



An Examination of Institution Governance Using Public and Official Perceptions

Muhammad Imran Shakir, Abdul Waheed, and Malik Asghar Naeem

Abstract— *Urbanization is an indispensable phenomenon all over the world which is conducive for urban problems. Accordingly, cities have become multi-folded by virtue of Industrialization, modernization and economic opportunity etc. The increasing population aggravated this process by generating pressure on local authorities for provision of remarkable service delivery. The resources are depleting as compared to the issues faced in service delivery. Authorities also have limitations in this regard which further worsen the management scenario. Likewise, urban planners and public administration are sailing in the same boat while doing urban governance. The institutional governance is major domain of urban governance. The institutions which are responsible to run the affairs of cities are mostly satisfied with their performance. On the other hand, there is a difference between actual performance of institutions and public perception. The main objective of this study is to examine the institutional governance on the basis of public and official perception. The study was carried out in Murree, Pakistan and hybrid research methodology was employed to conduct the research. The difference of opinion is tested on basis of various indicators of institutional urban governance. The overall result shows that participation is low as both public and government are on the same side. There is a perception of participation created in the general public by the public representatives but the in-depth analysis in the government institutions indicates that there is a major gap between perception and result oriented participation.*

Keywords— Institutional urban governance, political instability, participation, rule of law, transparency, accountability.

1. INTRODUCTION

Today the world population is increasing in an alarming situation and cities are growing day by day. The population in cities are growing as cities are the major generators of income, wealth, and employment, and are crucial for the economic development of any country. These are the places where human live and work. For the provision of quality life to the people, cities are required to facilitate its citizens by providing variety of services such as water, transportation, solid waste management, health, education, affordable housing and other necessities. The provision of such facilities is certainly based on resources but it also depends on institutions of urban governance. The notion of governance is not new, it starts with the civilization of human culture but the concept of governance became very famed in last two decades. This is an open terminology having many interpretations of various institutions. (UN-HABITAT, 2015) defines urban governance as the software which help urban hardware to function. It is the sum of ways the affairs of cities are planned and managed by different actors such as such as institutions and individuals,

private or public. This definition emphasis on the involvement of all major stakeholders; government, civil society and the private sector in decision making. (Slack & Côté, 2014) argues urban governance as the process through which the local governments along with other stakeholders- citizens, business associates, civil society and unions- make decision about the planning, managing and financing of the cities. Urban governance is important in variety of reasons. It is through urban governance the social and physical character is shaped.

It is useful to describe the relationship of urban governance and urban development. The history of urban development showed the direct relation between both phenomena. As urban development has multiple characteristics being more complex, dynamic and diverse in nature. This characterization is being involved in many urban issues, refers to majorly Inter-urban and Intra-Urban Issues (Karien, 2004). The Inter-urban issues generally relate to the physical development of the city, growth of new areas in the periphery of the city and spatial sense of the city. On the other hand, Intra-urban issues generally related to the social side of development including quality of life in a city, services delivery of basic utilities.

There are many actors which have been perceived as stakeholders including public institutions, private organizations and various types of community group (formal / informal). The complexity of problems associated with inter-urban & intra-urban issues is involvement of many stakeholders through which it is not easy to lead to an organized policy which should be flexible for all and also practicable in its nature. "There seems to be general agreement that top-down and command-and-control models of governance are no

Abdul Waheed (corresponding author) is with Dept. of Urban & Regional Planning, National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST), Pakistan. Email: drwaheed@nit.nust.edu.pk; waheedabdul@live.com

Muhammad Imran Shakir is with Dept. of Urban & Regional Planning, National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST), Pakistan. Email: Shakirplanner@gmail.com

Malik Naeem Asghar is with Dept. of Urban & Regional Planning, National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST), Pakistan. Email: Naeem.ait@gmail.com.

longer appropriate, or are in any event not as appropriate as they previously might have been” (Dekker & Kempen, 2004).

