

THE DECENTRALIZATION, DEVOLUTION AND LOCAL GOVERNANCE PRACTICES IN NEPAL: THE EMERGING CHALLENGES AND CONCERNS

Deepak Chaudhary

Abstract

Nepal has been facing political changes and systems over the decades. Presently Nepal has adopted the unitary federal political system. Under the system, devolution of power is shared to local levels in order to strengthen localism and development. The devolution is a broader concept of decentralization where power and authority are provided to a sub-national level of government constitutionally. This paper discusses the devolution and its implication on local levels that are directly related to local people and grass-roots democracy. The Constitution of Nepal 2015, Local Government Operations Act 2017, Inter Governmental Fiscal Transfer Act 2017 and other sectoral legislation and published related documents are reviewed for this paper. Besides, three numbers of local levels (rural municipalities) are taken as an empirical inquiry to find out the problems and challenges facing by local levels. The Constitution of Nepal 2015 provided enough power and authority to the local levels based on devolution under federalism. Despite that, the inadequacy of laws, and policies, and lacking coordination between local levels and center-province and poor mobilization are major challenges to local levels and the question of good governance and leadership is more pronounced in this regard. The relationship among the center, province and local levels is still debatable. Overall, the present collateral form of local governance is not being well functioned. The effectiveness of Leadership seems to be important to cope with local governance for local development and grass-roots democracy.

Keywords: Decentralization, devolution, good governance, local

level, and leadership

Introduction

The various social and political movements pressed for the state restructuring issues in order to address diversity and development to approach the lower level of governance since 1990 in Nepal. Maoist insurgency (1996-2006), Second People's Movement (2006), and the Madhesh movement (2007) are amongst them. As a result, the Constituent Assembly (CA) was formed for the state restructuring. After a long debate, CA promulgated the Constitution in 2015. It declared Nepal as a 'federal democratic republican nation' and Nepal adopted a federal political system forming three layers of governance- the Federation, the Province, and the Local level.

The Constitution of Nepal 2015 assigns certain power and authority for the federation, the provinces, and local levels. It provisions local 'government'. The schedule-8 of the present Constitution includes 22 types of powers (refer table-1) for the local levels ranging from local taxes to local level development plans and projects. Local levels are formed in the sense that it ensures the citizens' access to the services to their doorsteps. Good governance is essential to make success at the local level. Local governance is considered as a system and function whereby different actors get together for discussing the contemporary and future plans, elect their representatives, and take decisions collectively. Marques (2013) argue that 'governance' embraces the capacity of a state to function effectively, and promote society's welfare and to deliver public services through the exercise of political power. Therefore, local governance is crucial for local development, delivery of social, and public services. However, the local level is still facing numerous problems despite the devolution of power.

Nepal has been facing many political systems in the wake of changes over the decades but citizens are not still pleased because of less effectiveness of local governance. Many people would question the leadership's ability as they could not play an effective role in good governance, society's well-fare and development. Baral (2004) argues that the democratic rulers of Nepal post-1990 have not delivered to address people's needs and expectations. However, the present political system is new for Nepal and it would hasten to blame the slow pace of local levels but its initial journey is not satisfying the common people. The problems facing local levels need to address urgently the local people's rights in terms of service delivery, employment, infrastructure development and policy formation at local levels. The effectiveness of local governance is also related to grass-roots democracy. Therefore, this study attempts to fill the gap in studying the structure and system of local governance in a new political system in Nepal.

Objective and Methodology

The main objective of the study is to analyze the system and function of local governance in relation to power, authority, leadership and its effectiveness and challenges. Available secondary data relating to decentralization, devolution, local governance, and leadership are reviewed. This paper is based on reviewing and analyzing the Constitution of Nepal 2015, Local Government Operation Act 2017 and other related sectoral legislation of the Government of Nepal regarding decentralization and devolution in terms of power, authority, leadership, and governance. For effectively supporting the paper, an empirical inquiry choosing three numbers of local governments (Debangunj Rural Municipality of Province 1, Makwanpur Gadhi Rural Municipality of Province 3 and

Mayadevi Rural Municipality of Province 5) was done. Local-level leaders and people were consulted in order to find out the problems and challenges facing local levels in Nepal. Group discussions (around 5-8 people) with elected local members and available citizens at these rural municipalities were held. These group discussions were held between July 2018 & March 2019 on different dates. A critical interpretive qualitative approach is used for the analysis.

