A comprehensive & objective rating of the Elected Representatives’ performance
Founded in 1998, the PRAJA Foundation is a non-partisan voluntary organisation which empowers the citizen to participate in governance by providing knowledge and enlisting people’s participation. PRAJA aims to provide ways in which the citizen can get politically active and involved beyond the ballot box, thus promoting transparency and accountability.

Concerned about the lack of awareness and apathy of the local government among citizens, and hence the disinterest in its functioning, PRAJA seeks change. PRAJA strives to create awareness about the elected representatives and their constituencies. It aims to encourage the citizen to raise his/her voice and influence the policy and working of the elected representative. This will eventually lead to efforts being directed by the elected representatives towards the specified causes of public interest.

The PRAJA Foundation also strives to revive the waning spirit of Mumbai City, and increase the interaction between the citizens and the government. To facilitate this, PRAJA has created www.praja.org, a website where the citizen can not only discuss the issues that their constituencies face, but can also get in touch with their elected representatives directly. The website has been equipped with information such as: the issues faced by the ward, the elected representatives, the responses received and a discussion board, thus allowing an informed interaction between the citizens of the area.

**PRAJA’s goals are:** empowering the citizens, elected representatives & government with facts and creating instruments of change to improve the quality of life of the citizens of India. PRAJA is committed to creating a transparent, accountable and efficient society through people’s participation.
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WHY WAS A REPORT CARD NEEDED AND WHAT DOES IT CONTAIN?

The People of India have had Elected Representatives representing them in various bodies from the parliament to the panchayat for the last 60 years. These representatives have deliberated, debated, questioned, proposed new laws, passed new laws and governed the nation at all levels using the mechanisms given to them by the Constitution of India. The 1950 constitution which we gave to ourselves laid out the way in which we would govern ourselves. In the last three decades we have seen a steady decline in the quality of governance due to various reasons, prime amongst them being commercialisation of politics and criminalisation of politics, this has created a huge governance deficit in our country.

The Electorate has remained a silent witness for most part of this and are feeling let down and frustrated by the Government and the elected representatives. The time when the citizen has a ‘real’ say, is during elections which happens once in five years. The elections are the only time when the elected representatives are appraised for their performance in the corresponding term by the electorate.

Looking at the growing problems of Governance and the ever increasing needs of the citizens there is a need of a continuous dialogue and appraisal of the working of the elected representatives.

It is this need of continuous dialogue and appraisal that made Praja develop this Report Card.

Performance Appraisal of Elected Representatives has become the need of the hour.

This appraisal has been done keeping in mind the constitutional role and responsibility of the elected representatives and the opinion of their electorate. We believe this Report Card which we will be publishing every year will give to the citizens, elected representatives, political parties and the government valuable feedback on the functioning of the elected representatives. We also hope that it will set standards and bench marks of the performance of the elected representatives not only in Mumbai but across the country.
The following statistic helps estimate the enormity of the task of governing a city like Mumbai. If Mumbai were a country by itself, it would be the 75th most populous country in the world, much ahead of countries such as Israel and New Zealand. Bear in mind that we are not even counting people who travel every day from satellite cities to Mumbai for work.

As an economic powerhouse, Mumbai assumes special importance for the country, as the city alone contributes over 6% to the country’s GDP. However, the city is also characterised by huge disparities. As many as 41% of the households in the city live in slums, according to the 2011 census. One-third of the children studying in municipal schools suffer from malnutrition. Reported cases of rape and molestation have increased from 2011-12 to 2015-16 by 289% and 287% respectively. Such figures highlight that members of legislative assembly (MLAs) have to combat problems which are massive and complex.

MLAs are people’s representatives, and for this reason, it is incumbent on them to be raise the right issues on legislative platforms. While they need to be vocal about people’s concerns, merely this is not enough. The issues they raise should ideally be actionable and relevant to their areas of responsibility. However, this year, we have seen that the quality of questions asked by MLAs is just 38%. This is a matter of serious worry, as far as responsiveness to people’s problems is concerned. We have calculated the quality of questions keeping in mind their relevance to the fields which are in the domain of the state government. If MLAs are raising fewer issues which directly pertain to their area of responsibility, then it reflects negatively on them as the voices of citizens.

The above data point is merely an illustrative example for the analysis that we conduct on Mumbai’s MLAs from Maharashtra’s 13th legislative assembly. In a nutshell, we attempt to provide a comprehensive assessment of the performance of the past and present performance of these MLAs. The key findings from our report card are as follows-

- The average score achieved by the MLAs has seen a significant drop from 65.1% in 2016 to 60.5% in 2017.
- The average score of MLAs on questions asked has remained the same between 2016 and 2017 at 7.96.
- The average public perception about corruption of MLAs has deteriorated from 7.23 in 2016 to 6.87 in 2017. However, the average public perception from 2011 to 2014 was lower at 6.81.
Thus, we can see that there has been a drop in the performance of the MLAs on several major parameters. Our elected representatives in the state legislature need to pull up their socks and rise up to people’s expectations.

It is pertinent to note that the average public perception about the corruption of MLAs from 2011-14 was a low score of 6.81. This had increased to 7.23 in 2016, a possible fallout of a regime change at the state government. One can infer from this that the people believed that the new government would deliver on its promise to curb graft. However, the fact that this score has again reduced from 7.23 to 6.87 indicates that a sentiment of disillusionment is on the rise.

The French philosopher Rousseau in his work ‘The Social Contract’ had argued that through such a contract, people submit their individual will to a collective or general will so as to maintain social harmony. In the present context, this means that the people repose their faith in elected representatives, expecting in return that they govern in a smooth and accountable manner. It is up to the elected representatives to live up these expectations. For Mumbai’s MLAs, the time to step up to the challenge is NOW.

NITAI MEHTA,
Managing Trustee,
Praja Foundation
Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it’s the only thing that ever has.

– Margaret Mead

The change comes when people stand up and demand for it, and then strive to get it. Today we are at that juncture of history where time demands that we stand up and demand that change and go and get it.

Individuals involved in developing this report card strongly believe that they cannot just wait and remain mute spectators when time is demanding action from them. All of them have come together to develop this report card with a over-arching belief in the Constitution of India and the opportunity it creates for improved and efficient governance – the mean towards achieving the high ideals of the constitution – Justice, Liberty, Equality and Fraternity.

This book is a compilation of sincere, concerned efforts of the Core Praja Team. We would like to particularly appreciate the guidance of: Dr. C R Sridhar, KMS (Titoo) Ahluwalia and Dr. Suma Chitnis. And also to Praja’s Advisors for their active support.

It is important here to acknowledge Hansa Research for conducting the opinion poll. It is also very important to acknowledge the support of Vakils for doing a splendid publishing work.

Praja has obtained much of the data used in compiling this report card through Right to Information Act, 2005; without which sourcing information on the MLAs would have been very difficult. Hence it is very important to acknowledge the RTI Act and everyone involved, especially from the civil society, in bringing such a strong legislation. Also to those government officials who believe in the RTI Act and strive for its effective implementation.

