A SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW OF SOCIAL AUDIT IN DELHI: EVALUATING WELFARE SCHEMES UNDER THE AAP GOVERNANCE MODEL IN A PERIOD OF POLITICAL TRANSITION

Teena[1] and Dr. Harish Gujrati[2]
[1]Research Scholar,S.D. Govt. College, Beawar.
[2]Professor, S. D. Govt. College,Beawar.

ABSTRACT

This paper examines social audits as participatory accountability tools in urban welfare governance, focusing on Delhi during the Aam Aadmi Party (AAP)'s tenure from 2015 to 2024. It explores how social audits were institutionalized in flagship schemes such as the Public Distribution System (PDS) and Mohalla Clinics. Using participatory governance theory and critical institutionalism, the study analyzes the design, implementation, and limitations of social audits in the context of Delhi's political transition from 2019 onwards. While social audits contributed to transparency and citizen engagement, the paper argues that they faced challenges of bureaucratic resistance, political instrumentalization, and uneven institutionalization, particularly in a period of heightened political competition. The findings suggest that while social audits hold potential for deepening democracy, their effectiveness depends on sustained political will, institutional support, and civic capacity-building.

KEYWORDS: *Social audit, Delhi, Aam Aadmi Party, welfare governance, participatory accountability, urban policy.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of social audit has emerged as an important mechanism for promoting accountability, transparency, and participatory governance in public administration. Unlike conventional financial audits that focus on compliance and financial records, social audits are participatory processes enabling citizens to assess and evaluate government service delivery and welfare schemes. The significance of social audits in India was established through the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA), which mandated social audits as part of its accountability framework.

In the urban context, social audits represent an evolving practice, addressing the unique challenges of urban poverty, service delivery, and citizen engagement. Delhi provides an especially compelling case study for understanding the role of social audits in urban welfare governance. Since 2015, the Aam Aadmi Party (AAP) has advanced a welfare-centric governance model focused on delivering free or subsidized services in health, education, electricity, and water. AAP positioned itself as an anti-corruption party committed to transparency and citizen empowerment. Social audits have featured prominently in its governance narrative as instruments to check leakages, reduce corruption, and ensure better targeting of benefits.

However, the period from 2019 to 2024 marks a phase of political transition and contestation in Delhi's governance landscape. While AAP retained electoral dominance in the city, it faced increased

_____

_____

competition from the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) at the national level, policy challenges during the COVID-19 pandemic, and shifting voter expectations. This period raises important questions about the institutionalization, effectiveness, and political dynamics of social audits under the AAP model.

This paper offers a sociological review of social audit practices in Delhi between 2015 and 2024, with a particular focus on the transitional period from 2019 onwards. It aims to:

- Examine the institutional design and implementation of social audits in key welfare schemes.
- Analyze the role of social audits in fostering accountability and citizen participation.
- Assess the limitations and challenges facing social audits amid bureaucratic resistance and political competition.
- Offer policy recommendations for strengthening social audit mechanisms in urban governance.

By situating Delhi's social audit experiences within broader theories of participatory governance and accountability, this paper contributes to debates on the potential and limitations of citizen-led auditing in urban welfare states.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1 Social Audit: Conceptual Foundations
The term "social audit" refers to a participatory process in which citizens, civil society organizations, and stakeholders examine government programs to evaluate their social impact and effectiveness. Unlike financial audits focused on compliance with accounting norms, social audits aim to increase transparency, uncover leakages, and empower communities to hold the state accountable.

Key Features:
- Participatory data collection and verification
- Community engagement through public hearings
- Transparency of findings
- Enabling grievance redressal

International development literature recognizes social audits as part of broader *social accountability* strategies, which include tools like citizen report cards, community scorecards, and participatory budgeting (World Bank, 2004).