This paper tries to provide a rich contextualized understanding of some aspects of local governance and its challenges rather than more generalization.

The conceptual framework of Decentralization/ devolution, local governance, and leadership

Many scholars have different views regarding the decentralization and devolution. Some scholars believe that devolution is a part of decentralization and some others argue that they are quite different. Rondinelli (1981) defines decentralization as the transfer of responsibility for planning, management, and resource raising and allocation from the central government to local units. Decentralization can be political, administrative, or fiscal. Political decentralization provides power to elected representatives for public decision-making through constitution or laws and it emphasizes participatory governance. In administrative decentralization, responsibilities in terms of the planning, financing, and management are transferred from the central to lower units of the government. Delegation and deconcentration have frequently been used in administrative decentralization; in Deconcentration, some amount of administrative authority is handed over to lower levels within the central government framework (Boko, 2002). Similarly, delegation transfers specific defined-managerial responsibilities to organizations

and they are indirectly controlled by the central government. Fiscal decentralization refers to the financial authority to make decisions about expenditure and resource utilization. The constitution or laws normally ensure fiscal decentralization. The local unit can collect revenues or utilize resources in fiscal decentralization. Devolution is the creation financially or legally or politically of subnational units of government and it is related to autonomous mainly. Like the decentralization, devolution has also long been practiced. Dakyns (1932) argues that devolution arose more from a design of people to manage their own social affairs than from the government's desire to let them do so. The devolution is perceived as the transfer of authority for decision making from central to local and it is related to autonomy and self-rule in particular. Mukonza & Chakauya (2012) define devolution as a form of decentralization through which authority is conferred to elected sub-national levels of government. As of Merriam-Webstar dictionary, devolution is a transference (as of rights, powers, property, or responsibility) to another.

Generally, the devolution of power is actually related to a federal system. It involves the transfer of full responsibilities to sub-national authorities and it is characterized by power relationships among central national and other sub-national governments, by which decisions are made for local levels. As of Tannenwald (1998), there are six objectives of devolution: (i) more efficient provision and production of public services; (ii) better alignment of the costs and benefits of government for a diverse citizenry; (iii) better fits between public goods and their spatial characteristics; (iv) increased competition, and innovation in the public sector, (v) greater responsiveness to citizen preferences; and (vi) more transparent accountability in policymaking. In decentralization, authority is delegated while in devolution, power (including financial) is transferred to sub-

national levels and decision-making is granted.

The practice of decentralization in Nepal has been long as is mentioned in the below sub-chapter. Devolution under a federal arrangement seeks to transfer political, administrative and economic authority from the center to the local communities and further seeks to promote popular participation in decision-making (Amah, 2018). A substantial level of autonomy at the local level of government is important for self-rule and democracy. However, 'autonomy' has been a debatable issue in Nepal because of the long persistent of the central political system. The pragmatic form of devolution of power enhances local communities and the major beneficiaries of their own decisions and resources. It allows local authorities to design and deliver policies that are fulfilled to their own needs rather than the requirements of the central government (Morgan 2006:193-4). Therefore, the devolution can be understood as a broader concept of decentralization where autonomy and participation are more emphasized.

In Zimbabwe, it was believed that devolution would improve public service delivery, and enhance good governance through accountability and transparency (Nhede, 2013). In England, devolution was introduced to strengthen democracy and local government and local government have embedded it (Jeffery, 2006). The devolution is important in the context of localism and self-governing. Both localism and self-governing do not allow any interference from the outside and as a single entity it lobbies self-rule based on participation. Localism invokes the notion of freedom from interference by the central government which appeals to strong leadership to address sub-national development (Bentley, 2016, p.6). Representatives at local government act as change agents of the society in terms of economic, social and

political activities. The role of local governance is vital in rural development including agriculture development (Chaudhary, 2018). The authority, autonomy, capacity, and accountability and leadership are the major framework for the effectiveness of local governance. The capacity to make planning and implementation is an important dimension, which indicates towards decision-making that is related to leadership as well. As of accountability, the government should respond to the people and people can know each activity of development.

The local governance based on federalism has a wider scope, which demands strong and effective leadership and it can only ensure the success of local governments implementing devolution and development. Similarly, the Local Government Operation Act (LGOA), 2018 emphasizes the role of local leadership in the effectiveness of the local level. Leadership is related to policy implication and policy is related to people as well. Therefore, the role of leadership is crucial as the leaders of all political parties first of all make plans and policies and exercise devolution and decentralization in a pragmatic way for the effectiveness of local governance. Lindfield & Jones (2014) rightly point out that the settings (institutions and governance) in a poor country can be weak, but a leader's capabilities and motivations can play an important role in reviving the institutional success. Therefore, the effective function of local level encompasses power, authority, good governance and leadership.