Very importantly, Praja Foundation appreciates the support given by:

The content of the report is the sole responsibility of Praja Foundation.
The air in India is thick with criticism of politicians. The question that arises is: how can the performance of our elected representatives be assessed objectively? Surely the right way cannot be by asking them for their opinion of themselves. Nor is it adequate to get a few political pundits (who may have their own angles) to evaluate them.

The only way such an assessment can be done in a manner that is, and is seen to be, unbiased and credible, is through a systematic and transparent study undertaken independently by respected professionals. That is precisely what The Praja Report Card seeks to accomplish.

The ratings of the MLA's are based on:

(a) Data accessed through RTI on attendance of Assembly sessions, number and type of questions raised, use of discretionary funds, etc.

(b) Personal interviews with 20,317 citizens of Mumbai conducted by a reputed survey research organisation, to investigate the views of citizens on their elected representatives.

We believe the Report Card is an important step forward in promoting accountability and transparency in the political governance of the country.

K.M.S. (TITOO) AHLUWALIA, Formerly Chairman & CEO of A.C. Nielsen ORG-MARG
Of the total 36 MLAs from the city, the overall scaling is done for 32; as four MLAs are minister and hence do not ask any questions to the government or raise any issues in the house. MLA education, profession, birth date, constituency details and their bio-sketch have been taken from the affidavit submitted by the candidate during the election and the 13th Maharashtra Assembly Members Bio-Sketch book.

For understanding details on the ranking and scales of the marking kindly go to the section of methodology.
Prakash Manchhubhai Mehta
Birth Date: 22nd April 1959
Birth Place: Ghatkopar, Suburbs Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English and Gujarati
Constituency: 170
(Area: Ghatkopar (E), District - Mumbai Suburbs)
Political Party: Bharatiya Janata Party
Education: SSC
Profession: Business

Ravindra Dattaram Waikar
Birth Date: 18th January 1959
Birth Place: Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English
Constituency: 158
(Area: Jogeshwari (E), District - Mumbai Suburbs)
Political Party: Shiv Sena
Education: B.Sc.
Profession: Industry & Trade

He was elected as member of state legislative assembly from 1990-1995, 1995-1999, 1999-2004, 2004-2009 and 2009-2014. He was Minister of State for Slum Development, Housing and Urban Land Ceiling and Employment Planning from May 1995 to August 1996. He was also Minister for Consumer Welfare, Special Assistance & Tourism and Guardian Minister for Mumbai suburban district from August 1996 to June 1997. He was also Minister for State for Excise and Special Assistance Department from June 1997 to July 1999. He was active participant in Anti-corruption and Anti-emergency agitation in 1975-1977. He was re-elected to Legislative Assembly in October, 2014. He was Minister for Industries, Minerals and Parliamentary Affairs from 2nd November to 5th December, 2014. Currently he is the minister of Housing, Minerals and Labour Department and Guardian Minister for Raigarh district.

He has been Municipal Councillor as well as Chairman of Standing committee for four terms, Chairman of the Education committee of MCGM. He got elected to Maharashtra Assembly in October 2009. He received award of Best Corporator from Lions Club and Best Social worker award from Acharya Atre Pratishthan, Pune. He was re-elected to State Legislative Assembly in 2014. He is the Minister of State for Housing since 5th December 2014.
Vinod Shreedhar Tawde

Birth Date: 20th July 1963  
Birth Place: Mumbai

Language: Marathi, Hindi, English and Malvani

Constituency: 152
(Area: Borivali, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

Political Party: Bharatiya Janata Party

Education: B.E. (Electronics)

Profession: Business

He was part of the student movement through Akhil Bhartiya Vidyarthi Parishad along with holding post of National General Secretary of the organisation. Played key role in getting MUTP scheme worth Rs. 5500 crores for Mumbai. He was the General Secretary of the BJP, Maharashtra from 1996 to 2000. He has handled many important responsibilities within the BJP. He was the member of the Maharashtra Legislative Council for two consecutive terms from 2002 to 2014. From 2011 to 2014, he was leader of opposition in the Legislative Council. Currently he is the minister for School Education, Higher Technical Education, Sports and Youth Welfare, Medical Education, Marathi Language and Tourism Departments. On the invitation of American government in 1996, he toured USA, England and six nations in Europe for two months to study the Democratic social system and political social structure in foreign nations.

Vidya Jaiprakash Thakur

Birth Date: 15th June 1961  
Birth Place: Benipur, Varanasi (Uttar Pradesh)

Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Constituency: 163
(Area: Goregaon, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

Political Party: Bharatiya Janata Party

Education: Eighth

Profession: Business

She has been working in the BJP since 1992. She was General Secretary of the BJP’s women wing in Mumbai in 2013-14. She was elected as municipal councillor to MCGM on four occasions during 1992-2012. She was Deputy Mayor of Mumbai in 2007. She headed Public Health Committee of the MCGM for two times. She was member of Standing Committee, Market and Gardens Committee and Improvements Committee of MCGM. She was elected to Legislative Assembly in 2014. She was entrusted with the responsibility of Minister of state for the departments of Women and Child Welfare, Food and Civil Supplies and Consumer Protection and Food and Drug Administration in December 2014.
HOW TO READ THE RANKING PAGE:

Overall Rank for the current year (2017) is given after summation of all the weightages. The top three ranks are awarded a trophy - The Torch. The first gets gold, the second silver and the third bronze.

Areas for ranking:
1. Attendance
2. Questions Asked
3. Quality of Questions
4. Criminal Record (including the negative marking for criminal records)
5. Perceived Performance (Perception of Public Services)
6. Perceived as accessible
7. Perceived Least Corrupt

Colour Coding:
1-10
11-22
23-32

Badges for high ranks in individual areas

Perceived Performer
Quality of Questions
No. of Questions
Clean Criminal Record
Perceived as Accessible
Perceived Least Corrupt

Total Scores

Personal details
MUMBAI’S 32 MLAs AND THEIR RANKINGS

#1

#15

#32
Abu Asim Azmi

Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58.46%</td>
<td>63.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He was the President of Samajwadi Party, Mumbai from 1995 to 2000 and has been the General Secretary, Maharashtra since. He was elected as Member of Rajya Sabha where he was the member of Rajya Sabha Committee for Urban & Rural Development, Committee for Commerce, Committee on Rules, Consultative Committee under Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Member Defence Committee. He was elected to Maharashtra Legislature from two constituency assemblies: Mankhurd-Shivaji Nagar (Mumbai) and Bhiwandi East (Dist-Thane). He has subsequently resigned from Bhiwandi East, (Dist-Thane) constituency in 2009. He had handled various posts in Samajwadi Party. He was re-elected to Legislative Assembly in 2014.
Ajay Vinayak Choudhari

Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59.15%</td>
<td>68.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Birth Date: 5th July 1953
Birth Place: Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English
Education: Eleventh
Profession: Business
Constituency: 183
(Area: Shivadi, District - Mumbai City)

