# Local Autonomy Index 2.0 (1990-2020): Armenia (ARM)

## Introduction

The following scores represent autonomy analysis of the lowest level of local government in Armenia according to the “Local Autonomy Index”. Armenia is a unitary country with a two-level governing system – Central and local authorities. According to the Constitution (Constitution, 1995), The administrative-territorial units of the Republic of Armenia are the marzes [regions], which are governed by the appointed representatives of the central government, and the communities [hamaynk], which are granted self-governing authority. The scores presented are those for the year 2020. All the changes and reforms starting from 1990 are mentioned in the text and scoring tablets.

## Self-rule

### 1. Institutional depth

Local governance was established in post-Soviet independent Armenia in 1996 with the passage of the first law on local self-government. In 2002 the first law was abolished and the new Law on Local Self-Government (The Law on Local Self-Government, 2002) was passed in National Assembly(the latest amendment – 20.01.2021). One of the main changes from the perspective of institutional depth is that according to the previous Law (The Law on Local Self-Government, 1996), Marzpets (Governors or Heads of the regional administrations [marzes]) had a guaranteed right to dismiss the elected heads of communities in specific cases (The Law on Local Self-Government, , 1996, Article 7). According to the new law, this authority is transferred to the community council. The latter can make a proposal to dismiss the head of the community by applying to the marzpet (or to the Prime Minister in case of Yerevan) (The Law on Local Self-Governance, Article 17, 2002). Nevertheless, according to both the Constitution and the Law, municipalities are autonomous and can choose the tasks they want to perform even though certain functions are mandatory for local governments to perform such as pre-school education, land use planning, etc. According to Constitution article 182, the powers of local self-government bodies shall be prescribed by law. The score of the institutional depth cannot be the highest (The Law on Local Self-Government, Article 59, 2002). Which means that the powers of local self-governance can be under control of higher bodies through laws regarding municipalities.

In case of Yerevan, the functions and responsibilities are regulated by the Law on Local Self-Government in the City of Yerevan (2009). In regards of institutional depth here is important to mention that before the Law on Yerevan (2009), the self-governing of the city was regulated by two main laws - The Law on the Administrative-Territorial Division of the Republic of Armenia (1995) and The Law on Local Self-Governing (1996). Before the new law, the legal status of Yerevan was equalized to Marzes (Region) and the head of the city was appointed by head of the state (no elections). Thus, Yerevan status was equal to marzes and the coding here refers to those 12 communities within Yerevan which had the same powers as the communities in other marzes. This also needs to be taken into account in other Yerevan-related scorings. Accordingly, the code for Yerevan before 2009 and after is again 2.

CODING: 2

### 2. Policy scope

EDUCATION

Coding 1.0

Pre-school education – score 1: One of the mandatory functions of the municipalities is the provision of pre-school education service (through kindergartens, nurseries, day-care centers). The status of pre-school education institutions is defined by law (The Law on Pre-School Education, 2006). According to Article 22-25, Pre-school education is managed by two bodies: a) the designated government body for education; b) local self-government bodies. The former defines the main policy, standards, norms and exercises oversight of them. The municipalities are the main providers of the pre-school education service. Even though there is an oversight by the designated government body and the policy direction is defined by the central government, the score of 1 is given due to the fact that the municipalities are fully responsible for buildings, personal, and delivery of the service. The ownership of pre-school institutions is mixed, part of them are governed by regional administrations, another part by municipalities. Private pre-school institutions are also allowed. Local governments are in exclusive charge of the municipal pre-school institutions. Here Yerevan is not an exception and the same regulation applies the same way.

Primary Education - score 0: This is a responsibility of the central government (Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport/Regional Department of Education in the regional administration), not the municipalities. In case of Yerevan primary education (schools) is under the competency of the City. According to Article 3, the Mayor of the city ensures the implementation of the state educational policy in the territory of Yerevan, the construction, operation and maintenance of the buildings handed over to the state educational institutions with the right of use, Supervises the implementation of the legislation on education by the educational institutions, normative acts adopted by the authorized body of state management of education, implementation of educational programs in accordance with the state standard of general education etc. (The Law on General Education, 2009). Here the functions are the same both before and after adoption of the Law on Yerevan and the score is 1

Secondary education – Score 0: This is a responsibility of the central government (Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport /Regional Department of Education in the regional administration), not the municipalities. In case of Yerevan the score is 1 just as for primary education.