2.2 Social Audit in India
Social audits gained institutional prominence in India with MGNREGA (2005), which legally mandated social audits of program implementation by Gram Sabhas (village assemblies). Scholars have highlighted their role in:

- Exposing corruption in wage payments (Aiyar & Mehta, 2013)
- Empowering marginalized communities
- Creating spaces for deliberation
  However, studies also show:
- Elite capture of audit processes
- Bureaucratic resistance
- Variable quality of audits across states (Pande, 2020)

2.3 Urban Governance and Social Audits
While rural social audits are relatively well-studied, their urban counterparts remain less institutionalized. Urban governance in India faces unique challenges:

- High population density
- Complex service delivery mechanisms
- Overlapping institutional jurisdictions
- Greater political competition
  Pilot urban social audits have been conducted in domains like:
- Public Distribution System (PDS)

_____

_____

- Urban health centers
- Housing and sanitation

Yet, institutional support remains fragmented, and evaluations limited.

2.4 The AAP Governance Model in Delhi

Since its formation in 2012, the Aam Aadmi Party has positioned itself as an anti-corruption, pro-poor party, with a governance model centered on:

- Free electricity up to a certain consumption level
- Free water supply quotas
- Mohalla Clinics for primary healthcare
- Upgraded government schools
- Free bus rides for women

The party's narrative emphasizes transparency, citizen participation, and "Swaraj" (self-rule). Social audits are a key component of this model, intended to legitimize welfare spending, reduce corruption, and build citizen trust.

2.5 Political Transition in Delhi (2019–2024)

Between 2019 and 2024, Delhi's political context shifted:

- AAP maintained power at the state level but faced strong BJP challenges in municipal and national elections.
- The COVID-19 pandemic placed unprecedented strain on health and welfare systems.
- Governance conflicts with the central government and the Lieutenant Governor's office intensified. This period of political contestation and transition provides a critical lens to study whether and how social audits were maintained, adapted, or diluted as tools of accountability.

2.6 Research Gap

While some studies have examined social audits in Delhi's ration system or health services, comprehensive sociological reviews spanning the AAP era, especially during its transitional phase post-2019, remain limited. This paper seeks to fill this gap by analyzing:

- Institutional design and practice of social audits
- Their effectiveness in delivering accountability
- The sociopolitical dynamics shaping their evolution

3. Methodology
3.1 Research Design

This paper adopts a **qualitative sociological approach** to analyze social audit practices in Delhi during the AAP governance period (2015–2024), with particular attention to the transitional phase post-2019. It employs a **case-study strategy** to enable in-depth examination of how social audits were conceptualized, institutionalized, implemented, and contested in specific welfare schemes.

The design is interpretive, seeking to understand the *social meanings*, *power dynamics*, and *institutional negotiations* shaping social audit practices. By focusing on two flagship welfare programs— the Public Distribution System (PDS) and Mohalla Clinics—the study provides a rich empirical grounding for broader theoretical analysis.

3.2 Data Sources
3.2.1 Document Analysis

- Delhi government guidelines on social audits
- Departmental circulars and operational manuals
- Reports from the Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG) of India
- NGO-conducted social audit reports
- Media investigations and coverage

_____

_____

3.2.2 Secondary Literature
- Academic research on social audits in India
- Studies on Delhi's welfare policies and AAP's governance model
- Urban governance and accountability literature

3.2.3 Case Study Materials
- Publicly available audit reports
- Evaluation studies of Mohalla Clinics
- Civil society briefings and policy papers

3.3 Analytical Framework
The analysis combines three theoretical lenses:
- **Participatory Governance Theory**: Emphasizes citizen engagement as essential to democratic accountability and improved service delivery.
- **Critical Institutionalism**: Highlights the interaction of formal audit procedures with informal practices like clientelism, bureaucratic resistance, and political negotiation.
- **Governmentality (Foucauldian)**: Views social audits as technologies of power that shape citizen-state relations by making welfare delivery visible, legible, and governable.
  This multi-dimensional framework enables a nuanced understanding of how social audits operate not just as administrative tools, but as socially embedded and politically contested practices.

3.4 Limitations
- Reliance on secondary data limits direct participant perspectives.
- Variability in the quality and transparency of social audit reports.
- Political sensitivity of welfare governance in Delhi may constrain disclosure in official documents.
  Despite these limitations, triangulation across multiple sources allows for a robust sociological review.