He has been involved in various social work activities. He was deputy head of Shiv Sena local office, Parel. He headed Shivasena’s South Mumbai region since 2000, till 2014. He was elected to Maharashtra Legislative Assembly in 2014.
He has been involved in various social, cultural activities. He was Personal Assistant (PA) to Late Gopinath Munde from 2004-2006. He went on to handle various responsibilities within BJP. In 2012 he was elected as Municipal Councillor on MCGM and then to Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.
Birth Date: 13th January 1963
Birth Place: Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English
Education: SSC
Profession: Business
Constituency: 186 (Area: Mumbadevi, District - Mumbai City)

He has been an active worker of congress party and has held important positions such as General Secretary Youth Congress South Central Mumbai in 1988 and Vice President of Minority Cell in 1994. He was the member of Z.R.U.C.C., Western Railway in 1996. He was Member of All India Congress Committee in the year 2007. He was nominated as Municipal Councillor in 2002 and got elected to the Mumbai Municipal Corporation in 2007. He was member of Improvement Committee from 2005 to 2009 and whip of Congress party in 2007. He got elected to the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly in October, 2009. He was re-elected to the Legislative Assembly in 2014.
He has been fulltime worker of Akhil Bhartiya Vidyarth Parishad from 1988-1995. He was elected as a secretary of Mumbai University student council. He has handled various responsibilities within BJP. He was elected as municipal councillor from 2002 to 2012. He was group leader of the BJP in MCGM during this period. He has also worked as member of the Standing Committee, BEST Committee and Chairman of the Improvements Committee of the MCGM. He is member of the MMRDA. He was elected to Maharashtra Legislative Council in 2012-2014 and then elected to the state Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.
He handled various interparty responsibilities in Shiv sena. He was elected as Municipal Councillor on MCGM from 2002 to 2007 and 2011 to 2017, where he was member of the Standing Committee (2002-2005), Chairman of the ‘S’ ward committee (2004-2005), member of the Law and Justice Committee (2002-2007) and Works Committee (2013-2014). He also headed BEST Committee for the year 2012-13 and received award for ‘Best Administrator’ (BEST) in 2012-2013 by the Central Government. He was elected to state Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.
Aslam Ramazan Ali Shaikh

Score
2017  2016
74.12%  75.76%

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS
\[ \uparrow 2 \]
2016 — #11

NO. OF QUESTIONS
#2
2016 — #2

PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT
\[ \downarrow 29 \]
2016 — #25

ATTENDANCE
\[ \downarrow 22 \]
2016 — #1

PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY
\[ \uparrow 23 \]
2016 — #27

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD
#1
2016 — #1

PERCEIVED PERFORMER
\[ \uparrow 6 \]
2016 — #22

Birth Date: 5th November 1968
Birth Place: Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English, Gujarati and Urdu
Education: Eighth
Profession: Social Worker
Constituency: 162 (Area: Malad (W), District - Mumbai Suburbs)

He has been Municipal Councillor from 2002 to 2012. He was Chairman of P/North ward committee of MCGM between 2007-2008. He got elected to Maharashtra Legislative Assembly in October 2009. He was re-elected to Legislative Assembly in 2014.
Atul Bhatkhalkar

Score
2017: 72.79%
2016: 67.98%

Birth Date: 8th March 1965
Birth Place: Pune
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English
Education: B. Com.
Profession: Business
Constituency: 160
(Area: Kandivali (E), District - Mumbai Suburbs)

He was a General Secretary of the BJP, Maharashtra state from 1999 to 2014. He worked as Spokesperson of BJP for four years. He was elected to the Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.
Bharati Hemant Lavekar

Score

2017  2016
53.91%  60.14%

ATTENDANCE
#1
2016 — #1

PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY
↑22
2016 — #26

PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT
↓11
2016 — #1

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS
↓30
2016 — #29

RANK
#23

NO. OF QUESTIONS
↓30
2016 — #29

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS
↓30
2016 — #29

PERCEIVED PERFORMER
↑1
2016 — #2

CLEAN CRIMINAL
RECORD
#1
2016 — #1

She received ‘Ahilyabai Holkar’ award from Maharashtra Government in 2000-2001. She also received ‘Maharashtra Ratna’ award in 2005 for her distinguish social work. She was among the two persons selected from India by the American Government to study the Legislative Elections in America in 2006. She has been involved in various social work activities. She was elected to State Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.
Kalidas Nilkanth Kolambkar

Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74.93%</td>
<td>72.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He was appointed as Shiv Sena Ward President from 1977. He worked as Nanded Shiv Sena Chief Coordinator in 1999. He was elected as the municipal councillor in MCGM from 1985-1990. He was Member of Maharashtra Legislative Assembly for 1990-95, 1995-99, 1999-2004, 2004-2009 and 2009-2014 terms. He was In-charge of catering committee in 1995. He was Minister of State for Food and Civil Supplies from February, 1999 to May, 1999. He also headed Ministry of State Urban Development from May, 1999 to October, 1999. He was re-elected to state legislative assembly in 2014.
Mangal Prabhat Lodha

Score
2017 2016
58.20% 67.13%

Birth Date: 18th December 1955
Birth Place: Jodhpur (Rajasthan)
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English and Gujarati
Education: L.L.B
Profession: Industry & Trade
Constituency: 185
(Area: Malabar Hill, District - Mumbai City)

He tabled Right to Information Bill for the first time in the country in 1997 and forced discussion in the assembly. He was the Member of assembly in 1995-99, 1999-2004, 2004-2009 and 2009-2014. He was re-elected to Legislative Assembly again in October, 2014.
He has handled various responsibilities in Shiv Sena. He was the head of Shiv Sena local office, Kurla from 2000 to 2006. He was awarded ‘Samajbhushan’ and ‘Rohidas Ratna’ award for his social work. He was elected to legislative assembly in October, 2014.
Manisha Ashok Chaudhary

Score
2017 2016
68.32% 65.71%

She was director of the Thane Rural Bank from 2002 to 2006. She held various positions in Bhartiya Janta Party. She was Chairman of the Dahanu Municipal Council from 1997-2001 after being municipal councillor from 1997-2007. She was elected as municipal councillor to MCGM in 2009. She was elected to the Legislative Assembly in 2014. Since May 2015, she is the head of the women rights and welfare committee in the Maharashtra Legislature.
Birth Date: 21st October 1963  
Birth Place: Akbarpur, Uttar Pradesh  
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English and Urdu  

Education: Non Matric  
Profession: Business  
Constituency: 168 (Area: Chandivali, District - Mumbai Suburbs)  

He was appointed as Vice-president of North east district youth Congress committee between 1988-93 then Joint Secretary between 1993-98. He has held position of General Secretary, Mumbai Pradesh Yuvak Congress committee between 1995-98. He was acting secretary, Mumbai Pradesh Congress Committee (minority cell). He was member of Maharashtra legislative assembly from 1999 to 2004, 2004 to 2009 and 2009 to 2014. He was Minister of State for Food and Civil Supplies, Consumer Protection Department from November, 1999 to October, 2004, From December, 2008 to October 2009 onwards he was Minister of State for Home, Food and Drug Administration. He is State Minister for Textiles, Minorities Development, Wakf Board and welfare of former soldiers. He was re-elected to state legislative assembly in October, 2014.
Parag Madhusudan Alavani

Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.54%</td>
<td>54.51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He handled various responsibilities in Bhartiya Janata Party. He was the BJP president of the North Mumbai district from 1998 to 2002. He was municipal councillor in MCGM during 1997-2007. He was Chairman of the K/East ward committee in 2001-2002. He headed Improvement Committee of the MCGM, 2002-2003. He was group leader of the BJP in MCGM from 2003-2007. He was elected to Legislative Assembly in 2014.
Prakash Rajaram Surve

Score
2017 2016
52.63% 56.25%

Birth Date: 1st June 1962
Birth Place: Rudrauli, Raigad District
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Education: B.Com.
Profession: Business
Constituency: 154
(Area: Magathane, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

He was the Chairman of Sanjay Gandhi Niradhar Yojna Committee. He has been involved in various social activities. He received ‘Samaj Bhushan’ award from Navshakti for distinguished social work. He was elected to the Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.
Prakash Vaikunt Phaterpekar

Score
2017 2016
56.94% 65.88%

He has been involved in various social activities in Mumbai. He was Municipal Councillor in MCGM from 2007-2012. He was member of the various committees of MCGM like Improvements Committee (2009-2010), Works Committee (2009-2012), Public Health Committee. He was elected to Maharashtra Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.
Raj Purohit

Score

2017 | 2016
--- | ---
60.79% | 58.60%

Birth Date: 31st August 1954
Birth Place: Fungani, Sirohi (Rajasthan)
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English and Gujarati

Education: L.L.B
Profession: Advocate
Constituency: 187 (Area: Colaba, District - Mumbai City)

He has handled various responsibilities within organisation in BJP and ABVP. He was municipal councillor on MCGM during 1985-1992. He was member of the state legislature from 1990 to 2009. He has been chief whip of the BJP in State Legislature. He was the Head of the Assurance Committee in 1995. He was minister of state for Housing, Slum Improvement, Housing Repair and Redevelopment, Urban Land Ceiling Act, Employment and Self-employment and Parliamentary affairs from 1996 to 1999. He carried out important work of rent control act. He was again elected to state legislative assembly in October, 2014.
Ramchandra Shivaji Kadam

Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41.96%</td>
<td>49.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He has been involved in various social work activities. He started a rationing scheme for more than 2500 aged and homeless couples in Ghatkopar. He is working as spokesperson for Maharashtra BJP since 2015. He was elected to Maharashtra Assembly in 2009 and again got re-elected in 2014.
He has led various social organisations and held various posts and responsibilities within Shivsena. He was Municipal Councillor on MCGM from 1997-2012. He was elected to State Legislative Assembly in October, 2014 and currently he is the member of Legislative Library Committee.
Sadanand Shankar Sarvankar

Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.41%</td>
<td>66.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He has been involved in various social activities. He has also handled various responsibilities within Shiv Sena. He was the municipal councillor on three occasions in MCGM and headed the Standing Committee on two occasions. He was again elected to state legislature in October, 2014.
He is well known as art director, theatre producer. He has been involved in various social activities in Mumbai. He was Municipal Councillor in MCGM on two occasions during 1997-2002 and 2007-2012, during which he was member of the various committees like Works Committee (1997-2000), Law Committee in 2002. He also headed BEST Committee in (2007-2008 & 2009-2010). He was elected to Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.
Sardar Tara Singh

**Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>65.84%</td>
<td>68.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RANK**

- Quality of Questions: #5 (2016 — #5)
- No. of Questions: #6 (2016 — #6)
- Perceived Least Corrupt: #19 (2016 — #19)
- Attendance: #1 (2016 — #1)
- Perceived Accessibility: #1 (2016 — #1)
- Perceived Performer: #7 (2016 — #7)
- Clean Criminal Record: #24 (2016 — #24)

**Personal Information**

- **Birth Date:** 10th August 1937
- **Birth Place:** Haripur Hazara, Hazara District (Punjab)
- **Language:** Marathi, Hindi, English, Gujarati and Punjabi
- **Education:** Up to SSC
- **Profession:** Business
- **Constituency:** 155 (Area: Mulund, District - Mumbai Suburbs)
- **Political Affiliation:** BJP

He has been a Municipal Councillor for three terms between 1984-1999. He was Chairman of Standing committee and Public health committee. He was group leader of BJP in the corporation. He was awarded ‘Best Corporator Award’ by the Governor. He was elected as Member of Maharashtra Assembly in 1999-2004 and 2004-2009 and 2009-2014. He was elected to state legislature again in October, 2014.
Selvan R. Tamil

Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46.18%</td>
<td>57.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He was elected to MCGM as Municipal Councillor in 2012 and then to the Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.
Sunil Govind Shinde

Score

2017 | 2016
---|---
69.26% | 75.63%

He has been involved in various social and welfare activities. He was Chairman of the Sanjay Gandhi Niradhar Swawlamban Yojana from 1995-2000. He has handled various responsibilities within Shivsena. He was Municipal Councillor from 2007-2012. He was Chairman of the G/South ward Committee from 2007-2009, Chairman of BEST Committee in 2012 in MCGM. He was elected to Legislative Assembly in 2014.
He has been involved in various social and cultural activities. He was elected to State Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.
Sunil Waman Prabhu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73.17%</td>
<td>80.97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He has been elected to MCGM since 1997 as councillor. He was the chairman of Standing Committee of the MCGM in 2004. He was the leader of the house (Shivsena) in MCGM during 2005 to 2011. He is former Mayor of Mumbai from 2012 to 2014. During this period he raised a historical museum depicting struggle of Sanyukta Maharashtra. He was adjourned as ‘Best Municipal Councillor’ by the Praja Foundation for his outstanding work in MCGM. He was ranked 16th in the list of 500 top reputed persons released by the Foreign Policy Magazine. He is also member of Mumbai Regional Development Authority (MMRDA). He has been involved in various social activities in Mumbai.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Questions</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Questions</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Least Corrupt</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Accessibility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Performer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Criminal Record</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

She was elected to Legislative Assembly in April, 2015 through By-Election and hence she was not considered for 2016 ranking.
Tukaram Ramkrishna Kate

Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.70%</td>
<td>59.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Birth Date: 1st June 1958
Birth Place: Borichamal, Raigad District
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English
Education: Ninth
Profession: Farmer and Business
Constituency: 172 (Area: Anushakti Nagar, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

He has been involved in various social activities. He was the head of Bhartiya Kamagar Sena at Pepsi Company, Deonar, Chembur from 1995 to 1998. He was elected as the municipal councillor from 1997-2007 to MCGM. He headed Works Committee (suburban) in MCGM from 2005 to 2006. He was felicitated with Samaj Ratna award in MCGM along with Swachata Probodhan Award. He was elected to Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.
She was the member of Maharashtra Pradesh Congress working committee between 2004-2009. She got elected to Maharashtra Legislative Assembly from 2004-2009 & 2009-2014. She was member and Head of Women’s rights and Welfare Committee between 2008-09 and 2009 onwards she became Minister of State for Medical Education, Higher and Technical Education, Tourism and Special Assistance Department. She has won ‘Commendable Legislator’ award from Maharashtra branch of Commonwealth Parliamentary Union for the year 2006-07 and she participated in the delegation appointed for monitoring the election of the U.S. President. She was Minister of Women and Child Welfare Department during 2010 to 2014. She was re-elected to state legislative assembly in October, 2014.
Waris Yusuf Pathan