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Coding 0.5

Economic assistance – Score 0.5: The policy of providing social assistance in the Republic of Armenia is regulated by two main laws – Law on Social Assistance (2015) and Law on State Benefit (2013). According to the former, the state and communities provide social services through territorial bodies, organizations subordinated to state and local self-government bodies. On the other hand, the Law on State Benefit implies that generally economic assistance in Armenia is regulated and delivered by the state. The previous Law on Social Assistance (2006) didn’t oblige municipalities to perform certain functions. The new Law (2014, however, not only brought certain compulsory collaborative duties but also certain regulations for economic assistance at the local level. Particularly, Article 34 regulates cooperation between all the bodies exercising social assistance including the municipalities. A score of 0.5 is given since the responsibilities are widely shared within the Government designated body, Regional Administration, and local self-government bodies. To strengthen the role of local governments, municipalities with a population above 5000 established a position of social worker. In case of Yerevan, since it has more powers certain department exist for economic assistance. Article 63 regulates the function of the City in this sphere (The Law on Local Self-Government in the City of Yerevan, 2009). Here the code is 1.

Work training – score 0: The above Law also indirectly allocates responsibility to municipalities for work training (The Law on Social Assistance, Article 24 2014). However, here municipalities mostly have cooperation functions since for that kind of actions there is no certain regulation, thus, obligations in self-governing legislation. This mainly regulated by the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs with the help of so-called employment centers. The same is for Yerevan.

Integration of refugees – Score 0: No specific regulation or function

HEALTH

Coding 0.5

Primary health services – Score 0.5: Mainly, this is a responsibility of the central government (Ministry of Health/Regional Department of Health), not the municipalities. However, there are about 240 ambulatories in the villages which are municipal non-commercial organizations. LGs have powers in public health (both mandatory and delegated) according to article 47 of the Law on LSG. The score for Yerevan is 1. The latter has a department of health, which is regulating the functions and activity of outpatient clinics.

Hospitals – score 0: This is a responsibility of the central government (Ministry of Health/Regional Department of Health), not the municipalities. The score of the Yerevan is 1. According to the legislation, Health Department of Yerevan Municipality is regulating all public hospitals and policlinics (not private) in Yerevan. Some of the responsibilities are shared with Ministry of Health (the latter exercises oversight of the activities of health institutions).The Mayor of the city is officially responsible for the service and manages health organizations owned by the city (The Law on Local Self-Government in the City of Yerevan, Article 62, 2009).

Dental services – score 0: Dental services are mostly provided by private clinics and their oversight is done by the central government (Ministry of Health/Regional Department of Health), not by the municipalities. Oversight in Yerevan is exercised by Health Department of Yerevan Municipality.

LAND USE

Zoning and building permits - Score 2: The field of land use in Armenia is regulated by two main Laws - The Law on Local Self-Government (2002) and The Law on Urban Development (1998). Both of them allocate a list of competencies to municipalities regarding local land use, including zoning and issuing building permits. Particularly Articles 37 and 38 define the range of functions and responsibilities of the local government in the sector (The Law on Local Self-Government, 2002). The competency of building permits and zoning are reflected in the other Law – Articles 6, 11, and 141, 143 (The Law on Urban Development, 1998). A score of 2 is given taking into consideration the full responsibility of the municipalities in this field.

In case of Yerevan, in addition to the mentioned laws, the sphere is also regulated by the Law on Yerevan (2009). Particularly, Article 59 and 95 state all the rights and responsibilities of the council and heads of the administrative distinct. Score is the same from 1996-2020.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT AND HOUSING

Public transport – score 0.5: Local governments have both mandatory and voluntary functions in the public transport sector. According to the relevant Law on Public Transport (1998) and Law on Local Self-government (The Law on Local Self-Government, 2002), the local government has mandatory functions and is responsible for the functionality of public transport. Article 39 regulates both the mandatory and voluntary functions of the local government in the sector of public transport (The Law on Local Self-Government, 2002) However, according to the Law on Railway Transport and the Law on Public Transport, the central government is fully responsible for the functionality of railway transport. According to Article 6 of the Law on Railway Transport, the central government is responsible for the functionality of railway transport. It has mandatory tasks in this field (Law on Railway Transport, 2008). The score is 0.5 because local government has functions only in the field of public transport (mainly bus transportation) and has no responsibilities in the sector of railway transport. Metro exists only in Yerevan and operates under the Yerevan municipality. The same score is given to Yerevan. Article 57 states that the mayor of the city organizes the work of public transport in Yerevan (The Law on Local Self-Government in the City of Yerevan, 2009).