The concept of local self-governance or good governance is different from traditional methods and forms of government. The old technique depends upon the public actors / institutions whereas the modern method is giving representation to the private sectors, community as well as voluntary sectors. These actors are involved in the partnerships and networking of various kinds which are based on exchange of resources and mutual interest. According to (Andersen & Van Kempen, 2001), three types of collaborations can be distinguished. Firstly, Cooperation may be among Central/national (state level), municipal (local) and sub-municipal level. The devolution of powers and responsibilities from national to local level or this shift may be in opposite direction i.e. local governments take over the responsibilities from national government. Secondly, the involvement of private sector in development process. This sector has mega resources to be used in the mega projects. The involvement in the decision making strengthen the development process of cities through self-governance. Finally, Voluntary sector, civil society and community groups like NGO's, CBO's, neighborhood organizations, trade unions & religious organization should be engaged in the process of decision making and urban issues.

There are four major dimension of urban governance. (Harpham & Boating, 1997) categorized these dimensions as; political, cultural, technical and institutional. These dimensions are closely related to one another and important for good governance (Lange, 2009). However all the four dimensions are important contributors to urban governance but here the author is concern about the institutional domain of urban governance. (UNESCAP) enlisted eight characteristics of good governance which are; participation, consensus oriented, transparency, accountability responsive, effective and efficient, equity and rule of law. Good governance is generally evaluated on the basis of aforementioned indicator of governance. This research studies the governance on the basis of these characteristics.

Pakistan is considered as the most urbanized nation in South Asia; currently one third of population of Pakistan is urban and it is estimated that this figure will rise to 50% by 2025 (Government of Pakistan, 2015). The increase population growth and high urbanization in Pakistan created many challenges for the policy makers and town planners. Through a systematic and planned urban governance cities are planned. According to an estimate nearly half of the population of Pakistan will live in cities till 2025 (Kugelman, 2013, pp. 2-7). The story of urbanization in Pakistan is not new, its start with the partition in 1947 where majority of migrants from India settled in major cities of Pakistan. The reasons of migration changed from time to time but the rate at which the population is urbanizing in Pakistan is increasing day by day. The factors which led the people to migrate from rural to urban regions are, economic, employment, business, push and pull factors, terrorism,

militancy and insecurity etc. to accommodate the rapid increasing urban population, the government need to take serious steps for better urban governance policies.

Zubair Faisal Abbasi (Abbasi, 2014) argued that urbanization is a challenge not crisis, which requires the development of policies and respond to the challenge. The challenge of fast urbanization in Pakistan due to migration and population growth can be overcome through innovative policies and its implementation. According to (Mughul, 2014) the crises of Pakistan state is because of weak government institutions and political structure, which led the people of this country to suffer the most. Currently, Pakistan is facing the political instability and apparently Pakistan is facing poor governance and because of this situation middle and lower class of people has been much suffering. So for the bringing of impartial governance within country, we must need to overcome the political instability, lack of participation in effectiveness, corruption, lack of accountability which are mostly suffered in Pakistan.

It is one of the challenging task to engage the public in the development process. Many indicators suggest that levels of public participation declined during the last two decades of the 20th century. This decrease in participation and trust effects the performance and effectiveness of institutions and individuals (Gibson, Lacy, & Dougherty). There is increased demand for information on performance in relation to governance, the higher satisfaction of citizen leads to better governance (Bouckaert & Walle, 2003). The performance of institutions is measured by the level of satisfaction of the public, as all the work done for public must correspond to their satisfaction. The performance is measured best with the level of satisfaction of the people.

The trust of nation on government institutions is the key indicator to evaluate the feeling of public about its government (Newton, Kenneth, & Norris, 2000). Mostly institutions are ranked low by the public as they don't have trust on these institutions. The level of trust on government institutions can be judged by the perception of its people. While some researches shows that the relation between public participation and confidence in government institutions has produced conflicting outcomes. As, Putnam (1993) argues that public participation and government performance is directly proportion as better civic participation result in enhanced government performance and better trust level of government institutions. While, on contrary (Finkel, E., Sabatini, & Bevis, 2000) presents evidence that such engagement may result low trust in government institutions. According to Castello (2006) due to lack of theoretical model it is difficult to study the relation between public satisfaction and the institutional performance. Public perception is based on their interaction and level of participation. This study aims to explore the differences in public perception and institutional performance regarding urban governance. The main objective of this research is to compare the official version regarding institutional governance with the relevant public perception of the area.

2. METHODOLOGY

The research was carried out in Murree city of Pakistan which is one of the famous tourist city in the country. The Hybrid (Mix) method of research is used in this study keeping in view the Descriptive cum Exploratory type of research.