Score
2017  51.24% 
2016  57.71%

A Lawyer by profession, he has keen interest in reading and social work.
Yogesh Sagar

Birth Date: 4th October 1962
Birth Place: Malad, Suburbs Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English and Gujarati

Education: F.Y.J.C.
Profession: Business
Constituency: 161
(Area: Charkop, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

He has been Municipal Councillor from 2000-2012. He is also the district President of North Mumbai BJP. In the year 2003 he was awarded the Mayor Award under MCGM cleanliness work. He was elected to Maharashtra Legislative Assembly in October 2009. He has funded and worked for Shanti Sandesh Foundation and Mahila Microfinance Credit Society. He was adjourned as best elected representative by Praja Foundation for three consecutive years from 2011 to 2012, 2012 to 2013 and 2013 to 2014. He was re-elected to the Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.
Note: Number of MLAs who were ranked in 2016 are 31, in 2017 are 32.

**Attendance**

- **Good**: above 80%
- **Average**: 80% to 50%
- **Poor**: below 50%

**Quality of Questions**

- **Good**: above 80%
- **Average**: 80% to 50%
- **Poor**: below 50%

Note: This year, we have changed the methodology for assigning weightages for questions. We have combined the weightages given for the importance of the issue with its classification under the seventh schedule of the constitution.
MUMBAI REPORT CARD

Number of Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Good (Above 150)</th>
<th>Average (50 to 150)</th>
<th>Poor (Below 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of questions asked - 4343 6199

Clean Criminal Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Good (above 80%)</th>
<th>Average (80% to 50%)</th>
<th>Poor (below 50%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceived Least Corrupt

Number of MLAs

Good - above 80%
Average - 80% to 50%
Poor - below 50%

Overall

Number of MLAs

Good - above 80%
Average - 80% to 50%
Poor - below 50%
Note: (*) While we evaluated the performance of 12 Shiv Sena MLAs in 2016, but this year we evaluated the performance of 13 Shiv Sena MLAs, because one MLA was newly elected in April 2015.
**Party-wise Average Score for Different Parameters in 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Attendance (out of 10)</th>
<th>Number of Questions (out of 16)</th>
<th>Quality of Questions (out of 21)</th>
<th>Perceived Performer (out of 20)</th>
<th>Perceived Accessibility (out of 6)</th>
<th>Least Corrupt (out of 10)</th>
<th>Clean Criminal Record (out of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIMMM (1)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJP (12)</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>13.96</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC (5)</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP (1)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS (13)</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scores for the corresponding year (2012) in the last term have been given for comparison with the current year (2017).
Note: Scores for the corresponding year (2012) in the last term have been given for comparison with the current year (2017).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>MLA's Name</th>
<th>2016 Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2017 Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Abu Asim Azmi</td>
<td>63.04</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Ajay Vinayak Choudhari</td>
<td>68.80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59.15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Quality of questions; Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Ameet Bhaskar Satam</td>
<td>59.27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62.52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Questions asked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>INC</td>
<td>Amin Amir Ali Patel</td>
<td>84.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Ashish Babaji Shelar</td>
<td>67.40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68.56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Ashok Dharmaraj Patil</td>
<td>60.85</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Attendance; Questions asked; Quality of questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>INC</td>
<td>Aslam Ramazan Ali Shaikh</td>
<td>75.76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>74.12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Atul Bhatkhalkar</td>
<td>67.98</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>72.79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Questions asked; Perceived Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Bharati Hemant Lavekar</td>
<td>60.14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53.91</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Questions asked; Quality of questions; Perceived Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>INC</td>
<td>Kalidas Nilkanth Kolambkar</td>
<td>72.54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74.93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attendance; Questions asked; Perceived Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Mangal Prabhat Lodha</td>
<td>67.13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58.20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Attendance; Questions asked; Quality of questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Mangesh Anant Kudalkar</td>
<td>53.96</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55.83</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Perceived Accessibility; Criminal charges dropped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Manisha Ashok Chaudhary</td>
<td>65.71</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68.32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Questions asked; Perceived Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>INC</td>
<td>Md. Arif (Naseem) Lalan Khan</td>
<td>72.13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73.87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Attendance; Questions asked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Parag Madhusudan Alavani</td>
<td>54.51</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57.54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Questions asked; Perceived Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Prakash Rajaram Surve</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Prakash Vaikunt Phaterpekar</td>
<td>65.88</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56.94</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Questions asked; Quality of questions; Overall Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Raj Purohit</td>
<td>58.60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60.79</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Questions asked; Perceived Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Ramchandra Shivaji Kadam</td>
<td>49.55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41.96</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Ramesh Kondiram Latke</td>
<td>54.39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48.11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Sadanand Shankar Sarvankar</td>
<td>66.38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Attendance; Questions asked; Quality of questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Sanjay Govind Potnis</td>
<td>58.37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51.65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Sardar Tara Singh</td>
<td>68.81</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>65.84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Selvan R. Tamil</td>
<td>57.21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46.18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Quality of questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Sunil Govind Shinde</td>
<td>75.63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69.26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Sunil Rajaram Raut</td>
<td>57.77</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59.81</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Questions asked; Overall Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Sunil Waman Prabhu</td>
<td>80.97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73.17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Trupti Prakash Sawant*</td>
<td>57.84</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57.84</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Tukaram Ramkrishna Kate</td>
<td>59.70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44.70</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Questions asked; Quality of questions; Overall Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>INC</td>
<td>Varsha Eknath Gaikwad</td>
<td>79.40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72.28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Questions asked; Quality of questions; Perceived Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>AIMIM</td>
<td>Waris Yusuf Pathan</td>
<td>57.71</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51.24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Yogesh Sagar</td>
<td>78.35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70.20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Questions asked; Quality of questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (*)She was elected to legislative Assembly in April, 2015 through by-election and hence she was not considered for 2016 ranking.
1. The Matrix – Scale of Ranking

The Matrix for measuring the functioning of the MLAs has been designed by Praja with inputs from reputed people with sectoral knowledge in governance, political science, market research, media.

In order to design the research and get the desired output, it was important to answer the following two questions:

a. On what parameters should the performance of MLAs be evaluated?

b. How should the research be designed in order to represent areas of each MLA and meet the right people?

For the first question; The Indian Democracy functions on rules and strictures laid down in The Constitution of India adopted on 26th November, 1949. The Constitution has been amended on numerous occasions and various acts have been passed and adopted by subsequent assemblies to strengthen the functioning of centre, state and local self government institutions. All these acts/legislations with their base in the Constitution give our elected representatives needed powers for functioning; have built the needed checks and balances; and serve as the source of the terms of reference for the elected representatives on all aspects of their conduct as the people’s representatives. Hence the first parameter for evaluating the performance of MLAs is based solely in the mechanisms and instruments and duties and responsibilities as led in The Constitution of India.