4. CONTEXT: AAP GOVERNANCE AND WELFARE SCHEMES IN DELHI
4.1 Political Landscape of Delhi
Delhi is a Union Territory with a unique governance structure. While the elected Government of Delhi controls most departments, key domains like policing and land are under the central government via the Lieutenant Governor (LG). This division has produced frequent jurisdictional tensions.
Since 2015, the Aam Aadmi Party (AAP) has held a commanding majority in the Delhi Assembly:
- 2015: 67/70 seats
- 2020: 62/70 seats

AAP's electoral narrative centered on fighting corruption, delivering welfare, and ensuring participatory governance through a citizen-centric model.

4.2 AAP's Welfare Governance Model
AAP's governance style has been described as a **"pro-poor welfarist populism"** characterized by:
- Extensive subsidies and free services
- Targeted schemes for women, low-income households, and marginalized groups
- Emphasis on last-mile delivery and direct benefits

Key schemes include:
4.2.1 Electricity Subsidies
- Free up to 200 units per month
- Subsidized rates up to 400 units
- Claimed to benefit ~5 million households

_____

_____

4.2.2 Free Water Quota
- 20,000 liters of free water monthly per household
- Installation of meters to reduce waste

4.2.3 Mohalla Clinics
- Neighborhood primary healthcare centers
- Free consultations, medicines, diagnostics
- Over 500 clinics operational by 2024

4.2.4 Education Reforms
- Infrastructure upgrades in government schools
- Teacher training partnerships (e.g., with Cambridge)
- Happiness Curriculum and entrepreneurship classes

4.2.5 Women's Free Bus Rides
- Free travel for women on Delhi Transport Corporation (DTC) and cluster buses
- Aimed at improving mobility and safety

4.3 Narrative of Anti-Corruption and Accountability
AAP's core identity is built on challenging entrenched corruption:
- Originated from the India Against Corruption (IAC) movement
- Criticized previous governments for leakages in welfare delivery
- Emphasized "Swaraj" (self-rule) and citizen empowerment

      Social audits were positioned as a **signature transparency measure** aligned with this anti-corruption, participatory vision.

4.4 Political Transition and Contestation (2019–2024)
From 2019 onwards, AAP's governance faced new complexities:
- **Electoral Competition**: BJP dominated national elections in Delhi, though AAP retained the state.
- **COVID-19 Pandemic**: Stretched healthcare and welfare delivery systems; required emergency relief measures.
- **Central-State Conflicts**: Legal and administrative battles with the LG over control of services.
- **Municipal Politics**: AAP's eventual win in the MCD (Municipal Corporation of Delhi) elections shifted urban governance dynamics.

This period of **political transition** is crucial to understanding the evolving role of social audits:
- Did the commitment to participatory accountability persist?
- Were social audits institutionalized, expanded, or sidelined?
- How did political competition shape their design and implementation?

5. SOCIAL AUDIT PRACTICES IN DELHI
5.1 Rationale for Social Audits
AAP framed social audits as essential to:
- Curb corruption and leakages in welfare schemes
- Ensure transparency in public spending
- Empower beneficiaries to demand accountability
- Enhance policy responsiveness through citizen feedback

By making welfare delivery "auditable" by citizens, social audits aimed to break bureaucratic opacity and clientelist networks.

_____

_____

5.2 Institutional Design of Social Audits

While social audits were not legally mandated in Delhi as in MGNREGA, the AAP government sought to institutionalize them through:

5.2.1 Departmental Guidelines
- Welfare departments issued circulars defining audit objectives and procedures
- Emphasis on participatory methods and beneficiary inclusion

5.2.2 NGO Partnerships
- Civil society organizations contracted to conduct audits
- NGOs tasked with household surveys, data analysis, and community mobilization

5.2.3 Public Hearings
- Jan Sunwais organized to publicly present audit findings
- Officials, citizens, and media invited to ensure accountability

5.2.4 Transparency Measures
- Audit summaries published online
- Reports submitted to departmental heads for follow-up action

5.3 Variation Across Sectors

Implementation varied significantly:
- Some departments embraced audits as policy learning tools.
- Others resisted, treating audits as reputational risks.
- NGOs faced inconsistent funding and bureaucratic gatekeeping.
  As a result, the scope and depth of social audits differed widely across welfare schemes.