The practice of governance system (in terms of decentralization/devolution) in Nepal

Greece (Athens) is considered a birth of democracy (self-rule of people) from around 4-5th BC through the assembly comprising of ordinary people (Raaflaub, 2007). The ancient Greek democracy emphasized the relevance of the direct participation

of ordinary people in the collective self. Nepal has also long experiences regarding the government and governance. In ancient times, there were a number of small principalities called Janapad in Nepal such as Videh and Kapilvastu and these were autonomous (Nepal, 2055). The decisions were made collectively in these principalities. Panchayat (consisting of five members) was active in ancient times for maintaining rules and regulations in society. The governance had heavily been influenced by the utopian idea and moral education at that time. In the Lichhavi period in Nepal, there was a practice of decentralization to some extent. According to Regmi (1996), there were three layers of governance in the Lichhavi period- Center, Gram (Village committee) and Tol (block) and local-self governance existed at the village level. Talukdar Adhikari (authority chief) was appointed at each village called 'Talaswami' as well. Before unification 1769, there were a number of small principalities and these were autonomous. After unification, small principalities were integrated in Nepal and centralization of the political system of governance was practiced. However, the center did not interfere in some local socio-cultural practices; the practice of Kipat for Limbu community in the eastern hill region was an example in where only Limbus had authority in their land. However, an autocratic Rana regime in Nepal ruled largely based on the family for 104 years and centralization was highly practiced during the period.

Following the 1950 revolution, parliamentary governance governed the country with the monarch as the head of state. The idea of separation of powers among a legislature, an executive and a judiciary was initiated, although the king enjoyed the highest executive, legislative and judicial authority in practice. In Panchayat (1960-1990), the Constitution devised five tiers of governance; they were the center (The Rastriya Panchayat)

were Center, 5 Regional Development Regions, 14 Zones, 75 districts and around 4000 local levels (Village Panchayat and Municipalities known as Nagar Panchayats). During the period, Nepal introduced development planning in a systematic way. The first five-year plan implemented in 1956 emphasized the development of rural areas focusing on agricultural development and industrialization. Decentralization Act 1960 was instigated to approach the development at the lower level. Gau (rural) Panchayat was a lower unit to deliver public services but they did not have fiscal power. The decentralization practice in Nepal was mainly concerned with a political, administrative and institutional aspect. In the Panchayat era, a small number of expenditure and revenue authorities were transferred to local bodies by the decentralization act 1981 but low progress due to politicize in it (Fuel, 2011/12).

After the first People's Movement in 1990, Nepal adopted multi-party democracy and decentralization was more concerned to all. In 1992, the District Development Committee (DDC) and Municipality and Village Development Committee (VDC) acts were passed; these were also a lack of fiscal power to the local governance. Later on, Local-self Government Act was passed in 1998 in which limited fiscal power and resources utilization authorities were given to local government but the 'center' highly dominated in terms of budget, resources, and decision-making. However, Maoist insurgency (1996-2006) hampered the locally elected bodies. In this way, the decentralization in the past could not deliver development effectively (Sharma, 2014). The decentralization was bureaucratic in nature; local levels were under the influence of bureaucracy. The lack of people participation in decision-making and good governance, the local level failed to deliver development to the local people. In Nepal, local governance at the bottom level in the past was more

centralized (Acharya, 2014) and powerless in terms of authority and resource utilization.

Post-2006 (after Second People's Movement), Nepal embraced the 'federal political system' as per Interim Constitution- 2007. The federalism was institutionalized in 2015. Federalism in Nepal has been surfaced to address diversity and to enhance sub-national areas. The rationale for federalization in Nepal has to be appreciated from three perspectives; the first is Nepal's social and cultural diversity, the second perspective is related to inclusive development, and the third perspective relates to decentralization and the devolution of power and autonomy (Sharma, 2014, p. 101). The broad genesis of a federal system exhibiting shared rule encompasses a whole spectrum of more-specific non-unitary species ranging from constitutional unions, quasi-federations, and federations (Watts, 2018, P. 21). However, the nature of federalism is found varied from country to country. Under the federal political structure, there are three layers of governance- Federal (center), provincial and local governance in Nepal. The powers of the Federation, province and local level are mentioned in Schedule-5, 6 & 7 of the Constitution. Likewise, the concurrent powers of the Federation, State, and Local levels are mentioned in Schedule-9. However, lacking coordination among center-province-local levels has been a more crucial fact to consider.