However; The Constitution itself derives its power from the free will of its citizens as also the document itself states that it has been adopted, enacted and given to themselves by the people. Hence the perceptions of the people who are represented by the elected representatives are the other important, necessary parameter for evaluating the performance of the elected representatives (the MLAs). Thus, to answer the second question it is necessary to study people’s perceptions of the MLAs performance, in their respective constituencies.

The next few pages will elaborate the study design and details of the study conducted to judge the performance of MLAs in Mumbai; but before we get into details, it is important to understand the sources of data and its broad usage in the ranking matrix.
The following information was required to judge the performance of each MLA in the city:

1. Some of the tangible parameters like an elected MLAs’ attendance in the assembly, the number of questions (issues) she/he has raised in the house, importance of those questions, and utilisation of funds allotted to her/him.

2. Some parameters on her/his background such as educational qualification, income tax records & criminal record (if any).

3. Some soft parameters like the perception/impression of the people in her/his constituency, awareness about them, satisfaction with their work and improvement in the quality of life because of the MLA.

Once the areas of evaluation were finalised, it was important to decide upon the methodology which would best provide the required information. Information mentioned in points 1 & 2 above was gathered from RTI & by means of secondary research. MLA Scores have been derived out of maximum 100 marks with 60% weightage given to tangible facts about the MLA. For the Information on the 3rd point a primary survey was conducted amongst the citizens in each constituency to evaluate the perceived performance of the MLA. 40% weightage was given to perceived performance of MLAs in the minds of common man.

The data used for points 1 and 2 has been collected from government sources:

a. Election Commission of India’s Website.

b. Under Right to Information Act from Vidhan Bhavan.

c. Under Right to Information Act from City and Suburban Collector Offices.

d. Under Right to Information Act from Mumbai Police.

People’s perception as per point 3 has been mapped through an opinion poll of 20,317 people across the city of Mumbai by Hansa Market Research conducted through a structured questionnaire.

It is very important to understand here that the matrix is objectively designed and provides no importance to the political party of the representative or to any personal/political ideology.

Criminalisation of politics in the country has been growing since independence and is a phenomenon which if not checked now can destroy the democratic foundations of our nation. Hence personal criminal record related parameters pertaining to the elected representative are taken into consideration such as: their FIR cases registered against them as stated in the election affidavit; new FIR cases registered against them after being elected in the current term; and important pending charge sheets.
## Scale of Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sessions Attended (*)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Based on percentage of attendance. 1) 100% to 91% - 10; 2) 90% to 76% - 8; 3) 75% to 61% - 6; 4) 60% to 51% - 4; and 5) below 50% - 0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Number of Questions Asked</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Against Group Percentage Rank. 16 being the top most percentile and so on to the lowest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Importance of Questions Asked (Quality of Questions)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Issues are given certain weightages depending on the importance of the issue as per the seventh schedule of the Constitution of India. Further weighted by the score for number of questions asked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Total Local Area Development Funds Utilised during (April. 2016 to March 2017)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Calculation for the current financial year is done for the sanctioned fund of Rs. 2 crores approved till March 2017. (1) 100% (or more) to 91% - 5; (2) 90% to 76% - 4; (3) 75% to 61% - 3; (4) 60% to 51% - 2; and (5) below 50% - 0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 52**

## Past

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Education Qualification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A minimum of 10th Pass - 1; if not - 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| B | Income Tax | 2 | (1) Possessing PAN Card - 1  
(2) Disclosing Income in Affidavit - 1 |
| C | Criminal Record | 5 | If the candidate has zero cases registered against her/him, then 5; else as below:  
(1) Criminal Cases Registered containing the following charges: Murder, Rape, Molestation, Riot, Extortion - 0  
(2) Other criminal cases than the above mentioned - 3 |

**Total 8**

## Perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3 | Perception of Public Services | 20 | Based on a opinion poll of 20,317 people spread across different constituencies in the city of Mumbai  
Score on Public Services |
| B | Awareness & Accessibility | 6 | Score on Awareness amongst people about their representative, their political party and ease of access to the representative |
| C | Corruption Index | 10 | Score on perceived personal corruption of the representative |
| D | Broad Measures | 4 | Score on overall satisfaction and improvement in quality of life |

**Total 40**
## Scale of Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Negative marking for new criminal cases registered during the year</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>For any new FIR registered during the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Negative marking for Charge sheet</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>For any Charge sheet in a criminal case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Negative marking for no annual pro-active disclosures by the elected representatives of Assets and Liabilities and Criminal record</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>This can be done on own website, newspaper, Praja Website or any other source which should be announced publicly. Also marks would be cut for wrong disclosures in the above mentioned forums. (***)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Sessions taken into account for this report card are Winter 2015, Budget 2016 and Monsoon 2016.

(**) This negative parameter on proactive disclosures has not been applied. But as one of the primary purpose of the Report Card is to promote transparency amongst elected representatives, it is imperative that they proactively provide personal information on their personal annual economic status and to emphasise their probity in public life, they should share every year their updated criminal record.

### 2. Parameters for Past Records as per Affidavit

Parameters for Past Records are based on information in election affidavit that includes educational, criminal and financial records of MLAs. Total eight Marks out of Maximum 100 marks are allocated for this parameter.

#### a. Education

If the elected representative has declared in his affidavit, education qualification as 10th pass or more than that then on the scale one mark is allocated, else zero marks are given.

As a developing 21st century country, basic modern education is an important criterion for human development. Even at lowest clerical jobs in the government, the government insists on a minimum educational level. Going by the same logic and the times, it is prudent that a similar yardstick be applied to our elected representatives. However, we also believe that the educational parameter should be given a minimal weightage in the overall scheme vis-a-vis other parameters, that are more crucial for judging performance of the elected representatives.

#### b. Income Tax

It is widely published and believed in India that annual income levels and wealth of those who are elected sees a manifold increase in the few years when they represent. On this parameter, marks are allocated only for declaring returns (one mark) and for possessing a PAN card (one mark), as per the affidavit.
c. Criminal Record
Criminalisation of politics is a sad reality. A significant number of elected representatives have a criminal record i.e. 1) they have FIRs registered against them; 2) charge sheets filled; and 3) even convictions given by the courts of law. There is no excuse for not having moral probity in public life. It is the right of the citizens to have people representing them with no criminal records. Hence the scheme of ranking has taken into account marks for people with clean records:

i. Those with absolutely no criminal FIRs registered are given five marks.
ii. Those with FIRs registered against, with cases containing the following charges: murder, rape, molestation, riot and extortion are given zero marks.
iii. Those with other FIRs registered against, other than those mentioned in No. ii above, are given three marks.

We have negative markings as explained in No. 5 ahead for other parameters related to crime records like charge sheet.