Housing – 0: Though Article 38 of the Law on Local Self-Government (2002) implies that the community head has a function to implement housing construction and complex renovation of other social facilities, it does not provide any other details about it. Article 12 of the Law on LSG states that local governments have mandatory powers to support housing construction. No further explanations. There is a law on Approval of Complex Recovery Plan of Disaster Zone (2001), which is mainly about Gyumri (city which suffered from 1988 earthquake). Only this law regulates some issues regarding housing and social housing. However, this is an exception to a special case. Generally, The Republic of Armenia does not have any detailed policy and strategy about housing and social housing. Thus, the score is 0 and it is the same for Yerevan as well.

Police – score 0: This is not a local government function in Armenia.

CARING

Coding 1.5

General caring services – Score 0.5: Just as in the case of Social Assistance, general caring services are regulated by law (The Law on Social Assistance, 2015). Here again, local self-governments have general duties, mainly for identification of the cases and their referral to the social network under the central government purview. Since nursing homes and other services of care generally are not under the control of the local authorities, the score is 0.5. Yerevan is not an exception here and the score is the same. The only difference is that due to the size and the amount of the resources, the council or Mayor of the city often makes financial donations to existing programs or charitable foundations. In Armenia Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs is the main executor of caring policy implementation.

Special groups – Score 0.5: Municipal responsibilities regarding the needs of special groups (e.g. various functional disabilities or children with special needs) are mostly regulated through the Law on Local Self-Government (2002) and The Law on Social Assistance (2015). Besides these acts, there is a Law on Social Protection of the Disabled (1993). According to the latter, municipalities have general obligations to cooperate with the designated body in terms of supporting the ongoing programs (Article 6, 36). However, local governments do not have certain obligations for undertaking specific programs and mostly do not take a part in the process of decision-making and Yerevan here is not an exception.

Child protection – Score 0.5: The Law on the Rights of the Child (1996) is the central document regulating the policy of child protection. According to Article 3, the protection of the rights of the child is carried out by the designated state and self-government bodies. According to Article 20 (The Law on Social Assistance, 2015), the main functions of child protection are carried out by the designated state body, and local governments here again have just cooperative obligations, (as well as Yerevan) here again have just cooperative obligations.

CODING: 2.0

### 3. Effective political discretion

(cf. formulation of criteria of EPD; below, only reasons for not recording a full score of EPD are given).

EDUCATION

Pre-School Education - score 1

Primary Schools – score 0: Not a municipal function (Yerevan – score 1)

Secondary Schools – score 0: Not a municipal function (Yerevan – score 1)

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Economic Assistance – score 0.5: The function is carried out in cooperation with other state bodies. (Yerevan – score 1)

Work Training – score 0: Local governments do not have functions here.

Integration of refugees – score 0: No legislation

Child protection – score 0.5. This function is shared with other state bodies.

HEALTH

General/primary services – score 0: not a municipal function

Hospitals – score 0: not a municipal function

Dental services– score 0: not a municipal function

LAND USE

Zoning and building permits – score 2:

PUBLIC TRANSPORT AND HOUSING

Public transport - score 0.5: No function in Railway regulation

Housing - score 0: No legislation

POLICE

Police – score 0: This is not a local government function.

CARING

General caring – score 0.5: This function is shared with other state bodies.

Special groups – score 0.5: This function is shared with other state bodies.

Child protection – score 0.5: This function is shared with other state bodies.

CODING: 7

### 4. Fiscal autonomy

In Armenia, local authorities do not set the base or the rate of any tax, including the land, real property tax and vehicle tax, which are the main sources of revenue for local governments. Local authorities set the rate of minor taxes (user fees, charges and duties) within the ranges established by the law. Additionally, local councils have the right to establish other fees not set by the legislation and set their rates. Both according to the previous legislation (The Law on Taxes, 1997) and the new Tax Code (Tax Code, 2018), the tax policy and the rates are regulated by state legislation. Here municipalities have certain obligations regarding tax administration and collection and Yerevan is not an exception.