Local Level in federal Context in Nepal: Authority, power, and decentralization/devolution

As of the Constitution of Nepal (Article 306-n), the local level means the Village bodies, Municipalities and District Assemblies. Rural municipality and municipality are the lower levels of the political system in Nepal. The main aim of the restructured local level is to institutionalizing a democratic and well-functioning of

local government. The effective delivering public services to the local communities carry out social and economic development activities to uplift the living standards of local people and developing democratic leadership at the grassroots level are major notions of the present local government (Acharya, 2018a). The main notion of local governance was to establish 'Singhdarbar' (center of power in Nepal) at every local level. Under the constitution, a local level in Nepal is divided into 77 districts & 753 local levels (including 6 metropolises, 11 sub-metropolises, 276 municipalities, and 460 rural municipalities). This Constitution provisions 'local government' with autonomy rather than 'local unit'. The Constitution guarantees local autonomy and decentralization: Article 50 has provided the principle of inclusion in the governance system based on local autonomy and decentralization. As Article 56 of the Constitution, the Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal has three main levels of structure: federal, provincial and local. Schedule 8 (table-1 herewith) of the Constitution guarantees the authorities and powers for the local level. Local assemblies may make necessary laws on the matters set forth in the list contained in Schedule-8 & 9 of the Constitution (as per Article 226). The Schedules-8 & 9 are included in table-1 & 2. Likewise, Article 59 provisions that local level entities can make budgets of their respective levels utilizing natural resources. Article 60 mentions the distribution of sources of revenue, has the provision of imposing a tax on subjects within their fiscal jurisdiction and collects revenue from such sources. The legislative powers of the local level are in the village assembly and municipality assembly. These assemblies may make necessary laws on the matters set forth in the list contained in Schedule-8 & 9 of the Constitution (as per Article 226). Therefore, it is not only decentralization but devolution because power is handed over to the local political

unit considering local ‘government’ under federalism through the constitution.

Table-1: List of local Level Power as per Schedule-8 of the Constitution

S.N.	Matters
1	Town Policy
2	Cooperation institutions
3	Operation of F.M.
4	Local taxes (wealth tax, house rent tax, land and building registration fee, motor vehicle tax), service charge, fee, tourism fee, advertisement tax, business tax, land tax (land revenue), penalty, entertainment tax, land revenue collection
5	Management of the Local services
6	Collection of local statistics and records
7	Local level development plans and projects
8	Basic and secondary education
9	Basic health and sanitation
10	Local market management, environment protection, and bio-diversity
11	Local roads, rural roads, agro-roads, irrigation
12	Management of Village Assembly, Municipal Assembly, District Assembly, local courts, mediation and arbitration
13	Local records management
14	Distribution of house and land ownership certificates
15	Agriculture and animal husbandry, agro-products management, animal health, cooperatives
16	Management of senior citizens, persons with disabilities and the incapacitated
17	Collection of statistics of the unemployed
18	Management, operation and control of agricultural Extension
19	Water supply, small hydropower projects, alternative energy
20	Disaster management
21	Protection of watersheds, wildlife, mines, and minerals
22	Protection and development of languages, cultures and fine arts

For the effectiveness of the local level, Local Government Operation Act (LGOA) was initiated in 2017. It emphasizes on local level's development particularly. LGOA has many provisions such as plan formulation/implementation, judicial works, and financial jurisdictions. Besides, local governments can coordinate with the private sector, community organizations, and non-government organizations for sustainable development. As of LGOA, a Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson (in RMs), a Mayor, and Deputy Mayor (in Municipalities) lead the head of new local governments. The Rural Municipal executive is comprised of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson, the Rural Municipality's Ward Chairpersons as well as four women members elected among the Rural Municipal Assembly. Similarly, the Municipal Executive includes the Mayor and Deputy Mayor, Ward Chairpersons as well as five women members elected among the Municipal Assembly. Locally elected representatives comprise the Village or Municipality Assemblies, which have local legislative power. The local executive bodies carve up power based on the nature of the works. The Constitution also provides provisions for the local level with semi-judicial powers for settling various disputes at the local level. For instance, the Deputy Mayor or Vice Chairperson of the local unit serves as the coordinator of the judicial committee. According to the Local Government Operation Act 2017, leadership is important in order to handle the local level. Therefore, three approaches of local levels are- leadership, public service delivery, and economic development. The effectiveness of Leadership including inclusiveness ensures Participatory Approach at the local level that enhances local development. Article 51-f (3) emphasizes on the enhance of local public participation in the process of development works.

