no arrangement for accountability of these service-providing agencies. Lack of accountability in public service is gradually becoming a common practice beginning from the Secretariat—the highest level to Upazila, Union or Ward- the lowest level. The manpower and the expenditure of different public service organizations are increasing with the simple logic of developing their standards and widening their extent of work. But in reality, in many cases, the situation is rather worsening (PARC Report, Vol.2 P-1).

1.2 Public agencies have been generally characterized as being rigid, nonresponsive inefficient and ineffective pre-occupied with process rather than results, driven by outdated rules and regulations. They are regarded as insensitive to the changing demands of the people. Also in general, public servants have not acted as "servant" of the people, but rather as their "masters"; they are sometimes politically influenced and almost immune from the requirement of accountability and transparency. The concepts of "efficiency," "effectiveness," and "dynamism" seem to be quite remote from their actual practices. Some public officials may be personally cognisant of the changes that have replaced in modern public management, but the environment in which they function has not yet allowed these changes to filter into their administrative behavior and impact on the conduct of public duties in the service of the people. It is therefore necessary to analyze the root causes that have led to the present situation (PARC Report, Vol-1).

1.3 The general perception is that the members of the public are harassed and humiliated by public officials at different levels of administration. The relationship between public officials and the members of the public has taken the shape of benefactor and beneficiary, although the public servants were meant to provide service to public. People are unaware of how and where to obtain specific services and often fall prey to middlemen and corrupt practices. Cumbersome procedures and the slow pace of decisions and service delivery cause suffering to the people and waste public resources and time. It is, therefore, necessary to introduce a citizen's/client's charter to protect their rights. A citizen's charter is basically a document where provisions are made indicating the services available along with the commitments of the service delivery organizations to provide such services efficiently and accountably, which ensure value for money paid for the services. Past efforts for encouraging public agencies to define the reasons for their very existence- and therefore, their mission and functions, required inputs, and expected outputs—did not lead to positive results. The introduction of citizen's charters will create and nurture the culture of providing services and improve service delivery to clients. (PARC Report, Vol-1). Considering the above statements this study aims to highlight the present situation of delivery of services of Upazila agriculture & fisheries department and to find-out the ways & means to improve the existing situation in this context. For better understanding of the study, the term 'service' has been defined below.

1.4 Meaning of Service:

1.4.1 The term service has different meanings. Most related meaning to the study are as follows:

1.4.2 Service can be denoted as "an act of help or assistance", "work done by one person or group that benefits another" and "a agency or company that performs a public service, subject to government regulation."

1.4.3 In economics and marketing, a service is the non-material equivalent of a good. Service provision has been defined as an economic activity that does not result in

ownership, and this is what differentiates it from providing physical goods. It is claimed to be a process that creates benefits to the clientele by the service providers.

1.5 Key Attributes of Service:

Service can be described in terms of their main attributes.

- **Intangibility** – They cannot be seen, handled, smelled etc. There is no need for storage. Because they are difficult to conceptualize, service marketing requires creative visualizations to effectively make the intangible more concrete. From the customer's point of view, this makes it difficult to evaluate or compare services prior to experiencing the service.
- **Perishability** – Unsold service time is "lost", that is, it cannot be regained. It is a lost economic opportunity. For example a doctor that is booked for only two hours a day cannot later work those hours - she has lost her economic opportunity. Other service examples are airplane seats (once the plane departs, those empty seats cannot be sold) and other seats (sales end at a certain point).
- **Lack of transportability** – Service must be consumed at the point of "production."
- **Lack of homogeneity** – Service are typically modified for each client or each new situation (customized). Mass production of service is very difficult. This can be seen as a problem of inconsistent quality. Both inputs and outputs to the processes involved providing service are highly variable, as are the relationships between these processes, making it difficult to maintain consistent quality.
- **Human intensity** – Services usually involve considerable human activity, rather than precisely determined process. Human resource management is important. The human factor is often the key success factor in service delivery.
- **Demand Fluctuations** – It is very difficult to estimate demand. Demand can vary by season, time of day, business cycle, etc.

- **Client Involvement** – Most service provision requires a high degree of interaction between client and service provider.

Service Delivery

The delivery of a service typically involves five factors:

- The service providers
- Equipment used to provide the service (e.g. vehicles, machine, cash registers)
- The physical facilities (e.g. building, parking, waiting rooms etc.)
- The client
- Other customers at the service delivery location.

The service is defined as all activities involved in the service delivery process. Some service managers use the term "moment of truth" to indicate that defining point in a specific service where interactions are most intense.

1.6 Rationale of the Study:

1.6.1 Bangladesh Public Administration Training Center has been given the mandate to develop the human resources through imparting training and the ultimate aim of these training is to improve the delivery of public services. There are several sessions on "improving service standard of the organizations and delays in decision making" in Foundation Training Course (FTC) and Advanced Course on Administration & Development (ACAD) & other short courses. The output of the study may be fruitfully used as training materials in those courses.

1.6.2 A meticulous and critical study has been made in respect of service delivery in Upazila agriculture and fisheries department. It is expected that the strength and pitfalls of delivery may help rethink and re-design the future plan of the concerned organizations, so that these organizations may be more pragmatic to render service for the people.

1.6.3 Beside, scholar and researchers, theoreticians and practitioners who are interested to know more about the existing situation of service delivery may find the output of the study valuable.

1.7 Objectives of the Study:

This study is based on to address the following objectives:

- i) to examine and detect the existing provisions/nature, weaknesses, problems and flaws of service delivery of Upazila agriculture and fisheries department and
- ii) to make recommendations and suggestions to overcome the problems.

1.8 Scope of the Study:

The study has been devoted:

- a. to examine the existing performance of service delivery of Upazila agriculture and fisheries departments
- b. to find out the current situation of the service delivery of Upazila agriculture and fisheries department
- c. to detect the existing barriers for rendering prompt service to the people by the concerned departments
- d. to address the factors those influence for not to deliver proper public services by the concerned departments and
- e. to identify and assess the special feature to improve delivery of public services by the Upazila agriculture and fisheries department.

1.9 Expected Benefit of the Research Study:

The study is a critical study of the existing process of service delivery and identifies the problems in the process in order to suggest some ways and means to improve the existing service delivery system of agriculture and fisheries department of Upazila.

The expected benefit of the study may be as follows:

- (i) The findings and recommendations of the research work are expected to develop a new and improved process of public service delivery system of agriculture and fisheries department, which may be used by the macro-level policy makers.
- (ii) At the agency level the heads of agriculture and fisheries offices/department/directorate will be able to derive benefit from the recommendations to identify the problems of existing service delivery system as well as to apply new process of service delivery.
- (iii) Ultimately any new and developed system of service delivery will directly benefit the common people in the society.

CHAPTER – II

METHODOLOGY

2.1 Nature of Research:

This is a case study type of research. A case study was undertaken in selected six agriculture and fisheries department of Upazila.

2.2 Sample Size & Sample Area:

The information, finding and analysis throughout the research paper are the compilation of the contribution of the respondents including 12 agriculture officials who are posted at Upazilas as Upazila Agriculture Officer (UAO), Additional Upazila Agriculture Officer (AUAO), Agriculture Extension Officer (AEO) & Block Supervisor (Agriculture) and 10 fisheries officials- posted at Upazilas as Senior Upazila Fisheries Officer, Upazila Fisheries Officer (UFO) & Assistant Upazila Fisheries Officer (AUFO). Apart from these respondents, seventy-two public representatives (UP Chairmen and Members) and one hundred-twenty farmers & fishermen were asked to provide their opinions and suggestions-who knew about the status of service delivery of the agriculture and fisheries department of Upazila to improve service delivery at the grass roots level. The total respondents of the sample six Upazila were 214. Out of these respondents, Ghior, Chandina, Paba, Rampal, Mathbaria & Golapgonj upazila of Manikgonj, Comilla, Rajshahi, Bagerhat, Pirojpur & Sylhet district represent 15.42, 16.82, 18.22, 17.29, 15.89, 15.89 and 16.35 percent respondents respectively. Number of different categories of respondents may be seen in table-2.1.

Table-2.1: Location of the Sample Area and Corresponding Respondents

Sample Area				Number of Respondents				
Division	District	Upazila	Union	UAO AEO AUAD	SUFO UFP AUFO UFEO	UP Chairman/ Member(Public Representatives)	Farmers/ Fisherman	Total
Dhaka	Manikgonj	Ghior	Baratia	1 (8.33)	2 (20.00)	10 (7.20)	20(16.66%)	33(15.42)
Chittagong	Comilla	Chandina	Bataghashi	1 (8.33)	3 (30.00)	12 (8.64)	20(16.66%)	36(16.82)
Rajshahi	Rajshahi	Paba	Huzripura Horipur	3 (25.00)	1 (10.00)	15 (10.80)	20(16.66%)	39(18.22)
Khulna	Bagerhat	Rampal	Rampal	3 (25.00)	1 (10.00)	13 (9.36)	20(16.66%)	37(17.29)
Barisal	Pirojpur	Mathbaria	Mathbaria	2 (16.67)	2 (20.00)	10 (7.20)	20(16.66%)	34(15.89)
Sylhet	Sylhet	Golapgonj	Amura	2 (16.67)	1 (10.00)	12 (8.64)	20(16.66%)	35(16.35)
Total				12(100.0)	10(100.00)	72(100.00)	120(100.00)	214(100.00)

N.B.: Figures in the parenthesis indicate percentage of the concerned category of respondents.

UAO	=	Upazila Agriculture Officer
SUFO	=	Senior Upazila Fisheries Officer
UFO	=	Upazila Fisheries Officer
AUAO	=	Additional Upazila Agriculture Officer
UFEO	=	Assistant Upazila Extension Officer
BS	=	Block Supervisor (Agriculture)
AEO	=	Agriculture Extension Officer

2.3 Sampling Procedures:

For understanding the research/case study, random & purposive sampling have been followed. To collect primary data from different levels of respondents random sampling method have been followed. Purposive sampling applied in collecting secondary information.

2.4 Techniques of Data Collection:

Three sets of interview schedule have been administered for collection of primary data.

- a. **Schedule-I** covered the opinion and views of the agriculture and fisheries department of Upazila officials regarding various dimensions of service delivery and its inherent barriers (Appendix-A).
- b. **Schedule-II & III** have been used for collecting views/opinion and information of the farmers & fisherman/public representatives regarding the extent of delivery of service (Appendix -B & C).
- c. **Checklist:** Information not covered in the schedules has been collected with the help of suitably prepared checklist (Appendix.-D). Besides these, relevant records have been reviewed to reach the aims of the project.
- d. **Observation Method:** Apart from interview schedules and checklist, the researchers in respect of service delivery of the sample areas have made observation.

2.5 Data Collectors and Data Collection Period:

Data collectors were appointed to collect data. Six persons were trained in objectives, scope and methodologies of the study. They collected data under the intensive supervision of the researchers. The researchers have shared in collecting information and data. Data have been collected after immediate approval of the study proposal by the concerned authority (during March 2005 to September 2005).

2.6 Data Processing and Analysis:

Collected data have been presented through various techniques. First, data were tabulated and analyzed with the help of graphs and some statistical methods like percentage, mean, median etc. The researcher participated in data analysis and graphical representation.

2.7 Report Plan:

In **Chapter-I** introduction, objectives and scope of the study have been presented. **Chapter-II** describes methodology and limitations of the study. Collected information and data have been analyzed in **Chapter-III**. Findings and respondents opinion regarding their problems and suggestions have been accommodated in this chapter. In **Chapter-IV** we have proposed some recommendations, which have been discussed, followed by conclusion.

2.8 Limitations of the Study:

Due to time & cost constraints the scope of the study was kept limited to six Upazila agriculture and fisheries department. Hence, the findings of the study may not be treated as general condition of all the agriculture and fisheries departments of the country.

CHAPTER- III

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

3.1 In this report findings of the study have been arranged into different categories. These are (a) basic information about sample Upazila, (b) demographic characteristics of the respondents, (c) information provided by sample upazila officials (d) opinion of the clientele (Beneficiary--Farmers & Fishermen and the Public Representatives – Chairmen & Members of Union Parishad) about delivery of services and (e) problems and suggestions identified by the respondents to improve the delivery system of services. Compilations of the collected field survey data are the source of information for this analysis.

(A) BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT THE SAMPLE UPAZILAS

3.2 Table-3.1 reveals the basic information of the sample six Upazila at a glance. Chandina thana is the biggest Upazila in terms of population having 2,69,878 population of which 51.18 percent are male and 49.82 percent are female followed by 50.13% and 49.87% male and female respectively in Mathbaria Upazila comprising 2,53,915 population. Among the sample Upazila, Ghior Upazila of Manikgonj is the smaller one having 1,27,521 population. The male and female distribution rate of the six Upazila are almost unique in nature. It is noticed that in terms of area, Mathbaria possesses the highest land area (353.25 sq.km), whereas, for Ghior Upazila this figure is the lowest (145.95 sq. kilometer. The number of Union and fishery farm, literacy rate, and main occupation of the citizen may be shown in Table – 3.1.

Table –3.1: Basic Information about the Sample Upazila

Item	Upazila					
	Ghior	Chandina	Paba	Rampal	Mathbaria	Golapgonj
Area(sq.km.)	145.95	202.98	161.85	335.46	353.25	278.34
Population:	1,27,521	2,69,878	1,63,470	1,67,070	2,53,915	2,29,074
Male	50.16%	50.18%	53.62%	50.83%	50.13%	50.20%
Female	49.84%	49.82%	46.38%	49.17%	49.87%	49.71%
No. of Union	7	12	7	11	11	11
No. of Mouza	170	126	108	131	67	108
No. of Village	183	232	261	149	92	254
Literacy Rate:						
Average	31.2%	27.7%	25.1%	45.5%	59.6%	38.7%
Male	38.4%	34.3%	30.7%	51.5%	65.4%	44.2%
Female	24%	21.1%	18.9%	39.2%	53.7%	33.2%
Main Occupation:						
Agriculture	38.82%	50.45%	33.38%	33.52%	42.95%	24.07%
Agri. Labour	21.61%	21.07%	25.52%	20.13%	21.14%	18.54%
Wage labourer	4.57%	2.34%	5.01%	6.92%	4.12%	8.58%
Sericulture	-	-	-	1.79%	1.11%	
Construction labourer	1.16%	-	-	3.63%	2.62%	1.79%
Fishing	2.02%	-	-	-	-	-
Transport	1.31%	2.95%	4.03%	1.34%	1.41%	3.05%
Service	9.47%	5.95%	9.20%	4.87%	5.28%	6.19%
Communication	11.98%	9.3%	12.29%	13.97%	10.85%	11.03%
Others	9.06%	7.84%	10.57%	13.83%	195	17.55%
Fishery Farm	-	2	4	913	195	4

(B) DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

3.3 In this section an attempt has been made to highlight the demographic characteristics of the respondents/ the beneficiaries (farmers/fishermen and public representatives). The following indicators have been studied: age, education and occupation in this regard.