5.4 Case Study: Public Distribution System (PDS)
5.4.1 Background and Significance

The Public Distribution System (PDS) is one of India's largest welfare schemes, designed to ensure food security by providing subsidized grains to low-income households. In Delhi, over 1.8 million ration cardholders depend on the PDS for basic sustenance. Historically, Delhi's PDS was plagued by:
- Ghost beneficiaries and duplicate ration cards
- Diversion and pilferage by Fair Price Shop owners
- Poor quality of food grains
- Limited grievance redressal mechanisms

Addressing these systemic challenges was central to AAP's governance promise of "clean, efficient delivery."

5.4.2 Introduction of Social Audits in PDS

Recognizing the leakages in the PDS, the Delhi government introduced social audits as part of its anti-corruption strategy. The main objectives were:
- Verifying beneficiary lists to remove duplicates
- Monitoring fair price shop operations
- Collecting citizen feedback on delivery quality
- Improving transparency in ration distribution

The social audit process was designed to complement technological reforms such as electronic Point of Sale (e-PoS) devices for biometric authentication.

_____

_____

5.4.3 Institutional Mechanisms
- **NGO Partnerships**: Delhi government partnered with NGOs specializing in community mobilization and food security to conduct audits.
- **Household Surveys**: Auditors conducted door-to-door verification of ration cardholder details.
- **Public Hearings**: Findings were shared in Jan Sunwais, where citizens could directly confront shop owners and officials.
- **Corrective Measures**: Audit results were used to cancel ghost cards and improve shop functioning.

5.4.4 Outcomes and Impact
Positive Outcomes:
- Significant reduction in duplicate and ghost ration cards.
- Greater citizen awareness of entitlements and procedures.
- Enhanced transparency in allocation and delivery processes.
- Strengthened NGO-state collaboration on food security.

Limitations and Criticisms:
- Coverage was uneven, with audits concentrated in select districts.
- Resistance from Fair Price Shop owners who saw audits as threats.
- Bureaucratic inertia delayed follow-up action on audit recommendations.
- Political competition occasionally shaped the choice of audit sites and timing.

5.4.5 Sociological Insights
From a sociological perspective, PDS social audits illustrate both the potential and constraints of participatory accountability:
- **Empowerment**: Beneficiaries gained knowledge of entitlements and a platform to voice grievances.
- **Resistance**: Street-level bureaucrats and shop owners sought to subvert or undermine audits.
- **Politics of Visibility**: Social audits made corruption visible but also generated new spaces of negotiation and patronage.
- **Temporality**: Audits were often one-time interventions without sustained monitoring, limiting long-term change.

5.5 Case Study: Mohalla Clinics
5.5.1 Background and Significance
Mohalla Clinics represent AAP's flagship urban health reform, designed to provide **free, accessible, neighborhood-level primary healthcare**. By 2024, over 500 clinics had been established across Delhi. Key features included:
- Free consultations with qualified doctors
- Free diagnostic tests and essential medicines
- Proximity to low-income neighborhoods to reduce access barriers

The clinics were lauded nationally and internationally as a model for urban primary healthcare delivery.

5.5.2 Rationale for Social Audits
Given the scale and visibility of Mohalla Clinics, AAP sought to demonstrate accountability through social audits to:
- Monitor quality of care
- Track medicine availability and stock-outs
- Assess patient satisfaction
- Identify systemic gaps

Social audits were intended to build citizen trust while showcasing AAP's commitment to transparency.