CODING: 0

### 5. Financial transfer system

The financial transfer system in Armenia is mostly regulated through the Law on Financial Equalization (2016). According to Article 17, the amount of subsidies allocated to the local communities is approved by the Law on the State Budget of the Republic of Armenia each year. Article 20 of another Law (The Law on Budget System, 1997) states that in order to ensure the harmonious development of the communities, the state budget expenditures envisage financially equalizing funds to the budgets of the communities on the principle of financial equalization to cover the current expenditures of the communities. According to the reports of Ministry of Finance and the Community Finance Officers Association (CFOA) The proportion of unconditional financial transfers to total financial transfers received by the local government were too little that nearly all transfers were unconditional. There were no relevant mechanisms for the regulation of the process. So, the selection of communities receiving conditional transfers was a little biased. However, starting from 2006, regulation and stabilization of the process were taking place. But the number still remained low. After 2016, the proportion changed a little bit. So, unconditional transfers were still dominant but not all transfers were nearly unconditional. Local governments receive both unconditional (subsidies) and conditional (subvention) transfers. The total amount of the subsidies appropriated in the state budget has a lower threshold of not less than 4% of the actual revenues in the consolidated budget of the country (state plus all local budgets) of the penultimate year (two years before the current). The same applies for Yerevan with some exceptions. In case of Yerevan, coding is 2.

CODING: 2

### 6. Financial self-reliance

According to The Law on Local Self-Government (2002), own/local sources of municipalities are local taxes, duties and fees, user charges for specific services. According to reports of Ministry of Finance and CFOA the proportion of own/local sources own sources of communities yields within 10-25 % with some exceptions during these years. Most of the revenues of the tax, collection is from the property and land taxes (in Armenia personal income tax is not assigned to the municipalities). The legislation envisions sharing tax bases with the local governments (article 281 of the Law on Budget System) as part of the state budget approval by the parliament. No practice of sharing taxes through this process was recorded so far. In case of Yerevan, coding is 2.

CODING: 1

### 7. Borrowing autonomy

In Armenia, local authorities have the right of borrowing. According to the Law on Local Self-Government (2002) the council may approve a decision to borrow from a commercial institution or from the state budget or from another municipality, as well as issue municipal bonds. However, municipalities are required to endorse in advance such decisions by the government designated body. According to Article 38 local authorities may borrow under prior authorization by higher-level governments. The municipality may take a new loan only after fully repaying the previous loan. According to the Law, only the budget revenues may be pledged (serve as a collateral) for any kind of loan contract. The Government of Armenia is assumed to develop guidelines for issuance of municipal bonds but is lingering on this action.

The Law on Yerevan reflects almost the same formulations regarding borrowing autonomy. Particularly, Article 84 states that the Mayor with Council approval and only with the consent of the authorized body (Higher level of government) of public financial management may sign a loan contract for investment in development of the city's social infrastructure.

CODING: 1

### 8. Organisational autonomy

Executives and elements of the electoral system (including the elements of the process of election of local councils and heads) are determined by the Law (Electoral Code, 2016). Here the municipalities as well as Yerevan do not have any authority to influence the process of decision making. Local governments do not have an authority on the core elements of the political system, such as the electoral districts, number of seats, electoral system.

Organizational autonomy is mostly reflected in the process of hiring the administration staff, choosing the organization structure, setting the salaries, etc. Local governments have the discretion to decide their organizational structure, number of departments, number of the deputy mayors, aides, advisors and other discretionary positions. The number of municipal servants, the structure of the municipality and its subsidiary organizations is subject to the council’s approval and does not require and endorsement by the central government. The salary of the mayor is linked to the parliamentarian’s (formerly governor’s salary in the 1996 Law on Local Self-government) salary through a formula and grows incrementally (42.57-85.52%) depending on the population of the municipality). The salaries of the municipal staff cannot exceed 81,14-81,95% of the mayor’s salary.

CODING: 1.75

## Interactive-rule

### 9. Legal protection

According to Constitution (Constitution, 1995) as well as the Law on Constitutional Court (2018), local-self-government rights and functions are protected. The Constitution guarantees local self-governance as one of the essential blocks of democracy (Article 9). However, the Constitution does not list the number and the names of all local communities and municipalities are not protected from merging policies. This notion subtracts 1 point in legal protection. According to Law on Constitutional Court (2018), local authorities have recourse to the judicial system through constitutional courts to settle disputes with higher authorities (Article 70). According to the Law on Local Self-government, article 99 local governments can appeal the actions, inactions and the legal acts passed by central government bodies that execute oversight of local governments. The situation for Yerevan is a different case and the score of its legal protection is 3. Article 22 states, that Yerevan is the capitol of the Republic of Armenia (here merging risks are eliminated) (Constitution, 1995). Here it is important to mention that Article 187 states that is a community (local government), were not the same before the Law on Yerevan (2009). According to the Second Third amendment of the Constitution, Yerevan was defined as a regional-administrative body.