3.4 In respect of age distribution it is found that the highest percentage (40.10%) of the respondents belonged to the age group of 40-49 years followed by the respondents of the 30-39 and 50-59 years age group (21.88% & 18.76 %). The Table – 3.2 shows that 91.15% of the respondents belonged to the active age group of 15 to 59 years and remaining 8.85% belonged to the age group of 60 and above years. The table also

indicated that most of the beneficiaries (80.75%) belonged to the age group of 30 to 69 years. Detailed are shown in Table – 3.2.

Table-3.2: Age Distribution of the Respondents (Beneficiary--Farmers & Fishermen and the Public Representatives – Chairmen & Members of Union Parishad)

Age (in year)	Farmers & Fishermen n=120		Chairmen & Members of Union Parishad n=72		Total N=192	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
15 - 19	2	1.66	-	-	2	1.04
20 - 29	10	8.33	8	11.11	18	9.37
30 - 39	19	15.83	23	31.94	42	21.88
40 - 49	46	38.33	31	43.06	77	40.10
50 - 59	30	25.00	6	8.33	36	18.76
60 - 69	12	10.00	3	4.16	15	7.81
70 +	1	0.83	1	1.38	2	1.04
Total	120	100.00	72	100.00	192	100.00

3.5 Levels of education of the respondents (Farmers & Fishermen and the Public Representatives – Chairmen & Members of Union Parishad) have been presented in Table-3.3. The table shows that 17.19% respondents could sign only. It is shown that majority of the respondents (55.21%) belonged to the illiterate to Junior High School level of education followed by 18.23 & 15.62 % Higher Secondary and Secondary school. 7.81% and 3.12% of the beneficiaries were bachelor and master degree holder. It is observed that none of the public representatives is illiterate. On the other hand, 26.39% & 18.05% of the public representatives have higher secondary and junior high school certificate followed by 16.67 % and 12.50% secondary and bachelor level of education respectively.

Table-3.3: Distribution of the Respondents (Beneficiary--Farmers & Fishermen and the Public Representatives – Chairmen & Members of Union Parishad) by Education

Level of Education	Farmers & Fishermen		Chairmen & Members of Union Parishad		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Illiterate	14	11.67	-	-	14	7.29
Can sign only	21	17.50	6	8.33	27	14.06
Primary	24	20.00	9	12.50	33	17.19
Junior High School	19	15.83	13	18.05	32	16.67
Secondary	18	15.00	12	16.67	30	15.62
Higher Secondary	16	13.33	19	26.39	35	18.23
Bachelor	6	5.00	9	12.50	15	7.81
Master	2	1.67	4	5.55	6	3.12
Total	120	100.00	72	100.00	192	100.00

3.6 In respect to the occupation of the client (Farmers & Fishermen) it is observed that 37.25% and 15.83% had the agriculture farming and agriculture day-labour respectively as the principal occupation, i.e. 53.08% beneficiaries were directly related to agriculture followed by wage/construction labour (8.33%). On the otherhand, it is noticed that 38.89% of the Public Representatives (PR) – Chairmen & Members of UP had the agriculture farming as principal occupation followed by commerce/small business (20.83%). 12.50%, 11.11% and 9.72% of the respondents (Chairmen & Members of UP) who constituted the third, fourth and fifth largest occupational groups earned their livelihood through service (Pvt. & NGOs), social worker and teaching respectively; whereas, these figures for farmers & fishermen were 5.83%, 3.33% and 5.00% (Table-3.4).

Table 3.4: Distribution of the Respondents (Beneficiary-Farmers & Fishermen and the Public Representatives (PR) – Chairmen & Members of Union Parishad) by Principal Occupation

Occupation	Farmers & Fishermen		Chairmen & Members of Union Parishad	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agriculture Farming	44	37.25	28	38.89
Agriculture day-labour	19	15.83	-	-
Wage/Construction Labour	10	8.33	-	-
Rickshaw/Van Pulling	3	2.50	-	-
Fishing	3	2.50	-	-
Commerce/Small Business	12	10.00	15	20.83
Service (Pvt. & NGOs)	7	5.83	9	12.50
Teaching	6	5.00	7	9.72
Social Worker	4	3.33	8	11.11
House work	8	6.67	2	2.78
Transport	4	3.33	3	4.17
Total	120	100.00	72	100.00

(C) INFORMATION PROVIDED BY UPAZILA OFFICIALS

3.7 For this study a checklist was prepared & administered and opinion of officials were invited to explore/know about the existing manpower, physical infrastructure, investment in development projects, positive and negative impact of the development projects, interaction with Upazila administration to beneficiaries, and other logistics required to render services for the people. For realizing the actual problems, the concerned Upazila agriculture and fisheries Officers and other officers of the same

area were asked to inform the problems and opinions in these aspects. These have been reflected in table 3.5 to 3.12. The tables from 3.5 to 3.12 were constituted on the basis of the official's records and opinions of the concerned officials.

3.8 Sanctioned and actual manpower position of the sample Upazila Agriculture Unit (UAU) may be seen in Table-3.5. The table depicted that in most of the UAUs, there was no shortage of class-I officers except Rampal of Bagerhat. Only 22.22% of the post of class-I officer were vacant, and for class-III & IV employees, these figures were 3.73 % and 27.78 % respectively. The table depicts that average vacant post of agriculture department for all four categories of manpower for the three Upazila is 9.49% (Table-3. 5).

3.9 Sanctioned and actual manpower position of the four sample Upazila Fisheries Unit (UFU) may also be seen in Table-3.5. It is noticed that there is no provision of class-II officer in the sample UFU. The table depicts that in most of the UFUs, there is insignificant shortage of class-I Officers except Rampal of Bagerhat. Only 14.28% of the post of class-I Officer is vacant, and for class-III & IV employees, there is no shortage of manpower in the sample unit. The table depicts that average vacant post of Fisheries department for all four categories of manpower for the four Upazila is 4.35% (Table-3. 5).

Table-3.5: Statement of Manpower (Human Resource) of the Sample Upazila Agriculture Unit*/Fisheries Unit**

Level of Manpower	Department /Office	Sanctioned Post					Actual Manpower (up to 22.6.2005)				
		Chandina	Paba	Rampal	Mathbaria	Total	Chandina	Paba	Rampal	Mathbaria	Total
Class-I	Agriculture	-	3	3	3	9	-	3	1	3	7(22.22)
	Fisheries	2	1	2	2	7	2	1	1	2	6(14.28)
Class-II	Agriculture	-	1	1	1	3	-	1	-	-	1(66.66)
	Fisheries	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Class-III	Agriculture	-	50	18	39	107	-	50	15	38	103(3.73)
	Fisheries	3	3	3	3	12	3	3	3	3	12(00.00)
Class-IV	Agriculture	-	04	7	07	18	-	3	6	4	13(27.78)
	Fisheries	1	1	1	1	4	1	2	2	1	4(00.00)
Total	Agriculture	-	58	29	50	137	-	57	22	45	124(9.49)
	Fisheries	6	5	6	6	23	6	5	5	6	2(4.35)

N.B.: Figures in the parenthesis indicate the percentage of the concerned vacant post.

* Data for Agriculture Unit* of Ghior, Chandina and Golapgonj Upazila was not available.

** Data for Fisheries unit of Ghior and Golapgonj was not available.

3.10 As for physical infrastructures of Agriculture/Fisheries department, 100%, 75.00% and 62.50% respondents respectively informed that office room & furniture and residential accommodation for staffs were insufficient (Table-3.6). However, it is revealed that there is insignificant shortage of residential accommodation for officers.

Table-3.6: Opinion of the Officials about the Existing Facilities at Agriculture/ Fisheries Department*

Description	Number of Respondents		Percentage (%) of Insufficiency
	Sufficient	Insufficient	
Office Room	-	08	100.00
Officer's Resident Accommodation	06	02	25.00
Staff Resident Accommodation	03	05	62.50
Office Furniture	02	06	75.00

* It may be noted that 100 percent respondent mentioned the insufficiency of allocation of Annual Fund to provide service and this insufficiency is 37.50 percent of the total requirements.

3.11 Table-3.7 indicates the volume of investment in the developments projects of Agriculture and Fisheries sectors of upazila level in the year 2003-04. In 3 upazilas, 160 agricultural development projects were implemented in which the total investment was 25,06,200/-. The per capita project expense was Tk. 4.29/-. Again a sum total of Taka 9,30,678/- were spent for implementing 23 development projects under fisheries sectors in 4 upazilas. The per capita expense under fishery project was Taka 1.09. It indicates the poor investment status in agriculture and Fisheries sectors at upazila level.

Table-3.7: Statement of Investment in Development Projects by Agriculture and Fisheries Sectors of Upazila in 2004

Sector	No. of Project Implemented	Total Amount (in Tk.)	No. of Upazila	Population of the Upazilas	Per capita Dev. Project Expenses (in Tk.)
Agriculture Sector	160	25,06,200/-	3	58,4,455/-	4.29
Fisheries Sector	23	9,30,678/-	4	8,54,333/-	1.09

3.12 Table-3.8 shows the status of service actually received by the clientele in different upazila under the study. In most of the upazilas the record of providing service are not maintained properly. It is found from the table that in Ghior and Golapgonj upazilas no data were available. Only in Paba and Motbaria upazila the services provided by Agriculture and Fisheries department were available in which it was found that it is agriculture sector rather than fisheries sector was the major service provider.

Table-3.8: Service Actually Received by the Clientele/Beneficiary in 2004 as Opined by the Officials

Upazila	No. of clientele attended at the department		No. of clientele actually received service/training		No. of clientele not received service%	
	Agriculture	Fisheries	Agriculture	Fisheries	Agriculture	Fisheries
Ghior	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA
Chandina	DNA	350	DNA	300	DNA	14.28%
Paba	1025	275	885	225	13.66%	18.18%
Rampal	DNA	725	DNA	556	DNA	23.31%
Mathbaria	1500	500	1350	400	10.00%	20.00%
Golapgonj	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA

DNA = Data not available.

3.13 Table-3.9 stated the positive and negative impact of development projects undertaken at upazila level. In almost all cases it has been found that development projects have created a positive impact on different aspects of agricultural and fisheries sector. The farmers at grass root level have been acquainted with new technology and it helped a lot to boost up production level. In a few cases there have been some sort of negative impact, which may be considered insignificant in comparison with overall development. Sometimes market value falls during harvesting period, which can be addressed by giving price support, by the government.

Table-3.9: Statement of the Positive and Negative Impact of the Development Project Viewed by the Officials of Upazila

Impact			
Positive	No. of Respondents (in %)	Negative	No. of Respondents
Transfer of Technology among the farmers	33.33	Some farmer became more dependable on DAE	33.33
Availability of Improved HY seeds	66.67	Market value declines at harvesting period	33.33
Development of skills of farmers through training	66.67	Insignificant fund does not influence the fate of the poor farmer	66.67
Knowledge about procedure of seeds preservation	66.67		
Irrigation facility expanded	66.67		
Increased pulse crops	33.33		
Increased maize areas	33.33		
Prepare to face natural draught	33.33		
Develop group approach among farmers	33.33		
Farmers received loan	66.67		
Farmers became aware of shrimp training	33.33		
Shrimp quality developed	33.33		
Fish production increases	66.67		
Unused water became under cultivation	33.33		
Creation of self-employment	33.33		
Supply of fish protein	33.33		
Provide nutrition for people	33.33		

3.14 Table-3.10 shows a poor interaction between the development agencies with the stakeholders. The upazila officials of Agriculture and Fisheries department rarely visit the stakeholders at grass root level. On the other hand the farmers or fishermen who are considered to be the direct beneficiaries of the services also have poor contact with the service provider. Inevitably the reciprocal poor contact tells upon the production system and adversely affects the government policy.

Table-3.10: Opinion of the Officials Respondents about the Interaction with Beneficiaries

Interaction (Visit/Inspection) By	Average visit/Inspection (In Times)	No. of Respondents N=22
i) Upazila Officials to Farmers/Fishermen, Villages:		
a) In one month	1.78	8 (36.36)
b) In three month	4.37	12 (54.54)
c) In six month	3.86	18 (81.82)
d) Not at all	-	4 (18.8)
ii) Farmers/ Fishermen Family Members to Upazila Administration:		
a) In one month	1.34	12 (10.00)
b) In three month	2.10	19 (15.83)
c) In six month	3.22	32 (26.67)
d) Not at all	-	68 (56.67)

N = Number of Respondents.

N.B. Figures in the parenthesis indicate percentage of respondents.

(D) OPINION OF THE CLIENTELE (Farmers/Fishermen and Public Representative)

3.15 Table-3.11 reveals the opinion of the farmers and fishermen about the counseling by upazila officials. The beneficiaries although were satisfied with the behaviour of upazila officials but maximum respondents expressed their views negatively regarding counseling made by the upazila officials. 62% respondents opined that they did not get any counseling service from the upazila officials. In order to boost up production the counseling service could be more intensive.

Table-3.11: Opinion of the Beneficiaries (Farmers/Fishermen) about the Behaviour/Counseling by Upazila Officials

N=120

Behaviour/Counseling by Thana Officials			Total
Indicator	Yes	No	
Behaved well	67 (55.83)	53 (44.17)	120 (100.00)
Counseled	58 (48.33)	62 (51.67)	120(100.00)

N = Number of Respondents.

N.B.: Figures in the parenthesis indicate % of the type of behaved/counseling.

3.16 Table-3.12 shows the information system through different sources about the improved systems. It is observed that no established and formal system works for dissemination of knowledge and skill about improved system, only 10% respondents opined that the formal training were provided by upazila administration. It is further observed that electronic media plays a powerful and effective role in dissemination the knowledge of improved system. But in most cases the farmers and fishermen derive knowledge about improved system through an informal method of interaction with the neighbouring farmer. Although non-govt. organizations claim to play a vital role in poverty alleviation but they play a poor role in promotion of essential knowledge of technical know-how. It may be assumed that the non-govt. organisations are more concerned with credit facilities rather than to provide formal training in this productive sector. Neither the people's representative nor the social leaders play any vital role in providing knowledge of improved system.