Table 1: Sample size

Department	Official	End users
Town Municipal Administration	10	80
Education	06	20
Health	06	20
Public Health	06	15
Solid Waste Management	07	25
Total	35	160

Table 2: Indicators for institutional governance

Characteristics	Purpose	Indicators
Participation	To assess the level of public participation in decision making	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Level of Women participation 2. Level of Public representative participation 3. Level of private sector participation 4. Role of NGOs 5. Level of decentralization
Rule of Law	To identify the availability of law/policies and its implementation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. level of public respect for city code, standards, rules and regulations 2. level of enforcement of municipal regulations 3. level of measures for anti-corruption 4. special legislation exist related to tourism and environment
Transparency	To check the available mechanism for transparency	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mechanism for inclusion of urban poor in decision making 2. level of transparency in municipal staff selection and promotion
Responsiveness	To explore the mechanism in TMA to ascertain the needs and aspirations of the residents	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Availability of schedule for staff training to generate responsiveness and efficiency 2. mechanism in TMA to address public grievances 3. adequacy of budgetary allocation for basic municipal services 4. quality of local street and roads 5. quality of municipal water supply system 6. quality of sanitation and solid waste management system 7. initiatives of TMA for

Consensus Orientation	To assess the consensus of all party/stakeholder on major municipal strategies and its implementation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. level of consensus of all party/stakeholder on major municipal strategies 2. level of usage of media for public consensus building 3. level of promotion of issue based discussions among decision makers 4. Availability of institutional mechanism to consult civil society partners
Equity	To determine the level of equity in city	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. level of poverty in the city 2. extent of women representation in decision making departments
Effective and Efficiency	To evaluate the degree of effectiveness and efficiency of TMA/ City administration	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. level of usage of modern management techniques and tools 2. degree of municipal administrative procedural reforms 3. degree of innovation in municipal fiscal management 4. program of Research and Development 5. level of efficiency regarding access to safe drinking water and sanitation 6. percentage of coverage of sewerage services 7. level of public-private partnership in the provision of municipal services 8. access to municipal borrowing for city development
Accountability	To examine the accountability mechanism in Municipal Administration	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. degree of decentralization and delegation of authority 2. quality of monitoring the implementation of delegated tasks 3. level of participation of officials in major governance networks

Primary data was collected from structured interviews and public opinion survey. A sample of 35 officials from five different public departments namely Town Municipal Administration, Education Department, Health Department, Public Health Department, and Solid Waste Management (SWM) Departments was interviewed to evaluate the existing situation of urban governance as can be seen in table 1. Besides the structured interviews from the official, opinion of visitors from the aforementioned departments regarding different aspects of institutional governance were seek using a questionnaire based filed survey. Total 160 respondents were included in the public perception

survey from visitors of five departments. The survey was administrated face to face with the visitors randomly in the vicinity of concerned department.

Both the citizen perception survey and structured interviews from government officials were evaluated on basis of eight characteristic of institutional urban governance; transparency, participation, rule of law, effective and efficiency, accountability, responsiveness, equity and consensus orientation using a five point Likert scale(Very high, high, normal, low and very low). The details are shown in the following table 2.

For the purpose of analysis, the normal values were considered as null or void. In order to get the net result, the sum of “high” and “very high” was subtracted from sum of “low” and “very low” values. If the net result is greater than zero ($X > 0$), it shows positive response against certain indicator, which indicates that governance is good against that indicator. While on contrary if the net result is smaller than zero ($X < 0$), it shows bad governance against that indicator. The final results were ranked according to the following criteria.

Score/Range	Rank
76-100	Excellent
51-75	Very Good
26-50	Good
1-25	Slightly good
-1 to -25	Bad
-26 to -50	Very Bad
-51 to -75	Extremely Bad
-76 to -100	Worst

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Total 160 participants were interviewed in this study including citizens of Murree, Tourists from different areas of Pakistan. The respondents have different backgrounds in terms of income, family structure, area of living etc. Majority of the respondents were locals of Murree as they were well informed and having more information/knowledge about Murree and the concern departments working in the area. To get necessary information/data interviews were conducted from people of different backgrounds; majority (n=100) of survey was conducted from household, while 31 respondents were shopkeepers, 31 (19.4%), while 14 (8.8%) respondents were owner of hotels and 15 (9.4%) tourists participated in the survey (Table 3). The respondents were also categorized on the basis of monthly income where majority (n=112) of the respondents were having monthly income less than PKR 20,000. 41 (25.6%) respondents were having monthly income between PKR 20,000 to PKR 40,000, while 5 (3.1%) respondents were having monthly income in-between PKR 40,000 to PKR 60,000 and only 2 (1.3%) respondents were having monthly income more than PKR 60,000. The results show that people of the research local belongs to low income.