Despite the fact that according to the law, local governments are protected and have a right of recourse, the court system independence is the questions here. Court system in Armenia is not fully independent and is an object of different political influences. The situation has remained almost the same until 2018. After 2018, there were a few changes that which have changed the court system situation significantly but it did not become fully independent. Only side influences of different political parties and central government have weakened. So, the score before 2018 is 1.5 and after it, 3.

CODING: 1.5

### 10. Administrative supervision

Formally, according to both Constitution and the Law on Self-Government, municipalities are quite independent and supervision is basically implemented by determined norms and criteria. According to the Law on Local Self-Government (2002), legal control is limited with checking the legality of decisions made by local governments during the exercise of their functions. The same formulation is stated in the Law on Yerevan (2009). However, additionally the 9 states, that by the decision of the government, certain functions of territorial administration in Yerevan may be transferred to other republican bodies of executive power.

Inspections on the implementation of the functions of local self-government bodies are carried out in accordance with the Law on Organization and Conduct of Inspections in the Republic of Armenia (2000), while financial control over budgetary or financial-economic activities carried out by local self-government bodies (City Council in case of Yerevan) regulated in the Law on Budget System (1997).

Another body – The Audit Chamber – supervises the legality and efficiency of the use of community budget funds, loans and credits received, in the manner prescribed by the Law on the Audit Chamber (2018). All of the above-mentioned laws, in fact, authorize different state bodies to oversee the process of local self-governance at quite high level taking into consideration the fact that more than 70% of the municipality budget revenues come as transfers in the form of subsidies, subventions or transfers for the execution of delegated powers. According to the Law on Yerevan, the state supervises the execution of the Yerevan budget through the Control Chamber within the framework of their powers reserved by law (The Law on Local Self-Government in the City of Yerevan, Article 81, 2009). All of the above-mentioned laws, in fact, authorize different state bodies to supervise the process of local governing at quite high level taking into consideration the fact that more than 70% of the municipality budget is out of its own revenues. The case of Yerevan is different, and administrative supervision only aims at ensuring compliance with law (legality of decisions and partly the spending priorities). Score for Yerevan is 2:

CODING: 1

### 11. Central or regional access

There are no formal mechanisms of municipal representation in the higher levels of authority, but the informal channels such as party political networks and personal social construct here may work. Armenian municipalities are members of the Communities Association of Armenia (CAA), which was established in 1997 and re-organized in 2009. Two other professional associations were formed about the same time – Communities Finance Officers Association (CFOA) and Armenian Councilors Association (ACA). Since Armenia does not have a developed and advanced system of trade unions, these associations are the only channels that affect higher-level decision-making through more informal channels (e.g. consultations with the government officials and parliamentarians, sitting in the public councils in the ministries, advocacy instruments, development of white papers and policy recommendations etc.) and protect the rights of the communities .Yerevan here is not an exception even though its status is higher compared to the rest.

CODING: 1

## Additional questions (2020 only)

With these additional questions on the potential causal mechanisms and effects of local autonomy, we want to collect a current perception. More concretely, it means that it would be great if you could give us your answers to these questions directly here (i.e. no coding sheet), without considering any possible asymmetries in your country (i.e. national level only) or any changes over time (i.e. 2020 only). Any interesting (legal) indication may be also mentioned/added.

To better understand how an external shock may cause a change in local autonomy in a given country, a question is asked about the implication of Covid-19 pandemic.

The effects of local autonomy concern the satisfaction with local government service delivery, the importance of local government for citizens, the satisfaction with local democracy, the turnout at local elections and the trustworthiness of local politicians.

### Implication of Covid-19 Pandemic

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Implication of Covid-19 pandemic** | *The extent to which the autonomy of local government has been impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic* | **0-3** | 0 local government autonomy has generally decreased with the Covid-19 pandemic  1 local government autonomy has not been impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic  2 local government autonomy in health has increased with the Covid-19 pandemic  3 local government autonomy in health and in other fields related to the Covid-19 pandemic has increased |

Local government autonomy has not been impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic. Here, coding is 1 because Covid-19 did not have any positive or negative impact on local government's autonomy.