Table-3.12: Source of Information of Beneficiaries (Farmers/Fishermen) about the knowledge of Improved System

N=120

Sources of Information	Response
Formal Training from Upazila Administration	12(10.00)
Radio/Television	39(32.50)
Agricultural/Fisheries Officials of Upazila Administration	15(12.50)
Neighbouring Farmers	33(27.50)
Peoples Representatives	6(5.00)
NGO Workers	3(2.5)
Documentary Film/Leaflet/Handout	2(1.67)
Teachers of Schools/College	4(3.33)
Teachers/Imams of Mosques/Madrasha	3(2.5)
No Responses	3(2.50)
Total	120(100.00)

3.17 Table-3.13 depicts the service delivery of Upazila Agriculture Department to union parishad during 2003-04. It is observed from the table that in establishing nursery, tubewell maintenance, training and counseling to farmers, supply of fertilizer and pesticides the union parishad did not get expected services. But in other components such as establishment of demonstration farm, pump machine installation and maintenance and specially, in distribution of agricultural inputs the delivery of services was quite satisfactory. The loans and grants received by the

beneficiaries were more than the amount distributed by concerned government department.

Table-3.13: Statement of Service Delivery during Fiscal year 2003-04 from Upazila Agriculture Department to Union Parishad (Beneficiaries)

Sl. No.	Statement	Unit of Measurement	Average Service Delivery/Received Per Union		Deviation (+/-) from Upazila Admn.
			Delivered by Upazila Admn.	Received by Union	
1.	Establishment of Demonstration Farm	In number	70.14	84	(+)14.14
2.	Establishment of Nursery	In number	0.034	-	(-)0.034
3.	Irrigation Facility:	In number			
	a. Machine maintenance/servicing	In number	0.75	1.5	(+)0.75
	b. Pump Machine Installation	In number	0.55	0.65	(+)0.10
	c. Distribution/Sell/Tube-well	In number	0.07	13	(+)12.93
	d. Tube-well maintenance/servicing	In number	2	1.83	(-)0.17
	e. Spray machine	In number	1	0.83	(-)0.17
4.	Human Resource Development:				
	a. Training to Farmers	In Man Days	150.34	124.5	(-)25.84
	b. Farmers Rally/Day/VDP members Training		15.51	7.5	(-)8.01
5.	Counseling to Farmers	In number	4.13	8.83	(-)0.30
6.	Distribution of Agricultural Input:	In kg.			
	a. Fertilizer	Kg.	364.76	33.43	(-)34.33
	b. Seeds (Agri.)	Kg.	80.48	773	(+)692.52
	c. Pesticides	Kg.	0.86	0.67	(-)0.19
	d. Wheat	Kg.	385.07	390.66	(+)5.60
	e. Vhutra/Jab	Kg.	30.00	34.17	(+)4.17
	f. Mustered	Kg.	15.00	16.66	(+)1.66
	g. Pulse (Maskalai)	Kg.	6.25	7.50	(+)1.25
7.	Advisory service for Modern Technology	Number	4.13	4.00	(-)0.13
8.	Loan/Gant received	In Tk.	1550	2000	(+)450

3.18 Table-3.14 shows the delivery of service of Upazila Fisheries department to union parishad in the year 2003-04. It is observed that the different types of service delivery provided by the Upazila fisheries department to union parishad were not up to the expectation and in most cases the beneficiaries did not get the benefit of

services provided by the concerned department. The analysis shows that in case of training of fishermen, establishments of demonstration farm and nursery, digging of ponds and counseling services the performances were very poor. It is, therefore, necessary to strengthen the role of Upazila fisheries department to a great extent.

Table-3.14: Statement of Service Delivery during FY 2003-04 from Upazila Fisheries Department to Union Parishad (Beneficiaries)

Sl. No.	Statement	Unit of Measurement	Average Service Delivery/Received Per Union		Deviation (+/-) from Upazila Admn.
			Delivered by Upazila Admn.	Received by Union	
1.	Human Resource Development:				
	a. Training of Fishermen/Farmers	In man day	91	58	(-)33
	b. Training to VDP & NGO members	In man day	29.02	21.50	(+)7.52
2.	Inspection/Travel in Unit	In number	15	11	(-)4
3.	Establishment of Demonstration Farm (Fisheries)	In number	0.74	0.55	(-)0.19
4.	Establishment of Nursery (Fisheries)	In number	0.15	-	(-)0.15
5.	Distribution of Fish Fry/Finger link	In kg.	23.50	20.83	(-)2.67
6.	Distribution of Fertilizer	In kg.	1106	1053	(-)53
7.	Disbursement of Loan/Money	In Tk.	47,515.42	46666.67	(-)848.75
8.	Person received loan/money	In number	12	9.5	(-)3.5
9.	Digging of Pond/Dhighi	Decimal	-	-	-
10.	Counseling to fishermen	In number	9	6	(-)3

3.19 Table-3.15 shows the input supply by the Upazila Administration to the farmers. The respondents opined that the receipt of inputs such as; fertilizer, seed, irrigation equipment pesticides and fish fry were very poor. Maximum respondents did not receive any input, which actually could be taken into account. Regarding the quality of inputs they received were by and large up to the satisfaction. But the price of the inputs supplied to the beneficiaries was considered higher than the market price according to maximum number of recipient. It may be mentioned that uninterrupted supply of these inputs with subsidized price might increase the output.

Table-3.15: Opinion of the Respondents about Inputs Received from Upazila Administration

Inputs	Assistance				Total	Quality of Inputs		Total	Whether price of inputs are higher than market price		Total
	Received	Not Received	Sometimes Received	No Response		Good	Bad		Yes	No	
Fertilizer	9 (7.5)	82 (68.33)	23 (19.17)	6 (5.00)	120 (100.00)	21 (65.62)	11 (34.38)	32 (100)	17 (53.12)	15 (46.88)	32 (100)
Seed	7 (5.83)	100 (83.33)	8 (6.67)	5 (4.17)	120 (100.00)	11 (73.33)	4 (26.67)	15 (100)	8 (53.33)	7 (46.67)	15 (100)
Irrigation Equipment	5 (4.17)	88 (73.33)	21 (17.50)	6 (5.00)	120 (100.00)	9 (34.61)	17 (65.39)	26 (100)	19 (73.03)	7 (26.93)	26 (100)
Pesticides	-	9 (80.83)	12 (10.00)	11 (9.17)	120 (100.00)	9 (75.00)	3 (25.00)	12 (100)	9 (5.00)	3 (25.00)	12 (100)
Fish Fry	6 (5.00)	9 (77.50)	2 (1.67)	19 (15.83)	120 (100.00)	3 (37.5)	5 (62.50)	8 (100)	3 (37.50)	5 (62.50)	8 (100)

3.20 Table-3.16 reveals the status of modern farming system applied by the beneficiaries. It has been observed that the farmers in general have a very little knowledge of improved farming system. Eventually most of the respondents hardly apply modern technology in production process. The ultimate effect of applying outdated production technology results in low productivity.

Table-3.16: Opinion about the Use of Modern/Improved Farming System by Beneficiaries (Farmers/Fishermen)

N=120

Type of Responses	Not at all	Little	Substantial	Much	Total
Level of Knowledge in Modern/Improved Farming (Agriculture/Fisheries) Method	16(13.33)	85(70.83)	15(12.5)	4(3.33)	120(100.00)
Application/use of Knowledge on Modern Farming System	18(15.00)	82(68.33)	14(11.67)	6(5.00)	120(100.00)

3.21 Table-3.17 reveals the expectation of the beneficiaries from the respective of department of upazila. On different aspects such as timely receipt of credit, seeds, fertilizer, irrigation equipment and training; a good number of respondents want the facilities to be provided with low interest rate. Maximum number of participants want to undergo formal training on scientific method of agriculture and fish cultivations which they suggested to be provided free of cost.

3.22 The peculiarity as it has been recorded during the research work that the respondents are reluctant to meet the concerned officer of village and upazila level. It may be due to their reservation about the delivery system of government machinery.

Table-3.17: Expectation of the Respondents (Farmers & Fishermen) from Agriculture and Fisheries Units of Upazila Administration

N = 120

Expectation of Farmers	Response			Total
	Without interest	At low interest (5-12 percent)	At any interest	
Timely Receipt of Credit	43(35.83)	71(59.17)	6(5.00)	120(100.00)
	Free of Cost	At Market Price	At Fair Price	
Timely Receipt of Seeds & Fish Fry	41(34.17)	72(60.00)	7(5.83)	120(100.00)
Timely Receipt of Fertilizer	22(18.33)	89(74.17)	9(7.50)	120(100.00)
Timely Receipt of Pesticide and Necessary Counseling	24(20.00)	95(79.17)	1(0.83)	120(100.00)
Timely Receipt of Irrigation Equipment	23(19.17)	87(72.50)	10(8.33)	120(100.00)
Desire for Receiving Training	<i>Without Course Fees</i>	<i>By Paying Course Fees</i>		<i>Total</i>
Opportunity of Receiving Training on Scientific Agriculture & Fish Cultivation	91(75.83)	29(24.17)		120(100.00)
Desire for Interaction		Yes	No	
Opportunity to meet with concerned officers at villagers		52(43.33)	68(56.67)	120(100.00)
Opportunity to meet with concerned officials at Thana Administration		47(39.17)	73(60.83)	120(100.00)

3.23 The beneficiaries (farmers/fishermen) were asked to provide their opinion about the expected services and satisfaction they received from the concerned offices. The Table-3.18 portrayed that the beneficiaries received 34.17% services and satisfaction out of their total expectations. And they received only 24.17% input out of their total requirements.

Table-3.18: Opinion of the Respondents (Farmers/Fishermen) about the Expected Service and Satisfaction Received from the Concerned Office

(N=120)

Area	Responses in percentage
Rate of the services received as per the expectation	34.17
Received agriculture/fisheries inputs out of the total requirements	24.17

3.24 Table-3.19 shows the service available and the development of quality service delivery system in Upazila Agriculture and Fisheries department. 60.83% respondents opined that they did not receive proper services while 39.17% respondents opined in the positive in this regard. On the otherhand 75.85% respondents expressed their dissatisfaction on the fact that they did not receive required inputs, which indicates that supply of necessary inputs in Upazila Agriculture and Fisheries department was not sufficient. Although 55.83% respondents have no allegation against services delivery but 41.67 % respondents have allegation about the harassment of middlemen.

3.25 It is observed that only 53.33% respondents were deprived of the service due to complex procedures on the other hand 52.50% respondents could not avail of the service as to their expectation. 69.17% respondents opined that the service was not provided on time, which indicate the lack of promptness of service delivery by the officials. Due to lack of logistic supports, day-to-day business of 64.17% respondents was disrupted. In order to activate the service delivery system to the expectation of the respondent's 55.00% of them opined that the public representatives should be involved in day-to-day monitoring of the departmental service.

Table-3.19: Opinion of the Respondents (Farmers/Fishermen) about the Existing Service available & of Quality Service Delivered from the Concerned Office

Opinion	(N=120)	
	Yes	No
Receives proper service	39.17	60.83
Receives required inputs	24.17	75.85
Have allegation about service	44.17	55.83
Services are disposed within stipulated time	30.83	69.17
Harasses by middle-men	41.67	58.33
Received necessary service as well as inputs	23.33	76.67
Services are delayed	32.50	67.50
Deprived on account of complex procedures	53.33	46.67
Avail the opportunity into office as and when necessary/expect	47.50	52.50
Disruption of day to day business due to lack of logistic support (transport, trained/skilled manpower etc.)	64.17	35.83
Day to day monitoring should be made by public representatives	55.00	45.00

3.26 Table-3.20 shows the opinion of the respondents regarding availability of agriculture/fisheries inputs along with the satisfaction level of the respondents. The rate of agriculture/fisheries inputs received by the beneficiaries (farmers & fishermen) according to the respondents was 25.53% in average while the farmers & fishermen's satisfaction was 28.72 %. On the other hand, the satisfaction level of the Officials regarding their own performance is 50.00%. It is evident that satisfaction level of all the group of the respondents is comparatively low.

Table-3.20: Opinion about the Availability of Input & the Rate of Satisfaction of the Respondents (Officials & Public Representatives (Chairman/Members of UP)

Opinion	Responses (in %)		
	Officials (UAO/UFO) (n=22)	Public Representatives (n=72)	Average
Beneficiaries received necessary agriculture/fisheries inputs at the rate of	36.36	22.22	25.53
Beneficiaries (farmers & fishermen) are satisfied to the service of officials at the rate of	54.54	20.83	28.72
Officials are satisfied to their service performance at the rate of	50.00	-	50.00

3.27 Table-3.21 shows the opinion of the respondents about the promotion of service delivery on different aspects. In this regards respondents were the *officials of Upazila fisheries and agriculture department and public representatives*. 86.36% of the officials and 90.28% of the *public representatives* opined in favour of the proposal to display the bill-board in the open public places showing the various services offered by the concerned service providing departments. It indicates that till now such billboard is insignificantly displayed in front of concerned offices.

3.28 It is observed that 63.63% of the *officials* and 80.56% of the *public representatives* feel that there should be a mechanism to inform the clientele about the process and methods of service delivery although about 37% of the *officials* do not feel the necessity to inform about the process. It is observed that the bulk of the clientele, mostly illiterate and rural people are not aware of the system and methods of the servicedelivery system. 90.90% of the *officials* and 91.67% of the members of

public representatives opine that there should be a system to accept the allegation through complain book, although no complain book was found in the respective departments. 72.00% of the *officials* and 68% of the *public representatives* think that the beneficiaries are given proper service as per the ability of the departments. In general the facilities in these departments were found to be insufficient.