_____

_____

5.5.3 Institutional Mechanisms
- **NGO Collaborations**: Health-focused NGOs were contracted to conduct audits.
- **Patient Surveys**: Structured surveys of patients captured satisfaction levels, waiting times, and availability of services.
- **Clinic Inspections**: Physical inspections assessed infrastructure, hygiene, and medicine stock.
- **Public Disclosure**: Summaries of findings were shared online and with health department officials.

5.5.4 Outcomes and Impact
Positive Outcomes:
- High levels of reported patient satisfaction.
- Identification of gaps in medicine supplies leading to better stock management.
- Used as feedback for planning expansions and upgrades.
- Improved public perception of government health delivery.

Limitations and Criticisms:
- Limited audit depth: Some audits were reduced to short surveys without meaningful verification.
- Bureaucratic resistance: Some officials viewed audits as external interference.
- Political showcase: Critics argued audits were used to bolster electoral narratives without addressing systemic health staffing shortages.
- Data Transparency: Full audit reports were not always made public.

5.5.5 Sociological Insights
Social audits of Mohalla Clinics reflect the tensions between **participatory accountability** and **political instrumentalization**:
- **Citizen Engagement**: Patients valued being asked about service quality, creating a feedback loop.
- **Technologies of Power**: Audits produced new data for state control and public legitimacy.
- **Bureaucratic Politics**: Health department staff negotiated the audit process to protect reputational interests.
- **Electoral Dynamics**: Audit publicity was sometimes timed to enhance the ruling party's image.

6. CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS
6.1 Uneven Institutionalization
While social audits were promoted as a governance innovation, their institutionalization remained partial:
- Not legally mandated across all schemes.
- Depended on departmental willingness and political priorities.
- NGO funding was project-based, leading to discontinuities.
- Lack of a centralized audit authority in the Delhi government.

6.2 Bureaucratic Resistance
Street-level bureaucrats often resisted audits, seeing them as:
- Threats to discretionary power.
- Additional administrative burden without incentives.
- Potential for public embarrassment.

Such resistance led to partial compliance with audit recommendations and constrained access to data.

6.3 Politicization of Audit Processes
Political competition shaped the scope and implementation of social audits:
- Choice of audit locations sometimes favored politically sensitive or opposition-leaning areas.
- Public hearings became venues for partisan contestation.
- Audit findings were selectively publicized to support electoral narratives.

_____

_____

This politicization diluted the credibility of audits as neutral accountability tools.

6.4 Variable Quality and Depth
Audits varied widely in quality:
- Some conducted rigorous household surveys with community mobilization.
- Others relied on rapid, superficial assessments with limited verification.
- NGO capacity varied, with smaller organizations facing resource constraints.

Without standardized protocols and training, audit quality remained uneven.

6.5 Grievance Redressal Gaps
While audits identified issues, follow-up action often lagged:
- Departments lacked dedicated grievance redressal cells to process audit findings.
- Recommendations were treated as advisory rather than mandatory.
- Beneficiaries lacked sustained support to pursue complaints.

This limited the transformative potential of social audits.

6.6 Sustainability Challenges
Political will and funding priorities shaped the longevity of social audit initiatives:
- High initial enthusiasm in AAP's first term (2015–2020).
- Reduced emphasis during COVID-19 crisis when resources were diverted to emergency relief.
- Changing political dynamics post-2019, with the need to manage competition with BJP and municipal power struggles.

The result was a fragmented, inconsistent social audit landscape.

6.7 Data Transparency Limitations
Although AAP promoted transparency as a core value, full audit data was not always:
- Published online in accessible formats.
- Shared with independent researchers.
- Integrated into departmental planning documents.

This limited citizen oversight and policy learning.

6.8 Structural Constraints of Urban Governance
Delhi's unique governance structure created further challenges:
- Overlapping authority between the elected government and the LG.
- Frequent conflicts over administrative control.
- Municipal governance often dominated by opposition parties, complicating coordination.
  These structural tensions constrained the institutionalization of cross-departmental audit systems.