CODING:1

### Satisfaction with local government service delivery

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Satisfaction with local government service delivery** | *The extent to which the citizens are satisfied with local government service delivery* | **0-3** | 0 citizens are generally not satisfied at all with local government service delivery  1 citizens are generally moderately satisfied with local government service delivery  2 citizens are generally mostly satisfied with local government service delivery  3 citizens are generally entirely satisfied with local government service delivery |

Citizens are generally moderately satisfied with local government service delivery. According to CFOA (2019) report and Caucasus barometer report, the coding for the satisfaction with service delivery is 1. The Local Governance Annual Index (CFOA, 2019) gives 4.6 score out of 10 for municipal (public) service delivery. So, the coding here is 1.

CODING:1

### Importance of local government for citizens

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Importance of local government** | *The extent to which local government has an important role in the daily life of citizens* | **0-3** | 0 local government is not important at all in the daily life of citizens  1 local government is somewhat important in the daily life of citizens  2 local government is important in the daily life of citizens  3 local government is very important in the daily life of citizens |

According to the combined review of quantitative and qualitative reports of Caucasus barometer and the Local Governance Annual Index (CFOA,2019), the coding is 1.

CODING: 1

### Satisfaction with local democracy

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Satisfaction with local democracy** | *The extent to which the citizens are satisfied with local democracy* | **0-4** | 0 citizens are not at all satisfied with local democracy  1 citizens are rather not satisfied with local democracy  2 citizens are neither dissatisfied nor satisfied with local democracy  3 citizens are rather satisfied with local democracy  4 citizens are entirely satisfied with local democracy |

Citizens are neither dissatisfied nor satisfied with local democracy

According to the reports of Freedom House and the Annual Index of 2019 CFOA (Communities Finance Officers Association) the score for local democracy here can be 2. Freedom House gives 2.25 for 2020 (on a 1-7 scale). According to the Annual Index of 2019 CFOA, the local democracy score improved from 4.4 (2018) to 4.9 (2019). So, combining to sources the coding is 2.

CODING:2

### Turnout at local elections

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Turnout at local elections** | *Electoral turnout at local elections (approximately, last general elections)* | **0-4** | 0 no elections  1 between 1 and 25 %  2 between 26 and 50 %  3 between 51 and 75 %  4 between 76 and 100 % |

Based on the reports of 2019, turnout at local elections yields between 26 and 50 %. There weren’t any local elections in 2020, so the coding score is based on the data from 2019.

CODING:2

**Electoral participation on local level compared to electoral participation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Electoral participation on local level compared to electoral participation on national level** | *The extent to which electoral participation on local level is higher than on national level* | **0-2** | 0 electoral participation on local level is generally lower than electoral participation on national level  1 electoral participation on local and on national level are very much the same  2 electoral participation on local level is generally higher than electoral participation on national level |

Here the coding is one, the last national level elections were held in 2018. National Assembly elections were in 2018. And compared to the last local elections, participation on local and on national level are very much the same

CODING:1

### Trustworthiness of local politicians

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Perception of trustworthiness of local politicians** | *The extent to which local politicians are trustworthy* | **0-4** | 0 local politicians are not at all trustworthy  1 local politicians are rather not trustworthy  2 local politicians moderately trustworthy  3 local politicians are rather trustworthy  4 local politicians are very much trustworthy |

Local politicians are rather trustworthy

According to Caucasus barometer quantitative report, local politicians enjoyed the trust of 39% and 23% of residents that responded the survey. Data is from the latest reports available which are from 2019.

CODING:3

**Perception of trustworthiness of local politicians compared to national politicians**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Perception of trustworthiness of local politicians compared to national politicians** | *Whether local politicians are more trustworthy than national politicians* | **0-2** | 0 local level politicians are generally less trustworthy than national politicians  1 local and national politicians are similar in terms of trustworthiness  2 local level politicians are generally more trustworthy than national politicians |

Again according to the reports of Caucasus barometer, local level politicians are generally more trustworthy than national politicians. 39% of respondents trust Parliament and 51% of respondents have trust towards local government. However, trust towards executive government was higher during 2018-2019 than both Parliament and local government but now the number is relatively lower that the trust towards local government.

CODING:2
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