3.29 In the service delivery system the middlemen harass the recipient of the service. 54.54% of the *officials* and 62.50% of the *public representatives* recognize the negative role played by the middlemen. When the clientele were asked as to whether they got the necessary inputs along with proper advise, 45.45% and 31.95% of the *officials* and *public representatives* respectively gave their negative opinion. The *officials* did not agree that service were delayed, however 68.06% *public representatives* did not agree with the statement of the *officials*. Most of the respondents did not agree that clientele were deprived of the service delivery due to complex process. But the opinion seems to be value oriented. 45.45% of *officials* consider that clientele are 100% satisfied with the service delivery while 73.61% of the *public representatives* did not endorse the view. Again 54.54% *officials* are satisfied with the service they provide to the clientele. The opinions of the public representatives were not available in this respect. 81.82% *officials* consider that the clientele group could avail of the opportunity to enter themselves in the office as and when necessary while 52.78% of the *public representatives* endorsed the view of the *officials*. Fact remains that the facility to take necessary measure were limited in the concerned offices. 68.19% of the *officials* and 76.38% of the *public representatives* consider that the day to day business of the offices are disrupted in the absence of necessary logistic support but 81.82% *officials* did not agree that it was due to dearth of trained or skilled professionals. 72.73% of the *officials* did not want supervision of public representatives while 84.72% of the *public representatives* wanted supervision of the agriculture and fishery service delivery system by the public representatives. Insignificant *officials* and public representatives consider that the existing administrative system of the offices negatively affect the service delivery system.

3.30 It is evident from the above analysis that the opinions are not value-free, although the officials as well as the public representatives agree on the fact that the resources are limited, process is complex and satisfaction level of the clientele is not up-to the expectation.

Table-3.21: Opinion of the Respondents (Officials & Public Representatives (Chairman/ Members of UP) about the Existing system/pattern for promoting Delivery Service

Opinion	Responses (in %)			
	Officials (UAO/UFO) (n=22)		Public Representatives (n=72)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Existence of Bill-board indicating the availability of offering various services should be displayed in the public/open places	86.36	13.64	90.28	9.72
Mechanism to inform about the process of rendering service to the beneficiaries -so that they may follow the specific process & methods to avail services from concerned department	63.63	36.37	80.56	19.44
The authority should honour and accept the allegation of the beneficiaries about services offers	90.90	09.10	91.67	8.33
Beneficiaries are given proper service as per ability of concerned departments	72.73	27.27	68.06	31.94
Clientele are being harassed by middle-men	54.54	45.46	52.78	47.22
Clientele are receiving necessary input as well as proper advise	45.45	54.55	31.95	68.05
Service are delayed	18.18	81.82	68.06	31.95
Clientele are being deprived due to complexity of the process for service	27.27	72.73	33.33	66.67
Clientele are 100% satisfied with the service received	45.45	54.55	26.39	73.61
The officials are 100% satisfied @ services rendered	54.54	45.46	-	-
Clientele avail the opportunity of entering themselves in the departments, as and when expect	81.82	18.18	52.78	47.22
The day to day business of offices are disrupted on account of required logistic support	68.19	31.81	76.38	23.62
Services are disrupted due to trained/skilled/ professional person	18.18	81.82	56.94	43.06
Day to day supervision should be made by public representatives	27.27	72.73	84.72	15.28
Existing administrative system of departments negatively affect the delivery of public service	13.64	86.36	18.06	81.94

(E) PROBLEMS AND SUGGESTIONS IDENTIFIED BY THE RESPONDENTS TO IMPROVE THE DELIVERY SYSTEM OF SERVICES

3.31 Table-3.22 shows the problems identified by three groups of respondents—The respondents were the *officials (upazila fisheries and agriculture officer)*, *public representatives* and the clientele/beneficiaries i.e., farmer/fishermen who are recipient of service delivery. When it was asked whether the poor service delivery was due to lack of trained or skilled professional manpower, 54.54% of the *officials* considered it to be a cause of poor service delivery while 45.83% of the *public representatives* and

44% of the clientele gave their opinion in favour. So it appears from the responses that on average 48.18% of the total respondents is in favour of the dearth of professional manpower which stands on the way of speedy delivery of service. It is evident from the table that 68.18% of the respondents opined “scarce of training fund” as one of the barriers of service delivery and 59.09% of them identified “poor departmental budget/insufficient ADP allocation” for another causes for the same. About 41% officials claimed that proper service could not be delivered due to lack of training materials. However, none of the public representatives and beneficiaries made any remark in this connection. The average 56.36% respondents considered that lack of physical infrastructure were one of the major causes, which hindered the speedy service delivery system. The most common problem identified by the respondents was the scarcity of input supply. 86.09% respondents in average told about the insufficient input supply from the Upazila agriculture and fishery department. 47% respondents opined that poor service delivery was due to insufficient logistic support, such as transport facilities etc. About 48% respondents considered the complex rules and procedures to be responsible to speed up service delivery system while 72.04% respondents in average opined that absence of bill-board mentioning the service facilities was one of the many causes of poor service delivery. 64.16% of the clientele who were the stakeholders of service delivery system made the accountability of officials of the agriculture and fisheries offices, directly responsible for poor service delivery which were agreed by 22.72% officials. The maximum number of clientele from respective clientele group and public representatives told about the administrative complexity and lack of coordination at local level, and these views were endorsed by 59.09% officials. According to 52.24% respondents from three groups the existence of middle-men stands on the way to speed-up delivery system. 73.60% of the UP representatives were in favour of supervision by local representatives while only 27.27% of the officials thought that lack of supervision by local representatives was the cause of poor delivery system. Apparently it seems that the officials are not in favour of any supervision to be made by local representatives. 50.83% of the clientele consider that the absence of remedial measures of the allegation of the clientele is one of the causes of poor service delivery system. In fact

no established system of making allegation was found in Upazila agriculture and fishery offices. 21.82% of the respondents in average considered the absence of individual responsibility of the officials as one of the causes stood on the way to speed up delivery of services. In fact no such individual accountability was found in Upazila concerned offices, which might be conducive to speed up delivery of services. The members of all respondents group unanimously agreed on the fact that insufficient allocation of money hinders smooth delivery of services in upazila. It is no denying the fact that sufficient budgetary allocation is a pre-requisite for ensuring and enhancing the quality of service to the rural clientele group. 35% respondents from clientele group thought that procedural lacking of ensuring the standard of service quality reduced the speedy delivery service while only 13.63% officials endorsed the view. Average 79.44% of the respondents in general and 100% of the officials in particular opined that lack of rapid promotion scope of UAO/UFO adversely affected the service delivery system. In fact the scope of higher mobility in the agriculture and fisheries department is comparatively limited which tells upon overall service delivery system. 95.45% of the officials and 83.76% of the respondents in general opined that discrimination among the members of different cadre as well absence of career planning had negative impact on service delivery. Lack of availability of computer had been identified by 90.90% officials to be the cause of poor quality of service. While 62.24% of respondents in general made the ignorance of the people responsible for not being able to speed up delivery of services. Among other factors 77.27% of the officials opined that lack of working environment in upazila adversely affected the speedy service delivery.

Table-3.22: Problems/Limitations Detected by the Clientele to speed-up Delivery of Services

Problems/Flaws	Responses in %			
	Officials (UAO/UFO) (n=22)	Public Representatives (n=72)	Beneficiaries (farmers /fishermen) (n=120)	Average
Shortage of trained/skilled professional manpower & field staff	54.54	45.83	44.16	48.18
Insufficient training fund	68.18	No response	No response	68.18
Poor departmental budget/ Insufficient ADP allocation	59.09	No response	No response	59.09
Shortage of training materials	40.90	No response	No response	40.90
Insufficient infrastructure for storage and other required rooms	59.09	58.33	51.66	56.36
Scarce of required inputs	72.72	93.05	92.50	86.09
Insufficient logistic supports (transport etc.)	45.45	47.22	48.33	47.00
Complex Govt. rules/procedures	50.00	47.22	45.83	47.68
Absence of bill-board mentioning the service available in-front of office	63.63	75.00	77.50	72.04
Lack of accountability of officers/& other employees of office	22.72	54.16	64.16	47.01
Administrative complexity and lack of coordination at local level	59.09	62.50	60.83	60.81
Excessive frequency of middle-men	40.90	54.16	61.66	52.24
Lack of supervision by local representatives	27.27	73.61	62.50	54.46
Absence of remedial measures of the allegation of the clientele	18.18	48.61	50.83	39.20
Absence of individual responsibility of the officials	9.09	26.38	30.00	21.82
Insufficient allocation of money	86.36	90.27	89.16	88.59
Procedural Lacking of ensuring the standard of quality of the service	13.63	29.16	35.00	25.93
Lack of rapid promotional scope of officers	100.00	70.83	67.50	79.44
Discrimination and lack of proper adjustment & coordination regarding training, career planning, promotion, facility relating services, working environment among the members of different cadre	95.45	83.33	72.50	83.76
Lack of availability computer & IT	90.90	90.27	87.50	89.56
Ignorance of the people	77.27	56.94	52.50	62.24
Negative attitude of officers & staffs	27.27	70.83	73.33	57.14
Lack of necessary supervision & monitoring of the activities	22.72	59.72	54.16	45.53
Lack of opportunity having final decision making	59.09	52.77	51.66	54.50
Lack of working environment of officers in the Upazila	77.27	51.38	55.83	61.49
Out dated rules and regulations	40.90	43.05	43.33	42.43

3.32 Table-3.23 shows the suggestions given by the respondents. The respondents were the *officials (Upazila fisheries and agriculture officer)*, *public representatives* and the clientele/beneficiaries i.e., farmer/fishermen who are recipient of service delivery. It is evident from the table that on average 46.76% of the respondents advocated in favour of skill/trained manpower to ensure services and 37.345% of the respondents suggested to ensure necessary physical infrastructure in upazila agriculture and fisheries unit. About one-fourth of the respondents suggested to provide modern training equipments and filled up the vacant post immediately. In order to improve quality services in upazila agriculture and fisheries section, 74.50% of respondents suggested to increase supply of input. On the other hand, display of bill-board showing the services available in the concerned units have been suggested by 65.47% of the respondents. 60.62% of the respondents suggested to device mechanism of coordination at local level. The clientele are the worst sufferer by the evil role played by the middlemen. So 40.73% of the respondents suggested punishing the middlemen. 72.50% of the respondents from clientele group suggested making provision of supervision by local representatives. 79.16% of the respondents from the public representatives also endorsed the view. But only 27.27% of the officials want supervision by the local representatives, which means maximum officials do not want any external control. 91.66% of the respondents suggested to enhance monitory allocation. 82.40% of the respondents in general and 100% of the officials suggested rapid promotion scope to be undertaken which they believed to have positive effect on improvement of quality service. On the otherhand, 86.50% of the respondents suggested to formulate appropriate policy, regarding training, career planning, promotion, working environment, etc. 72.14% of the respondents suggested to introduce IT facilities and 69.22% of the respondents proposed that people should realize the actual problems of rendering service by providing agencies.

Table-3.23: Suggestions given by the Clientele to speed-up Services Delivery

Suggestions	Responses in %			
	Officials (UAO/UFO) (n=22)	Public Representatives (UP Chairman/ members) (n=72)	Clientele/ Beneficiaries (farmers/ fishermen) (n=120)	Average
Provision of trained/skilled professional manpower	50.00	44.44	45.83	46.76
Provide modern training equipments	31.82	25.00	27.50	28.11
Ensure required physical infrastructure	40.90	36.11	35.00	37.34
Available Supply of required input	68.18	76.38	79.17	74.58
Vacant post should be filled-up immediately	22.72	No response	No response	22.72
Ensure logistic support(transport etc.)	45.45	40.27	39.17	41.63
Concerned official should be more empowered in decision making	36.36	31.94	30.00	32.77
Simplify Govt. rules/procedures	31.82	29.17	28.33	29.77
Display of bill-board mentioning the service available in the office	63.63	65.28	67.50	65.47
Government should allocate more fund directly to concerned department	54.54	No response	No response	54.54
Ensure accountability of officers & other employees of concerned office	27.27	48.61	45.83	40.57
Device mechanism of coordination at local level	59.09	61.11	61.67	60.62
Extension service should be provided to marginal farmer and women	22.72	No response	No response	22.72
Middle-men should be punished	36.36	41.66	44.17	40.73
Provision of supervision by local representatives	27.27	79.16	72.50	59.64
Allegation of the client should be treated appropriately	18.18	31.94	52.50	34.21
Individual responsibility of the officials should be ensured	13.63	25.00	35.83	24.82
Sufficient allocation of money/ input should be ensured/given	86.36	94.44	94.17	91.66
Standard quality of the service should be ensured	22.72	61.11	50.00	44.61
Rapid promotional scope of officers should be well taken	100.00	76.38	70.83	82.40
Proper policy launch for adjustment & coordination regarding training, career planning, promotion, facility relating services, working environment among the members of different cadre	90.90	86.11	82.50	86.50
Introduction computer & IT	77.27	70.83	68.33	72.14
People should realize the actual problems	81.82	66.67	59.17	69.22
Positive attitude of officers & staffs	22.72	61.11	72.50	52.11
Frequent supervision & monitoring of the activities	40.90	55.55	52.50	49.65
Improve working environment	45.45	34.72	38.33	39.50

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY:

1. It is observed from the study that the fisheries department is poorly manned in comparison with agriculture department. Although 100% posts are not filled up but the manpower position is by and large satisfactory.
2. The physical facilities such as office and residential accommodation, furniture and equipments are poor in upazila. Sufficient funds are not allocated under annual budget to ensure better service delivery.
3. The number of development projects undertaken in respective upazilas are a few in number and not commensurate with the development need of the upazilas. It indicates poor investment status and low per capita development expenditure.
4. The record of service delivery is not properly maintained in upazilas. The documentation system is poor. It is, therefore, not possible to actually comprehend the nature and status of service delivery system.
5. It has been observed that despite the poor service delivery in upazilas, the development projects have brought about positive changes specially the farmers have been acquainted with new technology.
6. The interaction between the development agencies and the stakeholders is not upto the expectation. Contact between the service providing agencies and the recipient of service is neither regular nor frequent.
7. There is no organised and formal system of providing training to the farmers. Government service providing agencies have not developed any formal system to disseminate new knowledge and skill of improved technical know-how. The source of information about improved skill still largely depends on informal interaction with the fellow farmers.