*Kindly note that allocating scoring for each individual case would have been complex, instead scoring for cases after them being categorised as above seemed more logical and hence number of individual cases are not that important but the category of case needed for the scoring.*

3. Parameters for Present Performance in the State Legislature

In an indirect, representative democracy like India’s, citizens elect their representatives so that these representatives can represent them in the houses of legislation and deliberate on issues related to the citizens and form needed legislations under the guidelines of and using the mechanisms of the Constitution. Thus it is very clear that the weightages in the performance scale have to be more biased to these functions of the elected representatives i.e. of Deliberation.

a. Session Attendance
The mandate given by citizens to the representatives is to attend the business of the respective legislative houses. It is hence prudent that the representatives attend 100% or near to 100% sessions of their respective houses. Hence the marking as follows based on percentage of attendance: (1) 100% to 91% - 10 marks; (2) 90% to 76% - eight marks; (3) 75% to 61% - six marks; (4) 60% to 51% - four marks; and (5) below 50% - zero marks.

b. Number of Questions Asked
There cannot be really a set benchmark for the right number of questions or issues that have to be asked by a representative. However given the range and complexity of issues that our country is facing, it is necessary for the
representative to raise as many issues as they can, which are necessary for the citizens. Hence to stimulate the representatives to ask maximum number of questions the scale uses the percentile system for scoring.

**Devices used for asking ‘Questions’ that have been considered in the marking:**
- Starred Question
- Calling attention to matters of urgent public importance
- Half an hour discussion
- Motion of adjournment for purpose of debates
- Non Officials Bills (Private Member Bill)
- Resolutions/Non-Official Resolutions

The marking for this section is out of a maximum 16 marks that the representative can get for being the person with the maximum number of questions asked. The marking here is done against Group Percentage Rank: 16 being the top most percentile and so on to the lowest.

c. **Importance of Questions Asked (Quality of Questions)**

It is not just the number of questions that are asked but also the quality of questions that are asked. The system for weightages here is designed as below:

**Step 1:**

Issues are given certain weightages depending on the importance of the issue being prime functions of the State Legislature or of the Municipal bodies or the Centre as per the seventh schedule of the constitution of India. As explained ahead in weightages to issues raised in the questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Weightages</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Civic (civic amenities such as roads, sewage, etc.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Welfare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social cultural concerns</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forest/Environment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Financial Institutions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industries</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance/Policy Making</strong></td>
<td>Corruption &amp; Scams</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schemes / Policies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture/ Food Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Husbandry</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100
Step 2:
Questions asked are categorised into:

Formula representation of the calculation done to determine importance of the question asked by categorisation in seventh schedule
I - Issue; Q - Question; T - Total; C - Category; M - Marks as per categorisation

\[(I_1 \times Q_1)+(I_1 \times Q_1)+\ldots+(I_{nth} \times Q_{nth}) = T_1;\]
\[(I_2 \times Q_2)+(I_2 \times Q_2)+\ldots+(I_{nth} \times Q_{nth}) = T_2;\]
\[(I_3 \times Q_3)+(I_3 \times Q_3)+\ldots+(I_{nth} \times Q_{nth}) = T_3;\]

\[T_1+T_2+T_3 = T_x;\]
\[T_x / T_Q = M\]

The score in step 2 (M) is further weighted by score for Number of Question Asked (Point C).

Illustration for marking Importance of Questions Asked
If a MLA has asked a total of 5 questions: 1 related to civic, 3 question related to crime and 1 related to financial institutions; then the marking will be as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weightages</th>
<th>No. of questions asked</th>
<th>Calculation of Quality of questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5*1 = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8*3 = 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fin. Ins.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3*1 = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32/5 = 6.4 (Hence ‘M’ is 6.4)
Assuming the score for number of questions asked is 4 out of 16.

\[\text{score} = \left(\frac{6.4}{21}\times 100\right) + \left(\frac{4}{16}\times 100\right) = 6.4\]

\[\therefore 6.4\] out of maximum 21. So the MLA gets 6.4 Marks.

d. Total Local Area Development Funds Utilised during April 2016 to March 2017
MLAs get a Local Area Development Fund during their tenure. This fund they can spend as per their discretion on certain specified development work in their constituencies. It is necessary that the funds are utilised in a planned phased manner to achieve optimal results. And this can only happen if the representative has a appropriate plan right from the start of their term and that they do not spend the fund in an adhoc manner and that not entirely towards the end of their terms without focus on the needs of their constituency.

Hence the calculation for the current financial year is done for the sanctioned fund of Rs. 2 crore approved till March 2017. (1) 100% (or more) to 91%- 5; (2) 90% to 76% - 4; (3) 75% to 61% - 3; (4) 60% to 51% - 2; and(5) below 50% - 0.
4. Parameters for People’s Perception as per Opinion Poll

Since perceived performance was given a weightage of 40 points, we divided it further into 4 broad areas in order to evaluate the performance in detail. All these four areas were given differential weightage based on the importance in defining the MLAs performance. The weightages were divided in the following scheme:

- Perception of Public Services (impression of the people about the facilities in the area) was given a weightage of **20 points**,  
- Awareness & Accessibility of the MLA was given a weightage of **6 points**,  
- Corruption index was given a weightage of **10 points** and  
- Broad overall measures were given a weightage of **4 points**

The rationale for giving the above scoring points was to give more importance to the key issues like facilities in the area & corruption as compared to MLA being aware and accessible or overall feel of the people being positive. This is because we believe that scoring positively overall or being popular is actually a function of your work in different areas. Hence, these areas should be given more importance than the overall satisfaction. Moreover, a blanket overall performance for an individual may be good but when interrogated deeply about different traits the positives and negatives can be clearly pointed.

The next step after assigning weightages to four broad areas was to make sure that facilities which come under the state jurisdiction get more importance than the ones which come under the central government’s jurisdiction or the local self government’s jurisdiction. Hence the weightage for Perception of Public Services was further divided into a hierarchy of 4 levels to meet the desired objective. Level 1 included facilities which are more critical to state government whereas Level 4 included facilities that are more critical to central government or the local self government.

- Level 1 – This level included areas like Power supply, Law & Order situation & Instances of crime. It was given a weightage of **8 points**.  
- Level 2 – This level included areas like Pollution problems. It was given a weightage of **5 points**.  
- Level 3 – This level included areas like Hospitals & other Medical facilities & Appropriate Schools & Colleges. It was given a weightage of **4 points**.  
- Level 4 – This level included rest of the areas like Condition of Roads, Traffic Jams & Congestion, Availability of public gardens, Availability/Adequacy of public transport facilities, Water Supply, Water logging problems, Cleanliness & Sanitation facilities & Availability of footpaths & Pedestrian walking areas. It was given a weightage of **3 points**.
Research Design:

- A Member of Legislative Assembly, or MLA, is a representative elected by the voters of an electoral district to the Legislature of a State in the Indian system of Government. An electoral district (also known as a constituency) is a distinct territorial subdivision for holding a separate election for a seat in a legislative body.

- Winner of this seat in the constituency is termed as an MLA and has the power to manage the functioning of the constituency.

- In Mumbai, each constituency has further been divided into administrative wards and a municipal Councillor is elected to oversee the functioning of each ward. Hence, there is a clear delegation of responsibilities at the ground level.

- Since, our study focused on evaluating the performance of MLAs it was necessary to cover and represent all the assembly constituencies to which each of these MLAs belonged.

- Hence, we decided to cover a sample from each constituency. However, it is also known that constituencies differ in size as calculated in terms of area coverage and population. The number of the wards within each assembly constituency also differs.