LGOA (2017) has mentioned the functions, duties, and powers

of the head of rural municipality or municipality to do daily business in line with the federal set-up. The head of rural municipality or municipality has 35 functions, duties and powers in addition to others provided in the existing laws. Key duties, functions, and powers of heads include calling meetings of the assembly and executive body, tabling agenda in the meeting, preparing a budget, assigning responsibilities to deputy chief or members, overseeing fixed and movable assets of the local level, coordinating with other local levels, provinces and federal government, and so on. Similarly, duties, functions, and powers of deputy chief of rural municipality or municipality are as a coordinator of the judicial committee, working in the capacity of an acting chief in the absence of the head. Clause 47 (1) of LGOA has provisions of a 'judicial committee' that empower to settle disputes related to 13 specific matters. Similarly, Clause 47 (2) of LGOA has the provisions to settle the disputes in 11 other matters through mediation. However, the disputants can also directly go to the court in the cases under Clause 47 (2).

In addition, the Local Government Operation Act (2017) has ensured to delegate powers and functions at the lowest units called Wards; Wards are the closest local units of the people. Ward chairperson engage in the formation of budget and plan of the concerned wards, issue a letter of recommendation and certify various documents related to personal incidents, land, house, citizenship, reconciliation, and relationship both in Nepali and English. Land taxes are collected at ward levels. Likewise, executive officer of rural municipality and municipality perform their duties subject to the supervision and directives of the chief of the local level. In this way, local levels have enough power and authority, however, the exercise of power and authority has frequently been questioned in the wake of people's welfare.

In this way, the authority of law formation, judiciary authorities, and fiscal power are guaranteed for the local level by the Constitution. Without changing in Constitution, power and authority cannot be diminished or removed. Article 50 of the Constitution of Nepal clearly mentions the word 'autonomy' in the context of the local level. Therefore, it can be said that this is not only decentralization but also more than this and it is devolution under federalism.

Problems and challenges

Despite the devolution of power to local levels, local government is still not becoming effective and facing a number of problems. Based on group discussion at three number of local levels (rural municipalities- Devangunj of Province 1, Makwanpurgadhi of province 3 & Mayadevi of Province 3), it was noted that delay in the formation of laws by Center (federal government) relating to local levels is affecting in the decision-making process to some extent. It is a major barrier in the light of local level's effectiveness. It seems that local authorities are still seeking the center's order and direction in the context of big decisions. However, local levels have enough powers and authority as per the Constitution and they can make required laws under prescribed authorities mentioned in Schedule 12. Unfortunately, making laws by local levels are not heard until now. Similarly, many local levels have been facing the insufficiency of staff and whatever staff are available, there is conflict between staff and leaders the conflict between them can frequently be heard. Similarly, the development budget could not be expended in a stipulated timeframe; only 12 % of the total development budget is expended in six months of 2018-19 fiscal years in many local levels. It indicates the inability and poor performance of local government and leadership so far. The coordination between

elected leaders and bureaucrats seems to be not very good; bureaucrats would enjoy with old central-bureaucratic chain. Most of them (officers) are reluctant to stay at local levels. The federal government transfers staff without letting them know that they were being transferred to local levels. The transfer of three hundred local-level staff has halted the daily works of local units (Naya Patrika, 2019; p.1). Rijal (2018) questions regarding the provision of the traditional central bureaucratic chain (in terms of less accountable to local people) and believes that the decentralization and grass-root of democracy may not be effective until and unless the provision of the central bureaucratic chain to made to realise the essence of providing services to all local levels.

Likewise, last year, local units were more criticized because they imposed more taxes on people. However, the province and local units share rights of registration fees for houses and land, advertisement tax, vehicle tax and entertainment tax are shared rights. Similarly, fees, fines, and royalty received from natural resources are concurrent powers of the federal, provincial and local units. Nonetheless, it was blamed that local units were more concentrated on tax instead of service providing. Conversely, Inter Governmental Fiscal Transfer Act, 2017 has demarcated the jurisdiction of the three levels of government. Inter-Governmental Fiscal Transfer Act has provisions to regulate revenue powers & allocation, grants, budget management, public expenditure and financial discipline at all levels (federal, provincial and local levels). As Act, different levels of governments could collect taxes and non-tax revenues. As Clause 3 (3), the Local Level may levy and recover tax and non-tax revenues as specified in Schedule-3 in accordance with local law. Local government has been given more autonomy in spending. However, they lack the institutional support or expertise required to formulate effective

development plans (The Economist, 2018).

The present local units have a number of challenges from sound leadership to skillful staff and poor performance. There are deficiencies in technical and administrative knowledge and skills, poor staff compliance with directives of representatives, inadequate attention to budgetary demands and constraints, and sluggish implementation of programs and projects (Acharya, 2018b). Lack of laws, expenditure in unproductive fields (mostly spending on the purchase of personal vehicles for elected members instead of buying public bus) and party priority instead of citizens are major obstacles and barriers as well as challenges in the wake of local level effectiveness.

Conclusion

Based on the above discussion, local levels have been facing many problems ranging from insufficient laws, staff, infrastructures to mobilizations of economic resources. There is poor coordination particularly between the province and local levels that are affecting developments adversely in some aspects. Local levels have been blamed for bypassing the province; the linkage between the local levels and the province is poor due to insufficient laws. However, I agree that the strength and efficacy of sub-national governance institutions will depend primarily on the relationship between the sub-national institutions and national government players (DFAT & AF, 2017). The old bureaucratic working style is frequently being questioned at local levels that might not be helpful for participatory development. On the one side, the Nepal Civil Service (Nepal Bureaucratic organization) has largely been politicized since 1990 particularly. There is a number of trade unions in Civil service as a sister organization of major political parties and civil servant's attachment has directly been with top political leaders. Their influences are explicit as

the government could not send them at the local level. Moreover, Nepal Civil Service lacks in IT technology even online services are not being effective. Corruption and deferment are the major constraints noted in development. Nepal's ranking in corruption perceptions index is high as it is 124 among 180 countries (<https://www.transparency.org/country/NPL>). The question regarding professionalism in the wake of Nepal's civil service has frequently been questioned. On others, leaders of many local levels are found to be weak in educational and expertise backgrounds. The tussle and conflict between leaders and bureaucrats are still existing.

The establishment of good governance is more crucial than before. Dahal (2017) is of the opinion that good governance is essential for a federal democratic republic for competence. The institution/organization, leadership, and governance are largely associated with each other. Political institution and its structure and mechanism that entail devolution of power (in federal context), service delivery system and the roles and responsibilities of leaders, can only be effective and sustainable when there is truthful interaction between leader and public. Because decision-making and policy formation processes are principally associated with leaders and people. The pragmatic role of leadership (capability, coordination, and motivation) can revive even weak and fragile institutions using power and authority. I would support the idea of Shah (2006) who agrees with the importance of a leadership role for the new vision of local government because the local governments represent a multicenter, multi-order or multilevel system in nature. Therefore, the effective role of leadership for local levels seems to be vital. However, local leaders in Nepal have largely been associated with party-workers rather than ordinary people.

In essence, only pragmatic and dynamic leadership can tackle the impact of globalization, development and participatory democracy. It is believed that leaders must possess some attribute or characteristics such as a good mediator, charismatic, motivational, fairness, and visionary. These attributes help contribute to establishing good governance. Responsiveness (towards citizens), transparency and participation are the basis for effective leadership and governance for the efficiency of the local level. The awareness and training for local-level leaders regarding power, authority and function will be worthwhile to make the effectiveness of local governance because the practice of local levels in the federal context for Nepal is new and roles and the responsibilities of leadership in the present context are widened.

References

- Acharya, K. (2018a). Local Governance Restructuring in Nepal: From Government to Governmentality. *Dhaulagiri Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, 12, 37-49.
- Acharya, K. (2018b). The capacity of local governments in Nepal: from the government to governance and governability? *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, 186-197.
- Amah, E. (2018). *Devolution of Power to Local Government: Appraising Local Government Autonomy under the Nigerian Federation*. Beijing Law Review.
- Baral, L.K. (2004). Introduction. In L. H. Baral, *Nepal Local Leadership & Governance* (p. 9-32). New Delhi: Adroit Publishers.
- Bentley, G., Pugalis, L., & Shutt, J. (2016). Leadership and Systems of Governance: The Constraints on the Scope for Leadership of Place-Based Development in Sub-

National Territories. Regional Studies.

Boko S.H. (2002). Decentralization: Definitions, Theories, and Debate. In: *Decentralization and Reform in Africa*. Springer, Boston, MA.

Chaudhary, D. (2018). Agricultural Policies and Rural Development in *Nepal: An Overview*. Research Nepal Journal of Development Studies, 1(2), 34-46.

Dahal, G. (2017). Democratic Practice and Good Governance In Nepal. *Journal of Political Science*, 17, 18-35. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jps.v17i0.20511>.

Dennis A. Rondinelli, D.A.; Nellis, J. R. & Cheema, G. S.(1983). Decentralization in Developing Countries: *A Review of Recent Experience*. Washinton DC: The World Bank.

DFAT & AF. (2017). *Diagnostic Study of Local Governance in Federal Nepal*. Kathmandu: Australian Government, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) & The Asia Foundation Partnership on Subnational Governance in Nepal (AF).

Dakyns, A.L. (1932). Devolution in Theory and in Practice. *Public Administration*, 10(1), 68-73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.1932.tb02349>.

Fuel, D. N. (2011/12). Practice of Fiscal Decentralization-Fiscal Federalism?-in Nepal. *Statistical Bulletin*, 103(2), 101-117. <https://www.transparency.org/country/NPL>

Intergovernmental Fiscal Transfer Act (2017). Retrieved from <https://mof.gov.np>

Jeffery, C. (2006). Devolution and Local Government. *The Journal of Federalism*, 36(1), 57-73.

Lindfield, N. & Jones, A.M. (2014). Leadership and Local

- Government Effectiveness: A Framework for Analysis. *Asian Review of Public Administration*, 47-63.
- Marques, E. (2013). The government, political actors, and governance in urban policies in Brazil and São Paulo: concepts for a future research agenda. *Brazilian Political Science Review*, 7(3), 8-35.
- Morgan, K. (2006). Devolution and Development: Territorial Justice and the North-South Divide. *The Journal of Federalism*, 36(1).
- Mukonza, R.M., and Chakauya, R. (2012). Is Devolution a Panacea for Government Challenges? Views and Perceptions of Zimbabwe's Devolution of Power Debate.
- Naya Patrika (10 April 2019). Halt of three hundred local level's account. Kathmandu: Naya Prakashan Pvt. Ltd. p.1 Print Version (in Nepali).
- Nepal, G. M. (1998 (2055 BS)). *Nepalnirupan*. Kathmandu: Pragya Prathisthan.
- Nhede, N. (2013, 12). Devolution of power and effective governance: the Zimbabwean constitutional debate. *African Journal of Public Affairs*, 6(4).
- Raaflaub, K., Wallace, R., Ober, J., Cartledge, P., & Farrar, C. (2007). People's Power and Egalitarian Trends in Archaic Greece. In K. W. Raaflaub, *In Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece Berkeley*; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press. (p. 22-48). London: University of California Press.
- Regmi, J. (1996). *Lichhavi-History*. Kathmandu: CNAS/TU.
- Rijal, Y. (2018). *Local Government in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Bhrikuti Pustak.

- Rondinelli, D. Administrative Decentralization and Economic Development: The Sudan's Experience with Devolution." *Journal of Modern African Studies*, vol. 19(4) (1981b): 595-624.
- Shah, A. S. (2006). The New Vision of Local Governance and the Evolving Roles of Local Government. In A. Shah (Ed.), *Local Governance in Developing Countries* (p. 1-44). Washinton DC: The World Bank.
- Sharma, P. (2014). *The Federalism debate in Nepal*. (B. Karki, Ed.) Kathmandu: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) & Participatory Constitution Building in Nepal (SPCBN).
- Tannenwald, R. (1998). Devolution: The New Federalism-An Overview. *New England Economic Review*, 1-12.
- The Economist. (2018, June 20). Nepal Government presents an overambitious budget for 2018/19. Retrieved from <http://country.eiu.com/article.aspx?articleid=1682531752&Country=Nepal&topic=Politics&subtopic=Forecast&subsubtopic=International+relations&oid=491369833&flid=1276847511>.
- W. B. (2008). Decentralization and Local Democracy in the World: *First Global Report by United Cities and Local Governments*. Washington DC: The World Bank.