8. The price of inputs specially in agriculture sector provided by the government agencies were considered higher than the market price. The supply was sometimes interrupted due to production fall or transportation hazard.
9. The production system was found to be outdated causing low productivity of the output. The traditional method of cultivation adversely affects the production target.
10. Neither the clientele nor the public officials and public representatives are satisfied with the existing situation. The performance of the service providers are far from desired expectation of the beneficiaries. The clientile considered that the facilities to be provided by the government departments should clearly be displayed through bill board in conspicuous place. There is no established system of making information available to the clientele and no register is maintained to lodge any complaints.
11. The public representatives consider that there should be intensive supervision by the representatives but the officials did not prefer to undergo any supervision to be made by the public representatives. According to public officials it is not the mechanism but the resources, which stand on the way of providing better service.
12. The public officials of concerned departments have a little scope of higher mobility. Appropriate career development policy is not there to generate incentive to the officials. This has an adverse effect on the skill, efficiency and dynamism among the upazila officials, which in turn becomes barriers of service delivery system.
13. It is recognised both by the clientele group and the public representatives that the role-played by middlemen causes embarrassment for the uneducated rural people. As because the common people have no easy access to the public officials, the middlemen take the opportunity to exploit the poor and illiterate.

CHAPTER-IV

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

Recommendations:

1. **Adequate Manpower:** The manpower strength especially of fishery department of Upazila level may be streamlined and increased to ensure better service delivery. The vacant posts should be filled up and employees of both the department may be activated to provide better service at the field level.
2. **Physical Facilities:** The physical facilities such as office room, residential accommodation equipment and furniture may be provided alongwith sufficient budget allocation so that financial stringency does not hinder better service delivery.
3. **Launching Development Project:** More development projects under annual development plan may be undertaken and executed at upazila level, which will enhance flow of resources, advanced knowledge and skill and modern technology at upazila level. This will provide income generation activity, which in turn help poverty eradication. More investment will create more job opportunities. In undertaking new projects, emphasis may be given on local level planning.
4. **Introduction of Modern Record Management System:** The documentation system at upazila level may be improved. For this modern record management system may be introduced. Special courses on modern record management system may be organised in Regional Public Administration Training Centres located at Divisional headquarters for the employees of agriculture and fisheries department.
5. **Innovative Development Projects:** In order to enhance productivity more innovative development projects should be undertaken at upazila level which will ensure introduction of new technology, knowledge and skill. The farmers will, therefore, be acquainted with modern production system.

6. **Activate Service-Providing Agencies:** The service providing agencies may be activated to undertake extension work as well as to establish regular contact with the stakeholders. This contact must be intensive and door-to-door service should be provided.
7. **Introduction of Formal Training:** In order to transmit new information to the farmers, a formal training system may be developed. Training as a matter of fact is a catalytic agent. So highest priority may be given to formalize the training system. Effective training can develop the stakeholder as productive agent.
8. **Subsidized Agricultural Inputs:** The price of agricultural inputs should be subsidized and the supply should be uninterrupted. A constant monitoring system may be developed by the concerned authorities to ensure uninterrupted supply of agricultural inputs as well as to curb the artificial crisis sometimes created by dealers and hoarders.
9. **Modernization of Production Methods:** The traditional methods of production may be replaced by modernization of production methods. Power tillers and pump machines, may be imported duty free and expansion of rural electrification is necessary to boost up production.
10. **Display of Billboards:** The facilities provided by government departments and the procedure to avail of the facilities may be displayed through billboards to provide necessary information to the clientele. Complaints and allegations may be addressed properly and with utmost transparency.
11. **Role of Public Representatives:** There should be separate supervisory committee comprised of both the public representatives and government officials to monitor execution of government policy and programmes. An inspectorial service may be developed by the concerned departments to ensure accountability of the officials.
12. **Career Development Policy:** Well articulated career development policy may be formulated to ensure higher mobility of the officials as well as incentive provisions may be created along with reward and punishment provisions.

13. **Interaction between Officials and the Clientele:** The gap between public officials and the clientele groups may be minimized and the public officials should frequently visit the beneficiaries to develop a healthy and smooth relation between the service providers and recipient. The middlemen may be strictly dealt with extreme measures.

Conclusion:

The aftermath of newly independent countries of Afro-Asian region is termed as period of mass-disillusionment. People in general in these countries expect more effective service from government agencies. But the services provided by these agencies are neither effective nor transparent and accountable. Consequently people are frustrated, develop a sense of deprivation and no confidence on the public service. In order to fulfil people's hopes and aspirations it is, therefore, necessary to build up a pro-people and pro-active public service delivery system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, *Report of the Public Administration Reform Commission - Volume-I,II & III*, June 2000."

Centre for Policy Dialogue, *Crisis in Governance*, Dhaka: UPL, 1997.

Government of Bangladesh, *Constitution of the People's Republic of Bangladesh*, 1972.

Government of Bangladesh, *Matin Committee Report*, Dhaka, 1989.

Government of Bangladesh, *Oli Ahmed Committee Report*, Dhaka, 1995.

Government of Bangladesh, *Pay and Services Commission*, Dhaka, 1976.

Government of Bangladesh, *Public Administration Efficiency Study*, Ministry of Establishment, Dhaka, 1989.

Government of Bangladesh, *Public Report of Administrative Reorganisation Committee Letter of Transmittal*, Dhaka, 1996.

Government of Bangladesh, *Report of the Administrative and Service Reorganisation Committee*, Dhaka, 1973.

Government of Bangladesh, *Towards Better Government in Bangladesh*, Dhaka, 1993.

Khan M.M., *Administrative Reforms in Bangladesh*, Dhaka, UPL, 1998.

Ministry of Establishment, *Public Administration Efficiency Study*, (funded by the USAID), Dhaka, 1989.

The World Bank, *Government that Works: Reforming the Public Sector*, Dhaka, UPL, 1996.

UNDP, *Reform on the Public Administration Sector Study in Bangladesh*, 1993.

প্রশ্নমালা-১

(সংশ্লিষ্ট কৃষি/মৎস্য বিভাগের কর্মকর্তাদের জন্য)

বাংলাদেশ লোক-প্রশাসন প্রশিক্ষণ কেন্দ্র

সাভার, ঢাকা।

"Delivery of Services in Government Offices/Department/Organization: A Study" শীর্ষক গবেষণা প্রকল্প।

(অনুগ্রহপূর্বক প্রযোজ্য স্থানে টিক চিহ্ন দিন)

[বিঃদ্রঃ- শুধু গবেষণা কাজে ব্যবহারের জন্য এ প্রশ্নমালা প্রস্তুত করা হয়েছে। প্রদত্ত তথ্যসমূহ সম্পূর্ণরূপে গোপন রাখা হবে এবং উত্তর দাতার নাম, ঠিকানা ইত্যাদি কোনভাবে প্রকাশ করা হবে না।]

- ১.১। উত্তর দাতার নাম :
- ১.২। পদবী ও দপ্তর :
- ১.৩। মোট চাকুরীকাল (বছরে) :
- ১.৪। বর্তমান কর্মস্থলে চাকুরীর মেয়াদ (বছরে) :
- ১.৫। সর্বশেষ শিক্ষাগত যোগ্যতা :
- ১.৬। আপনার দাপ্তরিক কার্যাবলী সম্পর্কে কোন কর্ম বিবরণী (Job Description) আছে কি? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ১.৭। আপনার দাপ্তরের কর্ম পদ্ধতি সংশ্লিষ্ট গ্রাহকদের *(Clientele) জানানো হয় কিনা - যাতে করে সে সুনির্দিষ্ট প্রতিক্রিয়া ও পদ্ধতি অনুসরণ করে সহজেই সেবা পেতে পারে। হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ১.৮। উত্তর হ্যাঁ হলে গ্রাহকরা তা অনুসরণ করে কি? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ১.৯। আপনার দপ্তর থেকে গ্রাহকদেরকে কি কি সেবা প্রদান করা হয়ে থাকে :
- | | |
|----|----|
| কঃ | খঃ |
| গঃ | ঘঃ |
| ঙঃ | চঃ |
- ১.১০। আপনার দপ্তর থেকে যেসব সেবা/স্বাণ প্রদান করা হয়ে থাকে, সেসব সেবা/স্বাণ সম্পর্কে প্রকাশ্য বিলবোর্ড স্থাপন করা হয়েছে কী? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ১.১১। সেবা প্রদান সম্পর্কে গ্রাহকদের কোন অভিযোগ থাকলে তা কী গ্রহণ করা হয়? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ১.১২। আপনি কী মনে করেন আগত গ্রাহকগণ প্রয়োজনীয় সেবা পেয়ে থাকেন? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

* যে লোক/দপ্তরের প্রতিনিধি ব্যক্তিগত/দাপ্তরিক কর্ম সম্পন্ন করার জন্য সংশ্লিষ্ট ব্যক্তির অফিসে আগমন করেন, তিনি গ্রাহক হিসেবে গণ্য হবেন।

১.১৩। সেবা পাওয়ার ক্ষেত্রে আগত গ্রাহকগণ কি দালালদের (middle-men) দ্বারা প্রভাবিত হয়? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

১.১৪। উত্তর হ্যাঁ হলে প্রতারণার ধরণ উল্লেখ করুন:

ক.

খ.

গ.

১.১৫। আপনি কী মনে করেন দপ্তরে কাজকর্ম সম্পাদনে বিলম্ব হয়? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

১.১৬। আপনার কাজের জন্য কোন সময়সীমা নির্ধারিত আছে কিনা? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

১.১৭। আপনি কি মনে করেন পদ্ধতিগত জটিলতার জন্য গ্রাহকবৃন্দ প্রত্যাশিত সেবা থেকে বঞ্চিত হয়?
হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

১.১৮। উত্তর হ্যাঁ হলে জটিলতার ধরণ উল্লেখ করুন:

ক.

খ.

গ.

১.১৯। আপনি কী মনে করেন দপ্তরে আগত গ্রাহকগণ প্রাপ্ত সেবায় শতকরা ১০০% সন্তুষ্ট? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

১.২০। উত্তর "না" হলে কত ভাগ সন্তুষ্ট বলে আপনি মনে করেন? শতকরা ভাগ সন্তুষ্ট।

১.২১। আপনি কী দপ্তরে আগত গ্রাহকদের সেবা প্রদান করে ১০০% সন্তুষ্ট? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

১.২২। উত্তর 'না' হলে শতকরা কতভাগ সন্তুষ্ট? শতকরা ভাগ গর্বিত।

১.২৩। দপ্তরের কার্যক্রম সম্পাদনে আপনাকে প্রয়োজনীয় কর্তৃত্ব (Authority) দেয়া হয়েছে কী? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

১.২৪। প্রশিক্ষিত/দক্ষ লোকবলের অভাবে দপ্তরে সেবা প্রদানে বিঘ্ন হয় কী? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

১.২৫। জনসাধারণের সেবা নিশ্চিত করার জন্য, দাপ্তরিক কার্যক্রম জনপ্রতিনিধির তত্ত্বাবধানে সম্পন্ন করা প্রয়োজন মনে করেন কী?
হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

১.২৫। দপ্তরে বিদ্যমান প্রশাসনিক ব্যবস্থা জনসেবা প্রদানে নেতিবাচক প্রভাব ফেলছে কী? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

১.২৬। দপ্তরে জনসেবা নিশ্চিত/বৃদ্ধি করার জন্যে নিম্নের কোন প্রক্রিয়া অধিকতর ফলপ্রসূ হতে পারে বলে আপনি মনে করেন:

ক. যোগ্য/দক্ষ/প্রশিক্ষিত অফিসিয়াল।

খ.

গ.

১.২৭।

গ্রাহকদের দ্রুত সেবা প্রদানের ক্ষেত্রে বর্তমানে কী কী অসুবিধা/সমস্যা রয়েছে
(প্রযোজ্য ঘরে টিক চিহ্ন দিন):

- | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|
| ক. | প্রয়োজনীয় দক্ষ/যোগ্য/প্রশিক্ষিত জনবলের অভাব | ☐ |
| খ. | প্রয়োজনীয় অবকাঠামোর অপ্রতুলতা | ☐ |
| গ. | সরকারী নীতি ও নিয়ম-কানূনের জটিলতা | ☐ |
| ঘ. | প্রক্রিয়াগত জটিলতা | ☐ |
| ঙ. | দপ্তর থেকে গ্রাহকরা কি কি সেবা পেতে পারেন, সে সম্পর্কিত বিষয়সমূহ নোটিশ বোর্ডে (বিলবোর্ড) প্রদর্শন না করা | ☐ |
| চ. | কর্ম সম্পাদনের ক্ষেত্রে অফিসিয়ালদের জবাবদিহিতার ব্যবস্থা না থাকা | ☐ |
| ছ. | প্রশাসনিক জটিলতা এবং স্থানীয় পর্যায়ে সমন্বয়ের অভাব | ☐ |
| জ. | দালালদের দৌরাত্ম | ☐ |
| ঝ. | গ্রাহকদের অভিযোগের প্রতিকারের উপযুক্ত ব্যবস্থার অনুপস্থিতি | ☐ |
| ঞ. | স্থানীয় জনপ্রতিনিধিদের দ্বারা তদারকির ব্যবস্থা না থাকা | ☐ |
| ট. | কর্ম-সম্পাদনের ক্ষেত্রে একক (individual responsibility) দায়িত্বের নির্দিষ্ট বিধান না থাকা | ☐ |
| ঠ. | প্রয়োজনীয় অর্থ বরাদ্দ না থাকা | ☐ |
| ড. | কাজের গুণগত মান যাচাইয়ের ব্যবস্থা না থাকা | ☐ |
| ঢ. | দীর্ঘদিন ধরে পদোন্নতি না পাওয়া | ☐ |
| ণ. | বিভিন্ন সার্ভিসের সদস্যদের মধ্যে প্রশিক্ষণ, ক্যারিয়ার প্ল্যানিং, পদোন্নতি, চাকুরীগত সুযোগ-সুবিধা, কর্ম-পরিবেশ ইত্যাদির ক্ষেত্রে বিরাজমান বৈষম্য | ☐ |
| ত. | তথ্য সহায়তা কেন্দ্র ও আধুনিক প্রযুক্তি (কম্পিউটার) ইত্যাদি না থাকা | ☐ |
| থ. | স্থানীয়ভাবে চূড়ান্ত সিদ্ধান্ত গ্রহণের সুযোগ না থাকা | ☐ |
| দ. | জনসাধারণের অজ্ঞতা | ☐ |
| ধ. | কর্মকর্তা ও কর্মচারীদের নেতিবাচক মনোভাব | ☐ |
| ন. | কর্মকান্ডের তদারকী ও পরিবীক্ষণের জন্য প্রয়োজনীয় ব্যবস্থা না থাকা | ☐ |
| প. | | |
| ফ. | | |
| ব. | | |
| ভ. | | |
| ম. | | |
| য. | | |