- The total sample for the study covered for 36 MLA Assembly constituency = 20,317 respondents.

- Next step was to define the target group for the study. We finalised on covering within each ward:
  - Both Males & Females
  - 18 years and above (eligible to vote)

- Once the target group was defined, quotas for representing gender and age groups were set.

- The quotas were set on the basis of age and gender split available through Indian Readership Study, a large scale baseline study conducted nationally by Media Research Users Council (MRUC) & Hansa Research group for Mumbai Region.

- The required information was collected through face to face household interviews with the help of structured questionnaire.

- In order to meet the respondent, following sampling process was followed:
  - 2 – 3 prominent areas in the ward were identified and the sample was divided amongst them.
  - Respondents were intercepted in households in these areas and the required information was obtained from them.
Sample composition of age & gender was corrected to match the universe profile using the baseline data from IRS. (Refer to Weighting paragraph on the next pages)

The final sample spread achieved for each assembly constituency is as follows:

**Parameters of Evaluation:**

While deciding the parameters of evaluation for a MLA, we wanted to make sure that we covered issues at both the state & central level and hence decided to capture the information on four important aspects. These were as follows:

- Impression of the people about different facilities in his/her area
  - Condition of Roads
  - Traffic jams & Congestion of roads
  - Availability of public gardens/open playgrounds
  - Availability/Adequacy of public transport facilities like Auto, Taxis, Buses & Local Trains
  - Hospitals and other medical facilities
  - Appropriate schools and colleges
  - Power Supply
  - Water Supply
  - Water Logging during rainy season
  - Pollution problems
  - Instances of Crime
  - Law & Order situation
  - Cleanliness & Sanitation facilities
  - Availability of footpaths & Pedestrian walking areas

- Awareness & Accessibility of the MLA

- Perception of corruption for MLA

- Broad overall measures like overall satisfaction with MLA & improvement in quality of life because of MLA.
Illustration of Scorecard for an MLA:
Below is an illustration of scorecard for a MLA which will help us to understand the scoring pattern:

Parameter Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Broad groupings</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recall for party name to which the MLA belongs</td>
<td>Awareness &amp; Accessibility</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Recall for Name of the MLA</td>
<td>Awareness &amp; Accessibility</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Accessibility of the MLA</td>
<td>Awareness &amp; Accessibility</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Satisfaction with the MLA</td>
<td>Broad overall measures</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Improvement in Lifestyle</td>
<td>Broad overall measures</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>Corruption Index</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Power Supply</td>
<td>Impression of people - Level 1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instances of Crime</td>
<td>Impression of people - Level 1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Law &amp; Order situation</td>
<td>Impression of people - Level 1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pollution problems</td>
<td>Impression of people - Level 2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hospitals and other medical facilities</td>
<td>Impression of people - Level 3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Appropriate schools and colleges</td>
<td>Impression of people - Level 3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Condition of Roads</td>
<td>Impression of people - Level 4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Traffic jams &amp; Congestion of roads</td>
<td>Impression of people - Level 4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Availability of public gardens/ open playgrounds</td>
<td>Impression of people - Level 4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Availability/Adequacy of public transport facilities like Auto, Taxis, Buses &amp; Local Trains</td>
<td>Impression of people - Level 4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>Impression of people - Level 4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Water Logging during rainy season</td>
<td>Impression of people - Level 4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Cleanliness &amp; Sanitation facilities</td>
<td>Impression of people - Level 4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Availability of footpaths &amp; Pedestrian walking areas</td>
<td>Impression of people - Level 4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scores of Netted Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Netted Variables</th>
<th>Weightage Assigned</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Awareness &amp; Accessibility</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Broad overall measures</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corruption Index</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Impression of people - Level 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Impression of people - Level 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Impression of people - Level 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Impression of people - Level 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weighted Final Scores

Perceived performance score of the MLA = 
\[ \frac{(6 \times 74)+(4 \times 64)+(10 \times 72)+(8 \times 61)+(5 \times 58)+(4 \times 68)+(3 \times 59)}{100} = 26.5 \text{ out of } 40 \]

This score was further added with the performance on hard parameters and a composite score for each MLA was derived.

Weighting the data:

When conducting a survey, it is common to compare the figures obtained in a sample with universe or population values. These values may come from the same survey from a different time period or from other sources.

In this case, we compared the age & gender compositions achieved in our survey with the similar compositions in IRS study (Indian Readership Survey). In the process, minor deviations for demographics were corrected.

Hence, weighting not only helped us to remove the demographic skews from our sample data but also ensured that the representation of demography was correct.

5. Parameters for Negative Marking

Negative marking for new FIR cases registered

If there has been a new FIR registered against the elected representative after his election then this happens to be a matter of concern; and hence out of the marks earned by the representative, five marks would be deducted.

Do note that in the process of allocating marks does not take into account number of new criminal FIR cases, but simply takes into account even a single occurrence for allocating marks based on the severity of the crime.
Negative marking for Charge Sheet registered

A charge sheet signifies prima facie evidence in the case. This is again a serious concern for moral probity of the representative. Hence out of the marks earned by the representative, five marks would be deducted.

Do note that in the process of allocating marks does not take into account number of criminal charge sheets, but simply takes into account even a single occurrence for allocating marks based on the severity of the crime.

Negative marking for no annual pro-active disclosures by the elected representatives of Assets and Liabilities and Criminal record

As per the election commission norms the candidate standing for elections have to file an affidavit detailing amongst other things, their own asset and liabilities and criminal records. The candidate who gets elected later, does not share this information with his constituency or the election commission until and unless he/she stands for re-election or for a new election on different seat or post. However given the need of the time, we feel that it is necessary that the elected representatives proactively make their assets and liabilities (income status) and criminal records available to their constituencies at the end of every financial year when they are representing. This can be done through Newspapers or other Public Medias or through their own Websites or through Praja Website. This will bring larger transparency.
The four lions of the Ashoka Pillar, symbolizing power, courage, pride and confidence are the ethos behind the Indian Republic as embedded in our Constitution. We salute the top 3 ranking MLAs of Mumbai as torch bearers of this idea. They have topped the list by on an objective ranking system as explained earlier in this report card, performing more efficiently relative to their peers. Jai Hind.

**Trophy 1** – The Best Elected Representative as per Praja Matrix of Ranking Performance of MLAs.

**Trophy 2** – The Second Best Elected Representative as per Praja Matrix of Ranking Performance of MLAs.

**Trophy 3** – The Third Best Elected Representative as per Praja Matrix of Ranking Performance of MLAs.
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

WE, THE PEOPLE OF INDIA, HAVING SOLEMNLY RESOLVED TO CONSTITUTE INDIA INTO A SOVEREIGN SOCIALIST SECULAR DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC AND TO SECURE TO ALL ITS CITIZENS: JUSTICE, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL;
LIBERTY OF THOUGHT, EXPRESSION, BELIEF, FAITH AND WORSHIP;
EQUALITY OF STATUS AND OF OPPORTUNITY; AND TO PROMOTE AMONG THEM ALL FRATERNITY ASSURING THE DIGNITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE UNITY AND INTEGRITY OF THE NATION.