Table 3: Characteristic of respondents

Characteristics	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
Types of respondents	160	100
Household	100	62.5
Shopkeeper	31	19.4
Hotel Owner	14	8.8
Tourist	15	9.4
Monthly Income		
<20,000	112	70.0
20,000-40,000	41	25.6
40,000-60,000	5	3.1
Above 60,000	2	1.3
Living in Murree		
<5 Years	24	15.0
5-15 Years	15	9.4
15-25 Years	108	67.5
No response	13	8.1

Murree is known for tourism so the economy of people living in Murree mainly dependent on tourism industry. Majority of the people were living in Murree more than 25 years and household income is associated with the tourist industry.

Good governance is characterized by eight major domains which includes participation, rule of law, transparency, responsiveness, consensus, equity, effective and efficiency and accountability (UNESCAP). In this research respondents were interviewed to map the current situation of urban governance in Murree city. Public Survey was conducted to study the public perception regarding urban governance in the city. The results shows that according to citizens, the participation level is normal where almost half (47.3%) of the responded it as normal. When questions were asked about rule of law in the city, majority of the respondents (29.3%) showed positive response as they were satisfied from the current situation of rule of law in the city. The level of transparency is low, as more than half of the respondents (56.3%) ranked it as low. The citizen said that the level of corruption in government department is very high. The level of responsiveness is also low as most of the respondents said it as normal (33.5%) and low (35.6%). The results from public perception survey shows that according to the citizen the level of consensus is high as majority of the respondents (45%) said it as high.

When inquired about equity, nearly half of the respondents (46.6%) claimed it to be very low, this shows that public is not satisfy from the equity level. Some of the respondents said that most citizen special the vulnerable people are being neglected by the government. While the level of effectiveness and efficiency is satisfactory as majority reported it as high (33.6%) and (31.6%) normal. According to the citizens, the level of accountability is normal in the city, as 43.6%

said it as normal (Table 4).

Table 4: Public perception regarding institutional urban governance

Items	Very High N (%)	High N (%)	Normal N (%)	Low N (%)	Very Low N (%)	Net Result
Participation	21 (4.7)	84 (18.9)	210 (47.3)	129 (29.1)	0	-5.5
Rule of Law	164 (25.6)	188 (29.3)	140 (21.9)	143 (22.3)	5 (0.8)	31.8
Transparency	6 (3.8)	8 (5)	51 (31.9)	90 (56.3)	5 (3.1)	-50.6
Responsiveness	0	69 (14.4)	161 (33.5)	171 (35.6)	79 (16.5)	-37.7
Consensus	54 (16.9)	112 (35)	91 (28.4)	25 (7.8)	38 (11.9)	32.2
Equity	4 (1.3)	63 (19.6)	84 (26.3)	20 (6.3)	149 (46.6)	-32
Effective and Efficiency	33 (5.2)	215 (33.6)	202 (31.6)	48 (7.5)	142 (22.2)	9.1
Accountability	9 (5.6)	24 (15)	70 (43.6)	39 (24.4)	18 (11.3)	-15.1

On the other hand, to get insight with the performance of government institution, structure interviews were conducted form government employees. Performance was evaluated on the basis of eight major domains of institutional governance. The results shows that participation was not satisfactory as majority (29.4%) said participation is very low and 21.6% low. The results shows that rule of law is normal as majority (26.3%) were of that view that rule of law is normal and almost same number (25.1%) said it as low. The following table 5 shows summary of performance of government institutions with respect to urban governance.

Table 5: Performance of Institutions

Items	Very High N (%)	High N (%)	Normal N (%)	Low N (%)	Very Low N (%)	Net Result
Participation	13 (5.3)	48 (19.6)	59 (24)	53 (21.6)	72 (29.4)	-26.1
Rule of Law	12 (6.9)	38 (21.7)	46 (26.3)	44 (25.1)	35 (20)	-16.6
Transparency	0	13 (37.1)	11 (31.4)	7 (20)	4 (11.4)	5.7
Responsiveness	13 (9.3)	45 (32.1)	49 (35)	26 (18.6)	7 (5)	17.8
Consensus	4 (3.8)	26 (24.8)	32 (30.5)	28 (26.6)	15 (14.3)	-12.4
Equity	5 (7.1)	16 (22.9)	22 (31.4)	18 (25.7)	9 (12.9)	-8.6
Effective and Efficiency	4 (2.3)	34 (19.4)	65 (37.1)	52 (29.7)	20 (11.4)	-19.4
Accountability	4 (2.8)	25 (17.7)	54 (38.3)	43 (30.5)	15 (10.6)	-20.6

Transparency, which is a major domain of institutional urban governance is quite satisfactory, as majority (37.1%) of the respondents claimed it to be high, while 31.4% said it as normal. When questions were asked

from the respondents to evaluate the level of responsiveness, the results were normal; as majority (35%) were of the view that responsiveness is normal, while another 32.1% said high. Moreover, results shows that consensus orientation is also normal as most of the respondents (30.8%) said normal. Furthermore, similar responses were showed in case of equity as majority (31.4%) were of the view that equity is normal, 25.7% said low and 22.9% said high. Effective and efficiency is also normal; as most of the respondents (37.1%) said it as normal. Accountability which is also one of the main characteristics of good governance, is also normal. Questions were asked from respondents to evaluate the level of accountability; majority (38.3%) ranked it as normal, 30.5% said low.

4. CONCLUSION

The conclusion has been drawn by comparing public perception and performance of institutions regarding institutional domains of urban governance. When compared the results of public perception and institutions performance, the following results were revealed. The results from public perception shows that overall participation was 15% while results from structured interviews shows that participation is 24.5%. There is gap of 9.5%, which shows that there is difference of performance and public perception. As most of the citizen were of the view that public do not participate in any decision making process while on the other hand government officials claimed that public representatives and some prominent public figures are involved in decision making process. By comparing the results of citizen perception survey and structured interviews shows difference of 6.7%.

The overall result shows that participation is low as both public and government are on the same side. There is a perception of participation created in the general public by the public representatives but the in-depth analysis in the government institutions indicates that there is a major gap between perception and result oriented participation. There is difference of opinion between public and government officials regarding rule of law. The general consider laws related to municipal laws which they mostly abide by while on the other hand government officials indicating the technical side of rule of law, which is resultantly on negative side. The city is well known tourist destination as well as having military cantonment having sensitive installations therefore, the comparative situation with respective surrounding areas is better in the opinion of general public whereas the government officials are comparing the situation with respect to international standards which are far away.

The results reveals that the overall level of transparency is not good as the public ranked it very low while the government officials also do not consider it much high. The difference of opinion with respect to this indicator portraying bad institutional governance. The government institutions are working for the provision for the basic services to the public so they claim responsiveness as slightly positive, because they are expensing their institutional budget into quantifying

projects. On the other hand the general public believe on provision of quality of basic services which are not available so they ranked it very low. Many reasons like shortage of budget, lack of technology etc. have been pointed by the experts/professional which are the major constraints for the provision of basic services. Public representatives have created positive perception of consensus in general public but the in-depth analysis in the government institution shows that there is low consensus in the decision making process as well as execution etc. the major reasons of this perception are due to bipolar politics, vested interests, lack of awareness etc.

Table 6. Comparison of public and Institutional responses

Items	Public		Institutional	
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
Participation	-5.5	Low	-26.1	Very Low
Rule of Law	31.8	Good	-16.6	Bad
Transparency	-50.6	Extremely Bad	5.7	Slightly Good
Responsiveness	-37.7	Very Bad	17.8	Slightly Good
Consensus	32.2	Good	-12.4	Bad
Equity	-32	Very Bad	-8.6	Bad
Effective	9.1	Slightly Good	-19.4	Bad
Accountability	-15.1	Bad	-20.6	Bad

The general public in the research local are mostly poor, this fact is accepted by both government officials and general public. As the public itself is victim of poverty so they ranked equity very low while the government who is responsible to improve the lifestyle of the citizens; are trying to hide the real situation. The general public perceived the effectiveness as slightly positive as the city is focused by the highest provincial authority (Chief Executive). A few innovative projects like solid waste management have been initiated. However the government officials are of the view that these projects are not sustainable. Accountability which is an important indicator of governance is being ranked low by both public and government officials. Corruption is major issue of the country which affects almost every institution. The low level of accountability is due to the public perception about high corruption in the country.

REFERENCES

[1] Abbasi, Z. F. (2014). *The Challenge of Urbanisation*. Islamabad: Institute for Development Initiatives.
 [2] Andersen, & Van Kempen. (2001). Social fragmentation, social exclusion, and urban governance: an introduction. In R. K. H.T. Andersen, *Governing European Cities, Social fragmentation, Social Exclusion and Urban Governance* (pp. 1-18). Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
 [3] Bouckaert, G., & Walle, S. V. (2003). Comparing measures of citizen trust and user satisfaction as

indicators of ‘good governance’: difficulties in linking trust and satisfaction indicators. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 69, 329-343.
 [4] Castello, A. M. (2006). Institutional Performance and Satisfaction with Democracy. A comparative Analysis. *The comparative study of the Electoral System*, (p. 1). Seville.
 [5] Dekker, K., & Kempen, R. V. (2004, April). Urban governance within the Big Cities Policy: Ideals and practice in Den Haag, the Netherlands. *Cities*, 21(2), 107-119. Retrieved from Urban governance within the Big Cities Policy: Ideals and practice in Den Haag, the Netherlands
 [6] Finkel, E., S., Sabatini, C. A., & Bevis, G. G. (2000). Civic Education, Civil Society, and Political Mistrust in a Developing Democracy: The Case of the Dominican Republic. *World Development*, 28(11), 1851-1874.
 [7] Gibson, P., Lacy, D., & Dougherty, M. (n.d.). Improving Performance and Accountability in Local Government with Citizen Participation. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal Volume*, 10(1), 1. Retrieved from <http://www.innovation.cc/volumes-issues/gibson1.pdf>
 [8] Government of Pakistan. (2015). *National Report of Pakistan for HABITAT III*. Islamabad: Government of Pakistan Ministry of Climate Change. Retrieved from [http://unhabitat.org/wpcontent/uploads/2015/04/Pakistan%20\(National%20Report\).pdf](http://unhabitat.org/wpcontent/uploads/2015/04/Pakistan%20(National%20Report).pdf)
 [9] Harpham, T., & Boating, K. (1997). Urban governance in relation to the operation of urban services in developing countries. *Habitat International*, 21(1), 65-77.
 [10] Karien, R. v. (2004). Urban governance within the Big Cities Policy: Ideals and practice in Den Haag, the Netherlands. *Cities*, 109-117.
 [11] Kugelman, M. (2013). *Urbanisation in Pakistan: causes and consequences*. Norway: Norwegian Peacebuilding Resource Centre.
 [12] Lange, F. E. (2009). *Urban Governance: An essential determinant of city development ?* Friedrichsdorf: World Vision Institute for Research and Development.
 [13] Mughul, M. R. (2014, February 28). Good Governance in Pakistan Problems and Proposed Solution. *International Journal of Modern Business Issues of Global Market*, 2(2), 40-58.
 [14] Newton, Kenneth, & Norris, P. (2000). *Confidence in Public Institutions: Faith, Culture, or Performance? In Susan J. Pharr and Robert D. Putnam, eds., Disaffected Democracies: What's Troubling the Trilateral*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
 [15] Putnam, R. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Ital*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
 [16] Slack, E., & Côté, A. (2014). *Comparative urban governance*. London: Foresight, Government Office for Science. Retrieved from

- https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/360420/14-810-urban-governance.pdf
- [17] UNESCAP. (n.d.). *What is Good Governance*. Bangkok: UNESCAP. Retrieved from <http://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/good-governance.pdf>
- [18] UNESCAP. (n.d.). *What is Good Governance*. Bangkok: United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP). Retrieved from <http://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/good-governance.pdf>
- [19] UN-HABITAT. (2015). *HABITAT III Urban Governance*. New York: UN-HABITAT.