১.২৮।

দপ্তরে গ্রাহকদের সেবা ও সেবার মান বৃদ্ধি করার জন্য কী কী ব্যবস্থা নেয়া যেতে পারে
(প্রযোজ্য ঘরে টিক চিহ্ন দিন):

- ক. গ্রাহকরা দপ্তর থেকে কি কি সুযোগসুবিধা সেবা পেতে পারে, প্রকাশ্য স্থানে/জনসমাগম স্থানে সে সম্পর্কিত
বিলবোর্ড/নোটিশ প্রদর্শনের ব্যবস্থা করা ☐
- খ. প্রশিক্ষিত/যোগ্য জনবলকে আকৃষ্ট করার জন্য স্থানীয় পর্যায়ে প্রয়োজনীয় ভৌত অবকাঠামো প্রস্তুত এবং পরিবেশ তৈরী ☐
- গ. প্রয়োজনীয় সেবা সহায়তা বৃদ্ধি ☐
- ঘ. বিধি-বিধান, নিয়ম-নীতি ও প্রক্রিয়াগত জটিলতার নিরসন ☐
- ঙ. স্থানীয় পর্যায়ে সময় সংক্রান্ত অসুবিধা চিহ্নিতকরণ ও দূরীকরণের ব্যবস্থা ☐
- চ. গ্রাহক অভিযোগের দ্রুত প্রতিকারের ব্যবস্থা ☐
- ছ. সরকারী কর্মকর্তা ও জনপ্রতিনিধি সমন্বয়ে গঠিত কমিটিকে সংশ্লিষ্টদের কাজ তদারকির দায়িত্ব প্রদান ☐
- জ. প্রয়োজনীয় অর্থ বরাদ্দ ও যথাসময়ে ছাড়করণ ☐
- ঝ. চিহ্নিত দালালদের কঠোর শাস্তির বিধান ☐
- ঞ. দ্রুত পদোন্নতি প্রদান এবং আন্তঃক্যাডার সুযোগ-সুবিধা ও বৈষম্য দূরীকরণ ☐
- ট. পুরস্কার ও শাস্তির বিধান থাকা ☐
- ঠ. কম্পিউটার সহ আধুনিক প্রযুক্তির সরবরাহ নিশ্চিতকরণ ☐
- ড. জনসাধারণের মধ্যে সচেতনতা বৃদ্ধি করার জন্য প্রচার মাধ্যমে ব্যাপক প্রচার ☐
- ঢ. দায়িত্ব পালনে উদ্বর্তন কর্তৃপক্ষের সহায়তা ও অন্যান্য লজিস্টিক্স সহায়তা প্রদান ☐
- ণ. গ্রাহকগণকে কাজের গতি-প্রকৃতি, অগ্রগতি ও অবস্থা সম্পর্কে স্বচ্ছ ধারণা প্রদান ☐
- ত. প্রয়োজনীয় প্রশিক্ষণের ব্যবস্থা করা ☐
- থ. অফিসিয়ালদের প্রয়োজনীয়/অতিরিক্ত আর্থিক incentive প্রদান ☐
- দ. সিদ্ধান্ত গ্রহণের ক্ষমতা প্রদান ☐
- ধ. জনবলের অপ্রতুলতা দূর করা ☐
- ন. "জনসেবার জন্য প্রশাসন" এ শ্লোগান চালু ☐
- প. গ্রাহকদের সিদ্ধান্ত পাওয়ার অধিকার নিশ্চিত করা ☐
- ফ. সেবা সহায়তা কেন্দ্র প্রতিষ্ঠা ☐
- ব. টেবিলের সামনে সেবা প্রদানকারী ব্যক্তিবর্গের নাম ও দায়িত্ব সম্বলিত ফলক রাখা ☐
- ভ. নিয়মিত পরিদর্শনের ব্যবস্থা ☐
- ম.
- য.
- র.
- ল.

প্রশ্নমালা-২

(কৃষক/মৎস্যজীবীদের (Clientle) জন্য)

বাংলাদেশ লোক-প্রশাসন প্রশিক্ষণ কেন্দ্র
সাভার, ঢাকা।

"Delivery of Services in Government Offices/Department/Organization: A Study" শীর্ষক প্রকল্প।

(অনুগ্রহ পূর্বক প্রযোজ্য স্থানে ✓ টিক চিহ্ন দিন)

[বিঃদ্রঃ- শুধু গবেষণা কাজে ব্যবহারের জন্য এ প্রশ্নমালা প্রস্তুত করা হয়েছে। প্রদত্ত তথ্যসমূহ সম্পূর্ণরূপে গোপন রাখা হবে এবং উত্তর দাতার নাম, ঠিকানা ইত্যাদি কোনভাবে প্রকাশ করা হবে না।]

- ১.১ উত্তরদাতার নাম :
- ১.২ ঠিকানা :
- ১.৩ তথ্য প্রদানকৃত দপ্তরের নাম : কৃষি ☐ মৎস্য ☐ উভয়ই ☐
- ১.৪ বয়স :
- ১৫ - ২০ বছরের মধ্যে ☐ ৩১ - ৪০ বছরের মধ্যে ☐
- ২১ - ৩০ বছরের মধ্যে ☐ ৫১ - ৬০ বছরের মধ্যে ☐
- ৪১ - ৫০ বছরের মধ্যে ☐
- ১.৫ শিক্ষাগত যোগ্যতা :
- নিরক্ষর ☐ শুধু নাম লিখতে জানেন ☐
- প্রাথমিক ☐ নিম্ন মাধ্যমিক ☐
- মাধ্যমিক ☐ উচ্চ মাধ্যমিক ☐
- স্নাতক ☐ স্নাতকোত্তর ☐
- অন্যান্য (উল্লেখ করুন)

১.৬ পেশা :

	প্রধান পেশা	দ্বিতীয় পেশা
☐ কৃষি চাষ	☐	☐
☐ মৎস্য চাষ	☐	☐
☐ ব্যবসা (আইন ব্যবসা ছাড়া)	☐	☐
☐ সরকারী চাকরি	☐	☐
☐ বেসরকারী চাকরি	☐	☐
☐ আইনজ্ঞ	☐	☐
☐ শিক্ষকতা	☐	☐
☐ অন্যান্য (উল্লেখ করুন)	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐

১.৭। আপনার/আপনার পরিবারের মোট চাষযোগ্য জমির পরিমাণ শতাংশ।

১.৮। আপনি আধুনিক/উন্নত কৃষি চাষ পদ্ধতি ব্যবহার করেন কিনা? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

১.৯। মৎস্য চাষের বিবরণঃ

ক. জলাশয়ের ধরণঃ পুকুর ☐ দিঘী ☐ ডোবা ☐ খালবিল ☐ অন্যান্য ☐
খ. চাষ পদ্ধতিঃ বিজ্ঞান সম্মত ☐ সনাতন ☐
গ. মালিকানাঃ একক ☐ যৌথ ☐ সরকারী/খাস ☐
ঘ. মোট জলাশয়ের পরিমাণঃ শতাংশ
ঙ. আনুমানিক বাৎসরিক আয় (টাকা)ঃ

১.১০। আধুনিক/উন্নত কৃষি চাষ/মৎস্য চাষ পদ্ধতি সম্পর্কে আপনার ধারণা কতটুকু
মোটেরে নেই ☐ সামান্য ☐ যথেষ্ট ☐ অনেক ☐

১.১১। আধুনিক/উন্নত চাষ (মৎস্য ও কৃষি) পদ্ধতি সম্পর্কে আপনি কিভাবে ধারণা লাভ করলেন

আনুষ্ঠানিক প্রশিক্ষণ ☐ এনজিও কর্মী ☐
রেডিও/টেলিভিশন ☐ ছবি (ফিল) ☐
লিফলেট/হ্যান্ডআউট ☐ থানা মৎস্য কর্মকর্তা ☐
থানা কৃষি কর্মকর্তা ☐ স্কুল/কলেজের শিক্ষক ☐
প্রতিবেশী কৃষকদের কাছ থেকে ☐ মসজিদ/মাদ্রাসার ইমাম/শিক্ষক ☐
জনপ্রতিনিধি (মেম্বর/চেয়ারম্যান ইত্যাদি) ☐ অন্যান্য (উল্লেখ করুন)

১.১২। লব্ধ জ্ঞান/ধারণা কৃষি/মৎস্য চাষে কতটুকু ব্যবহার করেন?

মোটেরে না ☐ সামান্য ☐ যথেষ্ট ☐ অনেক ☐

১.১৩। কৃষি কাজ/মৎস্য চাষের পরামর্শের জন্য আপনি বা আপনার পরিবারের সদস্য থানা/উপজেলা কৃষি কর্মকর্তা/মৎস্য কর্মকর্তা বা তাদের কোন কর্মচারীর কাছে যান কিনা? গিয়ে থাকলে বিগত এক বছরে কতবার গিয়েছেন।

বিগত এক মাসে ☐ বার গিয়েছি
বিগত তিন মাসে ☐ বার গিয়েছি
বিগত ছয় মাসে ☐ বার গিয়েছি
বিগত ছয় মাসে একবারো যাই না ☐

১.১৪। কৃষি কাজ/মৎস্য চাষ সম্পর্কে পরামর্শ প্রদানের জন্য থানা/উপজেলা প্রশাসনের কৃষি কর্মকর্তা/মৎস্য কর্মকর্তা/কর্মচারীবৃন্দ আপনার এলাকা পরিদর্শন করে কিনা? করে থাকলে বিগত ছয় মাসে তারা কতবার আপনার এলাকা পরিদর্শন করেছেন?

বিগত এক মাসে ☐ বার
বিগত তিন মাসে ☐ বার
বিগত ছয় মাসে ☐ বার
বিগত ছয় মাসে একবারো পরিদর্শন করেননি ☐

১.১৫। উক্ত অফিসার/কর্মচারীরা ভাল ব্যবহার করেন কিনা এবং প্রয়োজনীয় পরামর্শ দেন কিনা?

ভাল ব্যবহার করেন ☐ করেন না ☐
পরামর্শ দেন ☐ দেন না ☐

১.১৬। উপজেলা প্রশাসনের সংশ্লিষ্ট কর্মকর্তা/কর্মচারীদের কাছ থেকে নিম্নবর্ণিত সহায়তা সময়মত পান কিনা? পেয়ে থাকলে তার গুণগত মানে ভাল কিনা এবং বাজার দরের চেয়ে বেশী কিনা?

উপকরণ	সময়মত সহায়তা			উপকরণের গুণগত মান		সরবরাহকৃত দাম বাজার দরের চেয়ে বেশী কিনা	
	পাই	পাই না	মাঝে মাঝে পাই	ভাল	ভাল না	হ্যাঁ	না
ক) সার							
খ) বীজ							
গ) সেচ যন্ত্র							
ঘ) কীটনাশক							
ঙ) মৎস্য পোনা							

১.১৭। কৃষি কাজ/মৎস্য চাষে কি ধরনের সেবা/সহযোগিতা আশা করেন?

ক. সময় মত ঋণ পাওয়া :

বিনা সুদে ☐ সামান্য সুদে (৫-১০%) ☐ যে কোন সুদে ☐

খ. সময় মত উন্নত জাতের বীজ/মাহুর পোনা প্রাপ্তি:

বাজার মূল্যে ☐ ন্যায্য মূল্যে ☐ বিনা মূল্যে ☐

গ. রোগ বালাই দেখা দিলে সময়মত প্রয়োজনীয় পরামর্শ ও কীটনাশক প্রাপ্তি :

বাজার মূল্যে ☐ ন্যায্য মূল্যে ☐ বিনা মূল্যে ☐

ঘ. সময়মত সেচ যন্ত্র প্রাপ্তির সুবিধা:

বাজার মূল্যে ☐ ন্যায্য মূল্যে ☐ বিনা মূল্যে ☐

ঙ. কৃষকদের থানায় সংশ্লিষ্ট কর্মকর্তাদের সাথে দেখা করবার সুবিধা

চান ☐ চান না ☐

চ. সংশ্লিষ্ট কর্মকর্তারা কৃষকদের সাথে গ্রামে দেখা করবেন ও এ সুবিধা:

চান ☐ চান না ☐

ছ. বিজ্ঞান সম্মত কৃষি/মৎস্য চাষ সম্পর্কে প্রশিক্ষণ গ্রহণের সুবিধা:

ফি প্রদান সাপেক্ষে ☐ বিনা খরচায় ☐

জ. অন্যান্য সুবিধা (যদি থাকে) উল্লেখ করুন:

ক।

খ।

গ।

ঘ।

২.০। উপজেলা কৃষি/মৎস্য দপ্তরের সার্বিক কার্যক্রম সম্পর্কে গ্রাহকদের* মতামত

- ২.১। আপনি কখনো সেবা গ্রহণের জন্য উপজেলা/ইউনিয়ন কৃষি/মৎস্য দপ্তরে গমন করেছেন? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ২.২। উত্তর হ্যাঁ হলে প্রত্যাশিত সেবার শতকরা কতভাগ পেয়েছেন? শতকরা ভাগ।
- ২.৩। আপনি কি জানতেন আপনার কাজের প্রকৃত দায়িত্বপ্রাপ্ত কর্মকর্তা কে? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ২.৪। আপনার কাজের প্রকৃত দায়িত্বপ্রাপ্ত কর্মকর্তার সাথে দেখা হয়েছে/হয়েছিল কি? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ২.৫। না হলে আপনি কি দেখা করতে চেয়েছিলেন? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ২.৬। হ্যাঁ হলে দেখা করতে চেয়েও কেন দেখা করতে পারেননি অনুগ্রহ করে বলুন :
- ক.
খ.
- ২.৭। আপনি কী প্রয়োজনীয় সেবা পেয়েছেন? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ২.৮। দপ্তরে প্রদত্ত সেবা সম্পর্কে আপনার কোন অভিযোগ আছে/ছিল কিনা? ☐
- ২.৯। আপনি কী এ অভিযোগ কখনও দায়িত্বপ্রাপ্ত কর্মকর্তা বা উর্ধ্বতন কর্মকর্তাকে জানিয়েছেন? ☐
- ২.১০। উত্তর হ্যাঁ হলে উক্ত অভিযোগ নিষ্পত্তির কোন ব্যবস্থা নেয়া হয়েছিল কি? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ২.১১। আপনি কী মনে করেন নির্ধারিত সময়ের মধ্যে দপ্তরের সেবাসমূহ সম্পন্ন করা হয়? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ২.১২। সেবা পাওয়ার ক্ষেত্রে আপনি কী কখনও দালালদের দ্বারা প্রতারিত হয়েছেন? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ২.১৩। উত্তর হ্যাঁ হলে প্রতারণার ধরণ উল্লেখ করুন :
- ক.
খ.
গ.
- ২.১৪। আপনি কী মনে করেন দপ্তরে কাজকর্ম সম্পাদনে বিলম্ব হয়? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ২.১৫। আপনি কী মনে করেন পদ্ধতিগত জটিলতার জন্য গ্রাহকরা প্রত্যাশিত সেবা থেকে বঞ্চিত হন? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

* যে ব্যক্তি/দপ্তরের প্রতিনিধি সেবা গ্রহণ/কর্মসম্পাদনের জন্য সংশ্লিষ্ট দপ্তরে আগমন করেন, তিনি গ্রাহক হিসেবে গণ্য হবেন।

২.১৬। উত্তর হ্যাঁ হলে জটিলতার ধরন উল্লেখ করুন :

- ক.
- খ.
- গ.