7. Discussion: Political Transition and Accountability
7.1 Social Audits as Participatory Accountability Mechanisms
Social audits in Delhi represent an innovative attempt to institutionalize **participatory accountability** within an urban welfare context. By design, they:
- Democratize oversight over state welfare spending.
- Empower marginalized beneficiaries to voice grievances.
- Enhance service delivery by identifying leakages and inefficiencies.
- Strengthen state legitimacy by demonstrating responsiveness.

Under AAP, social audits were positioned as a signature element of its anti-corruption, citizen-centric governance model. Particularly in its early years (2015–2020), there was strong political will to establish them in high-profile welfare schemes such as the PDS and Mohalla Clinics.

_____

_____

7.2 Impact of Political Transition (2019–2024)

The post-2019 period marked a **phase of political transition** with important implications for social audit practices:

- AAP maintained a legislative majority but faced increased competition from the BJP at the municipal and national levels.
- Governance conflicts with the Lieutenant Governor's office intensified.
- COVID-19 created urgent demands for emergency service delivery, disrupting routine auditing.
- Municipal elections saw AAP wrest control of the MCD from BJP, shifting urban governance dynamics.
  This transition introduced competing priorities and altered incentives:
- Politically, there was pressure to *showcase* welfare delivery successes while minimizing public critique.
- Departments diverted resources to pandemic relief, suspending audits in many schemes.
- Political competition risked instrumentalizing audits for partisan purposes—selectively highlighting successes or blaming rivals for failures.

7.3 Institutional Challenges and Bureaucratic Politics

A key finding is the **fragility of social audit institutionalization** in the absence of legal mandates. Unlike MGNREGA's compulsory social audits in rural India, Delhi's urban audits remained dependent on departmental circulars, NGO contracts, and political priorities.

Bureaucratic actors often resisted audits:

- Seeing them as threats to discretionary power.
- Treating audits as compliance checkboxes rather than learning tools.
- Withholding data or delaying responses to audit recommendations.

These dynamics limited the transformative potential of audits, turning them into *episodic interventions* rather than systemic accountability processes.

7.4 Citizen Engagement and Empowerment

Despite these limitations, social audits did facilitate important shifts in **state-society relations**:

- Created forums where beneficiaries could confront officials and demand explanations.
- Improved awareness of entitlements, especially among marginalized groups.
- Encouraged NGOs and civil society to build capacity for monitoring welfare delivery.
  However, engagement was uneven:
- Concentrated in high-profile schemes and localities with active NGOs.
- Less robust in peripheral, poorer neighborhoods lacking organized civil society presence.
- Language, caste, and class barriers limited some groups' participation.

7.5 Political Instrumentalization of Audits

Social audits, by making state performance publicly visible, have an inherently political dimension. In Delhi:

- AAP used audits to demonstrate anti-corruption credentials and differentiate itself from previous regimes.
- Opposition parties and bureaucrats occasionally framed audits as political theater rather than genuine accountability.
- Media coverage often amplified selective audit findings to support partisan narratives.

This **instrumentalization** risked undermining the credibility of audits as neutral, citizen-centered oversight tools.

_____

_____

7.6 COVID-19 and Adaptive Accountability
The pandemic period offers a telling case of social audit adaptation:
- Physical public hearings and household surveys became infeasible.
- NGOs and government departments experimented with phone surveys and online grievance redress.
- Emergency relief distribution (food rations, oxygen) saw new accountability gaps but also new monitoring innovations.
  These shifts suggest both the **resilience and vulnerability** of social audits:
- They can adapt procedurally to crisis conditions.
- But sustaining meaningful citizen engagement during emergencies is extremely challenging.

7.7 Comparative Perspective
Delhi's experience aligns with broader international and Indian trends:
- Urban social audits remain less institutionalized than rural ones.
- Success depends on political will, bureaucratic buy-in, and civil society capacity.
- Risk of elite capture or tokenistic implementation is high without legal mandates.
  Delhi's partial success offers lessons for other Indian cities seeking to scale participatory accountability in welfare delivery.

8. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS
Based on the preceding analysis, several policy recommendations emerge to strengthen social audits in Delhi:

8.1 Legal Mandate and Standardization
- Enact legislation mandating social audits for major urban welfare schemes.
- Define minimum standards for audit design, methodology, and frequency.
- Protect audits from abrupt policy shifts tied to electoral cycles.

8.2 Strengthening Institutional Infrastructure
- Establish an independent Urban Social Audit Directorate under the Delhi government.
- Create dedicated social audit units within key departments.
- Ensure stable funding for NGO partnerships and community mobilization.

8.3 Enhancing NGO and Civil Society Capacity
- Provide training, resources, and standardized toolkits for NGOs conducting audits.
- Foster collaboration across NGOs to share best practices and improve coverage.
- Encourage participatory planning of audit schedules and methodologies with local communities.

8.4 Addressing Bureaucratic Resistance
- Incorporate social audit participation in bureaucratic performance evaluations.
- Offer training on the value of participatory accountability for departmental learning.
- Create incentives for officials to adopt and act on audit recommendations.

8.5 Ensuring Data Transparency
- Mandate public disclosure of all audit reports in accessible formats.
- Develop online dashboards summarizing key findings and departmental responses.
- Encourage academic and media scrutiny of audit results.

8.6 Embedding Grievance Redressal
- Establish clear, time-bound grievance redressal mechanisms linked to audit findings.
- Create citizen helpdesks to support filing and tracking of complaints.
- Monitor departmental compliance with audit recommendations through independent oversight.

8.7 Managing Political Instrumentalization
- Ensure multiparty representation in social audit oversight committees.
- Promote non-partisan audit design and evaluation frameworks.
- Encourage media to cover audits responsibly, avoiding sensationalism and selective reporting.

_____

_____

8.8 Adapting to Crisis Contexts

- Develop remote and digital social audit protocols for use during emergencies.
- Train NGOs and officials in ethical, inclusive use of technology for citizen feedback.
- Build community resilience to maintain accountability even in crisis situations.

9. CONCLUSION

This paper has provided a sociological review of social audits in Delhi, examining their evolution, institutional design, and practical challenges under the AAP governance model between 2015 and 2024. Social audits emerged as a flagship mechanism to advance transparency and citizen participation in welfare delivery, particularly in high-profile schemes like the Public Distribution System and Mohalla Clinics.

The analysis demonstrates that while social audits achieved notable successes in empowering beneficiaries, uncovering leakages, and improving service quality, they also faced substantial challenges:

- Partial institutionalization without legal mandates
- Bureaucratic resistance and limited follow-through on recommendations
- Politicization and use as electoral instruments
- Uneven coverage and quality, constrained by NGO capacity and funding
- Adaptation pressures during the COVID-19 crisis

These findings underscore the **tension between participatory ideals and political realities** in urban governance. Social audits offer a powerful tool for democratizing accountability, but their effectiveness depends on sustained political will, robust institutional support, and genuine citizen engagement.

Delhi's experience provides important lessons for other urban centers in India and globally seeking to institutionalize social audits. Moving forward, policies that embed audits in legal frameworks, enhance civil society capacity, ensure bureaucratic cooperation, and safeguard non-partisan oversight will be critical to realizing the transformative potential of participatory accountability in urban welfare states.

10. REFERENCES

(Sample Style – you can expand as needed in your final document)

- Aiyar, Y., & Mehta, S. (2013). Spectators or Participants? Examining the Effects of Social Audits on Citizen-State Relations in India. *IDS Bulletin*, 44(1), 29–40.
- Pande, S. (2020). State Capacity and the Quality of Social Audits in India. *World Development*, 135.
- World Bank. (2004). Social Accountability: An Introduction to the Concept and Emerging Practice. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Government of NCT Delhi. (Various years). Departmental Guidelines and Social Audit Reports.
- Comptroller and Auditor General of India. (Various years). Reports on Social Welfare Schemes in Delhi.
- Delhi Dialogue Commission. (2015–2016). Recommendations on Social Audits in Urban Governance.
- Media Reports: *The Hindu*, *Indian Express*, *Scroll.in*, *Hindustan Times*.

_____