২.১৭। আপনি কী দপ্তর থেকে প্রাপ্ত সেবায় শতকরা ১০০% সন্তুষ্ট? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

২.১৮। উত্তর না হলে কত ভাগ সন্তুষ্ট? শতকরা ভাগ।

২.১৯। জনসাধারণের সেবা নিশ্চিত করার জন্য, দপ্তরের কার্যক্রম জনপ্রতিনিধির তত্ত্বাবধানে সম্পন্ন করা প্রয়োজন মনে করেন কী? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

২.২০। জনসেবা নিশ্চিত/বৃদ্ধি করার জন্যে নিম্নের কোন প্রক্রিয়া অধিকতর ফলপ্রসূ হতে পারে বলে আপনি মনে করেনঃ

- ক. যোগ্য/দক্ষ/প্রশিক্ষিত কর্মকর্তা/কর্মচারী
- খ. প্রয়োজনীয় সেবা সহায়তা
- গ.

২.২১। গ্রাহকদের দ্রুত সেবা প্রদানের ক্ষেত্রে বর্তমানে কি কি অসুবিধা/সমস্যা রয়েছে (প্রযোজ্য ঘরে টিক চিহ্ন দিন) :

- ক. দক্ষ মাঠকর্মীর অভাব ☐
- খ. পরিবহন সুবিধার অভাব ☐
- গ. সরকারী নীতি ও নিয়মগতকানুন এবং প্রক্রিয়াগত জটিলতা ☐
- ঘ. গ্রাহকরা কি কি সেবা পেতে পারেন, সে সম্পর্কিত বিষয়সমূহ নোটিশ বোর্ডে (বিলবোর্ড) প্রদর্শন না করা ☐
- ঙ. বার বার অফিসে এসেও সেবা না পাওয়া ☐
- চ. কর্ম সম্পাদনের ক্ষেত্রে অফিসিয়ালদের জবাবদিহিতার ব্যবস্থা না থাকা ☐
- ছ. প্রশাসনিক জটিলতা এবং স্থানীয় পর্যায়ে সমন্বয়ের অভাব ☐
- জ. দালালদের দৌরাত্ম ☐
- ঝ. গ্রাহকদের অভিযোগের প্রতিকারের উপযুক্ত ব্যবস্থার অনুপস্থিতি ☐
- ঞ. স্থানীয় জনপ্রতিনিধিদের দ্বারা তদারকির ব্যবস্থা না থাকা ☐
- ট. কর্ম-সম্পাদনের ক্ষেত্রে একক (individual responsibility) দায়িত্বের নির্দিষ্ট বিধান না থাকা ☐
- ঠ. তথ্য সহায়তা কেন্দ্র ও আধুনিক প্রযুক্তি (কম্পিউটার) ইত্যাদি না থাকা ☐
- ড. স্থানীয় পর্যায়ে চূড়ান্ত সিদ্ধান্ত গ্রহণের সুযোগ না থাকা ☐
- ঢ. জনসাধারণের অজ্ঞতা ☐
- ণ. কর্মকর্তা ও কর্মচারীদের নেতিবাচক মনোভাব ☐
- ত. কর্মকাণ্ডের তদারকী ও পরিবীক্ষণের জন্য প্রয়োজনীয় ব্যবস্থা না থাকা ☐
- থ. প্রয়োজনীয় অর্থ বরাদ্দের অভাব ☐
- দ.
- ধ.
- ন.

দপ্তরে গ্রাহকদের সেবা ও সেবার মান বৃদ্ধি করার জন্য কী কী ব্যবস্থা নেয়া যেতে পারে
(প্রয়োজ্য ঘরে টিক চিহ্ন দিন):

- ক. সরকারী অফিস থেকে গ্রাহকরা কি কি সুযোগ-সুবিধা-সেবা পেতে পারে, প্রকাশ্য স্থানে/জনসমাগম স্থানে সে সম্পর্কিত বিলবোর্ড/নোটিশ প্রদর্শনের ব্যবস্থা করা ☐
- খ. প্রশিক্ষিত/যোগ্য জনবলকে আকৃষ্ট করার জন্য স্থানীয় পর্যায়ে প্রয়োজনীয় ভৌত অবকাঠামো প্রস্তুত এবং পরিবেশ তৈরী ☐
- গ. দক্ষ মাঠকর্মী ☐
- ঘ. পরিবহন সুবিধা বৃদ্ধি ☐
- ঙ. বিধি-বিধান, নিয়ম-নীতি ও প্রক্রিয়াগত জটিলতার নিরসন ☐
- চ. স্থানীয় পর্যায়ে সমন্বয় সংক্রান্ত অসুবিধা চিহ্নিতকরণ ও দূরীকরণের ব্যবস্থা ☐
- ছ. গ্রাহক অভিযোগের দ্রুত প্রতিকারের ব্যবস্থা ☐
- জ. সরকারী কর্মকর্তা ও জনপ্রতিনিধি সমন্বয়ে গঠিত কমিটিকে সংশ্লিষ্টদের কাজ তদারকির দায়িত্ব প্রদান ☐
- ঝ. প্রয়োজনীয় অর্থ বরাদ্দ ও যথাসময়ে ছাড়করণ ☐
- ঞ. চিহ্নিত দালালদের কঠোর শাস্তির বিধান ☐
- ট. পুরস্কার ও শান্তির বিধান থাকা ☐
- ঠ. কম্পিউটার সহ আধুনিক প্রযুক্তির সরবরাহ ☐
- ড. জনসাধারণের মধ্যে সচেতনতা বৃদ্ধি করার জন্য প্রচার মাধ্যমে ব্যাপক প্রচার ☐
- ঢ. দায়িত্ব পালনে উর্ধ্বতন কর্তৃপক্ষের সহায়তা ও অন্যান্য লজিস্টিক্স প্রদান ☐
- ণ. গ্রাহকগণকে কাজের গতিপ্রকৃতি, অগ্রগতি ও অবস্থা সম্পর্কে স্বচ্ছ ধারণা প্রদান ☐
- ত. প্রয়োজনীয় প্রশিক্ষণের ব্যবস্থা করা ☐
- থ. অফিসিয়ালদের প্রয়োজনীয়/অতিরিক্ত আর্থিক incentive প্রদান ☐
- দ. সিদ্ধান্ত গ্রহণের ক্ষমতা প্রদান ☐
- ধ. "জনসেবার জন্য প্রশাসন" এ শ্লোগান চালু ☐
- ন. গ্রাহকদের সিদ্ধান্ত পাওয়ার অধিকার নিশ্চিত করা ☐
- প. টেবিলের সামনে সেবা প্রদানকারী ব্যক্তিবর্গের নাম ও দায়িত্ব সম্বলিত ফলক রাখা ☐
- ফ.
- ব.
- ভ.
- ম.

প্রশ্নমালা-৩

(ইউনিয়ন পরিষদ চেয়ারম্যান/সদস্য এর জন্য)

বাংলাদেশ লোক-প্রশাসন প্রশিক্ষণ কেন্দ্র

সাভার, ঢাকা।

"Delivery of Services in Government Offices/Department/Organization: A Study " শীর্ষক প্রকল্প।

(অনুগ্রহপূর্বক প্রযোজ্য স্থানে ✓ টিক চিহ্ন দিন)

[বিঃ দ্রঃ- শুধু গবেষণা কাজে ব্যবহারের জন্য এ প্রশ্নমালা প্রস্তুত করা হয়েছে। প্রদত্ত তথ্যসমূহ সম্পূর্ণরূপে গোপন রাখা হবে এবং উত্তর দাতার নাম, ঠিকানা ইত্যাদি কোনভাবে প্রকাশ করা হবে না।]

- ১.১ উত্তর দাতার নাম :
- ১.২ পদবী/ঠিকানা :
- ১.৩ বয়স :
- ১৫ - ২০ বছরের মধ্যে ☐ ৩১ - ৪০ বছরের মধ্যে ☐
- ২১ - ৩০ বছরের মধ্যে ☐ ৪১ - ৬০ বছরের মধ্যে ☐
- ৪১ - ৫০ বছরের মধ্যে ☐
- ১.৪ তথ্য প্রদানকৃত দপ্তরের নাম : কৃষি ☐ মৎস্য ☐ উভয়ই ☐
- ১.৫ আপনি কত বছর পর্যন্ত এ দপ্তর সম্পর্কে জানেন :
- ১.৬ শিক্ষাগত যোগ্যতা :
- নিরক্ষর ☐ শুধু নাম লিখতে জানেন ☐
- প্রাথমিক ☐ নিম্নমাধ্যমিক ☐
- মাধ্যমিক ☐ উচ্চ মাধ্যমিক ☐
- স্নাতক ☐ স্নাতকোত্তর ☐
- অন্যান্য (উল্লেখ করুন)
- ১.৭। বিগত এক বছরে (২০০৪ সালে কৃষি/মৎস্য দপ্তর থেকে নিম্নবর্ণিত ক্ষেত্রে আপনার ইউনিয়ন/ওয়ার্ড কতটুকু সহায়তা পেয়েছে তার বিবরণ দিনঃ

বিষয়	মোট পরিমাণ
কৃষি খাতঃ	
ক। প্রদর্শনী খামার স্থাপনা (সংখ্যায়)	
খ। নার্সারী স্থাপন (সংখ্যায়)	
গ। সেচ ব্যবস্থাঃ	
☐ সেচ যন্ত্রের মেরামত/সার্ভিসিং (সংখ্যায়)	
☐ পাম্প মেশিন স্থাপন (সংখ্যায়)	
☐ টিউবওয়েল স্থাপন (সংখ্যায়)	
☐ টিউবওয়েল মেরামত/সার্ভিসিং (সংখ্যায়)	

☐ খাল খনন (কিঃমিঃ)	
☐ খাল পুনঃ খনন (কিঃমিঃ)	
☐ নালা পুনঃ খনন (কিঃমিঃ)	
☐ অন্যান্য (যদি থাকে উলেখ করুন)	
প্রশিক্ষণ কার্যক্রম (জন দিবসে)	
কৃষি উপকরণ প্রাপ্তি (কিঃ গ্রাম)	
সার	
বীজ	
কীটনাশক	
অন্যান্য উপকরণ (উলেখ করুন)	
কৃষি খাতে অন্য কোন সহায়তা পেয়ে থাকলে তার বিবরণ দিনঃ	
বিবরণ	পরিমাণ
মৎস্য খাতঃ	
ক। মৎস্য পোনা প্রাপ্তি (কিঃগ্রাম)	
খ। পুকুর/দিঘী খনন (শতাংশ)	
গ। পুকুর/দিঘী পুনঃ খনন (শতাংশ)	
ঘ। ঝণ প্রাপ্তি (হাজার টাকায়)	
☐ টাকার পরিমাণ	
☐ সদস্য/ব্যক্তির সংখ্যা	
ঙ। মৎস্য উৎপাদন বিষয়ে প্রশিক্ষণ (জন মাস)	

১.৮। অন্যান্য মন্তব্য/সুপারিশ (যদি থাকে):

২.০। উপজেলা কৃষি/মৎস্য দপ্তরের সার্বিক কার্যক্রম সম্পর্কে মতামত
(প্রযোজ্য ঘরে টিক চিহ্ন দিন):

- ২.১। আপনি কী মনে করেন দপ্তরের কর্ম-পদ্ধতি সংশ্লিষ্ট গ্রাহকদের (Clientele) জানানো উচিত যাতে করে তারা সুনির্দিষ্ট প্রক্রিয়া ও পদ্ধতি অনুসরণ করে সহজেই সেবা পেতে পারে? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ২.২। আপনি কী মনে করেন সকল গ্রাহকগণ তাদের প্রত্যাশা অনুযায়ী দপ্তর থেকে সহায়তা পেয়ে থাকেন? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ২.৩। সংশ্লিষ্ট দপ্তর থেকে যেসব সেবা/কার্যক্রম সম্পাদন করা হয়ে থাকে, সেসব প্রকাশ্য বিলবোর্ডে জানানো উচিত কী না? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ২.৪। কর্ম সম্পাদন সম্পর্কে কৃষক/মৎস্যজীবীদের কোন অভিযোগ থাকলে কর্তৃপক্ষের তা গ্রহণ করা উচিত কিনা? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ২.৫। আপনি কি মনে করেন আগত কৃষক/মৎস্যজীবিকগণ প্রয়োজনীয় সেবা/পরামর্শ পেয়ে থাকেন? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ২.৬। সেবা পাওয়ার ক্ষেত্রে আগত তারা কি দালালদের (middle-men) দ্বারা প্রতারণিত হয়? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ২.৭। উত্তর হ্যাঁ হলে প্রতারণার ধরণ উল্লেখ করুন :

ক.
খ.
গ.

- ২.৮। আপনি কি মনে করেন দপ্তরে কাজকর্ম সম্পাদনে বিলম্ব হয়? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ২.৯। কৃষক/মৎস্যজীবীদের কর্ম সম্পাদন নিশ্চিত করার জন্য কোন সময়-সীমা নির্ধারিত থাকা উচিত কিনা? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ২.১০। আপনি কি মনে করেন পদ্ধতিগত জটিলতার জন্য কৃষক/মৎস্যজীবীদের প্রত্যাশিত সেবা থেকে বঞ্চিত হয়? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐
- ২.১১। উত্তর হ্যাঁ হলে জটিলতার ধরণ উল্লেখ করুন :

ক.
খ.
গ.

- ২.১২। আপনি কি মনে করেন দপ্তরে আগত কৃষক/মৎস্যজীবিকগণ প্রাপ্ত সেবায় শতকরা ১০০% সন্তুষ্ট? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

২.১৩। উত্তর "না" হলে কত ভাগ সম্ভূষ্ট বলে আপনি মনে করেন? শতকরা ভাগ সম্ভূষ্ট।

২.১৪। প্রশিক্ষিত/দক্ষ/পেশাদার লোকবলের অভাবে দপ্তরে সেবা প্রদানে বিঘ্ন হয় কী? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

২.১৫। জনসাধারণের সেবা নিশ্চিত করার জন্য, দাপ্তরিক কার্যক্রম জনপ্রতিনিধির তত্ত্বাবধানে সম্পন্ন করা প্রয়োজন মনে করেন কী? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

২.১৬। অফিসের বিদ্যমান প্রশাসনিক ব্যবস্থা জনসেবা প্রদানে নেতিবাচক প্রভাব ফেলছে কী? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

২.১৭। জনসেবা নিশ্চিত/বৃদ্ধি করার জন্যে নিম্নের কোন্ প্রক্রিয়া অধিকতর ফলপ্রসূ হতে পারে বলে আপনি মনে করেনঃ

ক. যোগ্য/দক্ষ/প্রশিক্ষিত অফিসিয়াল/ডাক্তার ☐

খ. প্রয়োজনীয় সেবা সহায়তা (কৃষি ও মৎস্য চাষের উপকরণ ইত্যাদি) ☐

গ.

২.১৮। দপ্তরে কর্মকর্তা/কর্মচারীগণ নিয়মিত উপস্থিত থাকেন কী? হ্যাঁ ☐ না ☐

২.১৯। কৃষক/মৎস্যজীবীদের দ্রুত সেবা প্রদানের ক্ষেত্রে বর্তমানে কী কী অসুবিধা/সমস্যা রয়েছে (প্রযোজ্য ঘরে টিক চিহ্ন দিন)ঃ

ক. প্রয়োজনীয় দক্ষ/যোগ্য/প্রশিক্ষিত জনবলের অভাব ☐

খ. প্রয়োজনীয় ভৌত অবকাঠামোর অপ্রতুলতা ☐

গ. সরকারী নীতি ও নিয়ম-কানুন এবং প্রক্রিয়াগত জটিলতা ☐

ঘ. সরকারী দপ্তর থেকে গ্রাহকরা কি কি সেবা পেতে পারেন, সে সম্পর্কিত বিষয়সমূহ নোটিশ বোর্ডে (বিলবোর্ড) প্রদর্শন না করা ☐

ঙ. বার বার দপ্তরে এসেও সেবা না পাওয়া/কাজ না হওয়া ☐

চ. কর্ম সম্পাদনের ক্ষেত্রে অফিসিয়ালদের জবাবদিহিতার ব্যবস্থা না থাকা ☐

ছ. প্রশাসনিক জটিলতা এবং স্থানীয় পর্যায়ে সমন্বয়ের অভাব ☐

জ. দালালদের দৌরাত্ম ☐

ঝ. গ্রাহকদের অভিযোগের প্রতিকারের উপযুক্ত ব্যবস্থা না থাকা ☐

এং. স্থানীয় জনপ্রতিনিধিদের দ্বারা তদারকির ব্যবস্থা না থাকা ☐

ট. কর্ম-সম্পাদনের ক্ষেত্রে একক (individual responsibility) দায়িত্বের নির্দিষ্ট বিধান না থাকা ☐

ঠ. প্রয়োজনীয় অর্থ বরাদ্দ না পাওয়া ☐

ড. কাজের গুণগত মান যাচাইয়ের ব্যবস্থা না থাকা ☐

ঢ. অফিসিয়ালদের দীর্ঘদিন ধরে পদোন্নতি না হওয়া ☐

ণ. বিভিন্ন সার্ভিসের সদস্যদের মধ্যে প্রশিক্ষণ, ক্যারিয়ার প্যানিং, পদোন্নতি, চাকুরীগত সুযোগসুবিধা, কর্মপরিবেশ ইত্যাদির ক্ষেত্রে বিরাজমান বৈষম্য ☐

ত. তথ্য সহায়তা কেন্দ্র ও আধুনিক প্রযুক্তি (কম্পিউটার) ইত্যাদি না থাকা ☐

থ. স্থানীয়ভাবে চূড়ান্ত সিদ্ধান্ত গ্রহণের সুযোগ না থাকা ☐

দ. জনসাধারণের অজ্ঞতা ☐

ধ. কর্মকর্তা ও কর্মচারীদের নেতিবাচক মনোভাব ☐

ন. কর্মকাণ্ডের তদারকী ও পরিবীক্ষণের জন্য প্রয়োজনীয় ব্যবস্থা না থাকা ☐

২.২০। দপ্তরে গ্রাহকদের কাজ দ্রুত সম্পাদন এবং সেবার মান বৃদ্ধি করার জন্য কী কী ব্যবস্থা নেয়া যেতে পারে
(প্রযোজ্য ঘরে টিক চিহ্ন দিন)

- ক. সরকারী দপ্তর থেকে গ্রাহকরা কী কী সুযোগ-সুবিধা-সেবা পেতে পারে, প্রকাশ্য জনসমাগম স্থানে সে সম্পর্কিত
বিলবোর্ড/নোটিশ প্রদর্শনের ব্যবস্থা করা ☐
- খ. প্রশিক্ষিত/যোগ্য জনবলকে আকৃষ্ট করার জন্য স্থানীয় পর্যায়ে প্রয়োজনীয় ভৌত অবকাঠামো প্রস্তুত এবং পরিবেশ তৈরী ☐
- গ. বিধি-বিধান, নিয়ম-নীতি ও প্রক্রিয়াগত জটিলতার নিরসন ☐
- ঘ. পরিবহন সুবিধা ও অন্যান্য লজিস্টিক্স সহায়তা প্রদান ☐
- ঙ. স্থানীয় পর্যায়ে সমন্বয় সংক্রান্ত অসুবিধা চিহ্নিতকরণ ও দূরীকরণের ব্যবস্থা ☐
- চ. গ্রাহক অভিযোগের দ্রুত প্রতিকারের ব্যবস্থা ☐
- ছ. সরকারী কর্মকর্তা ও জনপ্রতিনিধি সমন্বয়ে গঠিত কমিটিকে সংশ্লিষ্টদের কাজ তদারকির দায়িত্ব প্রদান ☐
- জ. প্রয়োজনীয় অর্থ বরাদ্দ ও যথাসময়ে ছাড়করণ ☐
- ঝ. চিহ্নিত দালালদের কঠোর শাস্তির বিধান ☐
- ঞ. আন্তঃক্যাডার সুযোগ-সুবিধা ও বৈষম্য দূরীকরণ ☐
- ট. পুরস্কার ও শাস্তির বিধান থাকা ☐
- ঠ. কম্পিউটার সহ আধুনিক প্রযুক্তির সরবরাহ নিশ্চিতকরণ ☐
- ড. জনসাধারণের মধ্যে সচেতনতা বৃদ্ধি করার জন্য প্রচার মাধ্যমে ব্যাপক প্রচার ☐
- ঢ. দায়িত্ব পালনে উর্ধ্বতন কর্তৃপক্ষের সহায়তা ☐
- ণ. গ্রাহকদের কাজের গতি-প্রকৃতি, অগ্রগতি ও অবস্থা সম্পর্কে স্বচ্ছ ধারণা প্রদান ☐
- ত. প্রয়োজনীয় প্রশিক্ষণের ব্যবস্থা করা ☐
- থ. সংশ্লিষ্ট অফিসিয়ালদের প্রয়োজনীয়/অতিরিক্ত আর্থিক incentive প্রদান ☐
- দ. সিদ্ধান্ত গ্রহণের ক্ষমতা প্রদান ☐
- ধ. "জনসেবার জন্য প্রশাসন" এ শ্লোগান চালু ☐
- ন. টেবিলের সামনে সেবা প্রদানকারী ব্যক্তিবর্গের নাম ও দায়িত্ব সম্বলিত ফলক রাখা ☐
- প.
- ফ.
- ব.
- ভ.
- ম.
- য.

APPENDIX-D**CHECKLIST**

(For Agriculture and Fisheries Unit of Upazila Administration)

Bangladesh Public Administration Training Centre

Savar, Dhaka

**Title of the Research: "Delivery of Services in Government Offices/Department/Organization:
A Study"**

AGRICULTURE/FISHERIES UNIT

(Data and information to be provided shall be used for the research studies. Personal information or identity in any form shall in no way be disclosed. Thus, please do not hesitate to provide the information)

1. Name of the office :
2. Address :
3. Land under Agriculture in the Upazila:

Areas	Total Areas (In acre)
a) Cultivable Land	
i) Irrigated	
ii) Non-Irrigated	
b) Non-cultivable Land	
Total Land	

4. Manpower Position of your Unit/Section (Agriculture/Fisheries):

a) Agriculture/Fisheries Section	Approved Posts (No.)	Actual No. (upto 31/12/04)	Vacant Posts
a) Class-I			
b) Class-II			
c) Class-III			
d) Class-IV			
Total			

5. Functions of the Upazila Agriculture/Fisheries Department:

6. Job Description of the Officers/Staffs of Upazila Agriculture/Fisheries Department (if any):

7(a). The Number of clientele came to the Department for Service in the last year (2004):

(b) Service actually rendered to the clientele (No.):

8.1 Opinions about the followings of Upazila Agriculture/Fisheries Department:

- | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| a) Office room: | Sufficient | ☐ | Insufficient | ☐ |
| b) Officers Res. accommodation: | Sufficient | ☐ | Insufficient | ☐ |
| c) Staffs Res. accommodation: | Sufficient | ☐ | Insufficient | ☐ |
| d) Office furniture: | Sufficient | ☐ | Insufficient | ☐ |
| e) Allocation of annual fund: | Sufficient | ☐ | Insufficient | ☐ |

8.2 If the fund is insufficient, how much, of the total requirement was allocated (in percentage):

9.a Please give an account of investment in development projects in agriculture and fisheries sector for the last two financial years (FY: 2002-03 and 2003-04):

Sector	Financial Year (Figures in lakh Taka)					
	2002-03			2003-04		
	No. of Project Implemented	Total Budget	Total Expenses	No. of Project Implemented	Total Budget	Total Expenses
a. Agriculture						
b. Irrigation						
c. Fisheries						
d. Other Related Field(s) if any, Please Specify:						

9.b Please indicate major benefits and Negative Impact from the above (Serial 9(a):

Benefits Derived from the Project(s)	Negative Impact of the Project(s)
a.	a.
b.	b.
c.	c.
d.	d.
e.	e.
f.	f.

10. Statement of Budget and Expenses for the FY 2003-04:

Sector	Financial Year (Figures in lakh Taka)			
	Revenue Budget		Development Budget	
	Allocation	Actual Expenses	Allocation	Actual Expenses
Agriculture Department				
Fisheries Department				

11. Basic task(s) performed by your section/unit during the FY 2003-2004:

Sl No.	Task(s) Job Elements	Unit/ Indicators of Mesurement	Task Accomplished During 2003-04
1.	Establishment of Demonstration Farm	In Number	
2.	Establishment of Nursery	"	
3.	Irrigation Equipment	"	
	a) Procuremnet	"	
	b) Distribution/Sale	"	
4.	a) Pump Machine Installation	"	
	b) Pump Machine Repair/Servicing	"	
5.	a) Tube well repair/servicing	"	
6.	a) Canal Digging	In k.m.	
	b) Canal Redigging	"	
7.	Irrigation	"	
	a) Drainage Construction	"	
	b) Irrigation Drainage Reconstruction	"	
8.	Human Resource Development Programme	In man days	
	a) Training of Farmers	"	
	b) Training of extension workers	"	
	c) Other Training Activities (if any) Please specify	"	
9.	Inspection/Travel	"	
10.	Counselling to Farmers	In Number	
11.	Visitors visited your office/Units	In Number	
12.	Distribution of Agriculture Inputs	In Kg.	
	a) Seeds	"	
	b) Fertilizer	"	
	c) Pesticide	"	
	d) Other	"	
13.	Other developmental work (If any please specify)	"	

12. Please indicate major problem(s)/limitating factors in carrying out the above tasks (serial 11) (Also indicate problems in mobilising farmers):

- a.
- b.
- c.
- d.
- e.

13. What is the suggestion(s) to improve the quality and productivity of your section/unit's performance? Please specify in specific and realistic terms:

- a.
- b.
- c.
- d.
- e.

14. Plese give a brief account (maximum three sentences) of what impact (positive or negative) your section/unit has created on the socio-economic conditions of the people of the Upazila:

Positive Impact	Negative Impact
a)	a)
b)	b)
c)	c)
d)	d)

15. Because of the privatization goals process/participation of NGOs in development activities, do you think that role, functions and objectives of your unit/section have changed (formally or informally). If so, please list down major changes in such role, functions, goals and obejctives:

a) Goals & Objectives:

Existing Goals & Objectives	Future/Changing Goals and Objectives
a.	
b.	
c.	
d.	
e.	

b) Role & Functions:

Existing Role/Functions	Future/Changing Role/Functions
a.	
b.	
c.	
d.	
e.	

16. What role/functions/tasks/jobs do you think may be devolved delegated from your section/unit to other organisations (like NGO, Private sector etc.) operating in Upazila Administration to improve the quality and productivity of agriculture and fisheries sector. Please list down such role/tasks:

Role/Functions/tasks/jobs to be Developed/ Delegated to NGOs/Private Sector:	<u>To whom/what organisation</u>
a.	
b.	
c.	
d.	
e.	

17. What roles, functions, tasks/jobs do you think should be devolved/delegated to your sector/unit from other Organisation (NGO/Private sector etc.) to improve the quality and proudctivity of Agriculture/Fishereis sector. Please name such roles and functions below:

Role/Functions/Tasks to be Devolved to your Unit/Section	<u>From whom/what organisation</u>
a.	
b.	
c.	
d.	
e.	

18. Other comments/suggestions (If any):

Signature (Optional):

Date:

