

Citizen's Local Authority Transfer Fund Report Card for Mumias / Butere Town Council (Mumias Constituency)



© National Taxpayers Association
March, 2010

This publication was made possible through support provided by the Department for International Development (DfID) through the Global Transfer Fund (GTF) and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA).

The findings expressed herein are those of the NTA and they do not necessarily reflect the views of our partners.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	Executive Summary	1
3.0	Recommendations for The Town Clerk and the ward councillors	2
	Summary findings from NTA Audit of LATF Projects in Mumias Constituency	3
4.0	NTA Research Methodology	4
	Annex 1: Project profiles and digital photographs for all LATF projects visited and assessed	
	• LASDAP Projects in Mumias Constituency	7 - 19
	Annex 2: CDF/LATF Project Rapid Assessment Form	20
	Annex 3: CDF/LATF Project Users Questionnaire	21
	Annex 4: Technical Project Assessment Form	23

1.0 Introduction

- This Citizen's Report Card has been researched and published by the National Taxpayers Association (NTA) to sensitize citizens, elected representatives, government officials and civil society organizations on the management of the Local Authority Transfer Fund (LATF).
- The NTA is a national, independent, non-partisan organization focused on improving the delivery of services and the management of devolved funds for the benefit of all Kenyans.
- The NTA is supervised by a Governing Council of prominent civil society and private sector leaders. The day to day operations of the NTA are managed by the NTA Secretariat based in Nairobi and eight Regional NTA offices located in the provincial headquarters. The NTA is establishing Constituency Monitoring Committees of volunteers at the constituency level across Kenya.
- The NTA has researched and published Citizen's Report Cards in 46 constituencies from all provinces in Kenya. The NTA will cover all 210 constituencies by December 2011.
- This Citizen's Report Card presents findings from research (on LATF projects) in Mumias / Butere Town Council (Mumias Constituency)
- The monitoring exercise was conducted between January and May 2009.
- It is important to note that the Financial Year 07/08 was simply used to set the scope of the work based on NTA's interest but financial reporting takes into consideration accumulated allocations to the monitored projects over the years.

2.0 Executive Summary

- The main findings from NTAs research in Mumias / Butere Town Council (Mumias Constituency) are listed in Table 1 below.
- Project profiles and digital photographs of all CDF projects visited and assessed are listed in Annex 1.
- The key findings for projects funded and monitored are as follows:

Kshs 3,193,778 of taxpayers' money has been badly used due to complete and incomplete projects that are not in use

27% of the total LATF funds awarded in FY 2007-08 were on badly implemented projects

Kshs. 750,000 of taxpayers' money is unaccounted for

6% of the total LATF funds awarded in FY 2007-08 are missing and unaccounted for

3.0 Recommendations for The Town Clerk and the ward councillors

1. Complete all incomplete LATF projects by the end of 09/10 FY.
2. Trace and fully account for all missing funds.
3. Reduce by 100% badly built LATF projects in FY 09/10.
4. Make available to NTA all records of LATF projects, plus Bills of Quantities.

Table 1: Summary of Findings from NTA Audit of LATF Projects in Mumias Constituency

Category	Project Assessment Classification	No. of Projects	Budget Awarded	Budget Spent	Budget Unaccounted For
			Kshs.	Kshs.	Kshs.
A	Well built, completed projects - good quality construction, good value for money for taxpayers'.	10	3,274,690	3,274,690	-
B	Badly built, complete and incomplete projects - poor quality construction, money wasted, poor value for money	10	3,193,778	3,193,778	-
C	Well built, incomplete projects - project not yet complete, being built in phases, so far well built	3	4,748,500	4,748,500	-
D	Abandoned Projects - projects are incomplete and not funded in the last year, taxpayers' money is wasted	-	-	-	-
E	Ghost projects - officially allocated funds, but project does not physically exist	2	750,000	-	750,000
TOTAL		25	11,966,968	11,216,968	750,000

Main Findings	Summary of Funds (Kshs.)	% of Total
Total Money Badly Used (B Projects)	3,193,778	27%
Total Money Wasted (D Projects)	-	-
Budget Unaccounted For	750,000	6%

4.0 NTA Research Methodology

The research methodology involved the following stages and methods.

1. Secondary Data Collection and Analysis

NTA Research Officers held a series of meetings with district and constituency officials to collect information on LATF projects funded in FY 2007/08. At least 10% of the projects funded in the stated financial year were monitored.

2. Project Site Visit, Rapid Assessment, and User Interviews

NTA Research Officers visited all selected LATF projects funded in FY 2007/08. At each project site they:

- i) took digital photographs of the project;
- ii) undertook a rapid assessment of the project using a structured Project Rapid Assessment Form (see Annex 3)¹.

3. Desk-based Project Classification

Upon returning from the field NTA Research Officers analysed the data collected and then classified all projects into one of the following five categories:

Category A Projects – Well implemented, completed projects

This category was for LATF projects which had scored above 15 marks out of 30 on the Project Rapid Assessment Form (Annex 3)², and were found to be well built, with good value for money (i.e. the budget was the right amount for the infrastructure delivered).

Category B Projects – Badly implemented, complete and incomplete projects

This category was for LATF projects which had scored less than 15 marks out of 30 on the Project Rapid Assessment Form, and were found to be poorly constructed with poor value for money, and/or with budgets much larger than what was actually delivered.

Category C Projects – Well implemented, incomplete projects

This category was for LATF projects which had scored above 15 marks out of 30 on the Project Rapid Assessment Form, and were projects well implemented but incomplete, i.e. money had been used to build a structure of good quality, but the construction is incomplete.

Category D Projects - Abandoned Projects

This category of projects are incomplete and did not receive financial allocation in the subsequent Financial Year. It should be noted that the LATF Act provides for continuous allocation to projects until completion.

Category E Projects – Ghost projects

This category was for LATF projects which had been officially allocated funds but the project did not physically exist as at the time of study i.e. it was a ghost project.

¹The data listed in this form was based on the findings from interviews with project users

²The Research Officer gave each project a score out of 30 marks for: (1) Community participation in project selection/community users satisfaction with the project (10 marks); (2) Project completion status - on time/within budget? (10 marks); and, (3) Visual assessment of overall quality of construction and finish (10 marks).

4. Desk-based Independent Technical Assessment and Strategic Visits



At this stage NTA Research Officers contracted a local engineer (or quantity surveyor) to undertake an independent desk review which involved: (i) analysis of secondary data and data collected in the field; (ii) strategic field visits to selected projects where additional information was needed; and, (iii) classification of all projects into one of the six categories above.



5. Desk-based Analysis and Final Project Classification



Following the independent technical assessment, the NTA Research Officer met with the contracted engineer or quantity surveyor to compare her/his list of categorised projects. The output of this meeting was a final list of categorised projects.



Annex 1



Project Classification Summary Tables,
Project Profiles and digital photographs
for all LATF projects visited and assessed in
the Financial Year (FY) 2007 - 08



Project Number	LATF/002	
Constituency	Mumias	
Project Name	St Paul Shianda youth poly-technic	
Project Activity	Purchase of sewing machines and wiring	
Location/Ward	E. Wanga	
Councilor's Name.	Cllr. James Musira.	
Project Status	Complete	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	30,000	
Total Funds Spent to Date	30,000	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	67%	
Date of assessment	12/01/09	
Project Category	A	
Comments	The institution benefitted from the kitty as they used the funds to purchase the electric machines. The machines are of good quality and have greatly enhanced learning at the institution. There is value for money in the project.	



Project Number	LATF/CDF/003	
Constituency	Mumias	
Project Name	Mukambi Baptist primary	
Project Activity	Construction of 4 classes	
Location/Ward	E. Wanga	
Councilor's Name.	Cllr. James Musira.	
Project Status	Complete	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	580,000	
Total Funds Spent to Date	580,000	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	80%	
Date of assessment	14/01/09	
Project Category	A	
Comments	The classes have been constructed using quality materials and the workmanship is very impressive. The project has seriously reduced the congestion crisis that has been witnessed at the institution. There is no doubt value for money in the project.	



Project Number	LATF/015	
Constituency	Mumias	
Project Name	Masinjira market	
Project Activity	Construction of pit latrine	
Location/Ward	Etenje	
Councilor's Name.	Cllr. Kennedy Egesa.	
Project Status	Complete	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	89,000	
Total Funds Spent to Date	89,000	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	77%	
Date of assessment	17/01/09	
Project Category	A	
Comments	This is a well implemented project based on the amount of money spent so far. Due to its location – the market place, it serves many people and has significantly enhanced hygiene at the centre. There is value for money in the project.	



Project Number	LATF/017	
Constituency	Mumias	
Project Name	Khaunga market	
Project Activity	Construction of latrine	
Location/Ward	Malaha/Muluku	
Councilor's Name.	Cllr. Fabiano Akuta Makana and Sylvester Chweyi.	
Project Status	Complete	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	58,400	
Total Funds Spent to Date	58,400	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	80%	
Date of assessment	15/01/09	
Project Category	A	
Comments	The project is located at the border of the two wards and has been well implemented using quality materials and the workmanship is quite remarkable. It has significantly enhanced the sanitation and hygiene at the market. There is value for money in the project.	



Project Number	LATF/027	
Project Name	Shibinga –Ibokolo road	
Project Activity	Grading	
Location/Ward	Shibinga	
Councilor's Name.	Cllr. Washington Khwale.	
Project Status	Complete	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	1,200,000	
Total Funds Spent to Date	1,200,000	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	73%	
Date of assessment	03/02/09	
Project Category	A	
Comments	The grading of the road was well done and the surface properly compacted. The drainage system is well done and will protect the road from storm water effect for a reasonable period of time. The community expressed great satisfaction with the project and there is indeed value for taxpayers' money.	



Project Number	LATF/028	
Constituency	Mumias	
Project Name	Shibinga –Lunza road	
Project Activity	Road grading	
Location/Ward	Shibinga	
Councilor's Name.	Cllr. Washington Khwale	
Project Status	Complete	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	849,490	
Total Funds Spent to Date	849,490	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	77%	
Date of assessment	04/02/09	
Project Category	A	
Comments	The grading work was well undertaken and the drainage system is well done. The road surface is well compacted and the community members expressed great satisfaction with the project. This is a well implemented project and it represents value for taxpayers' money.	



Project Number	LATF/029	
Constituency	Mumias	
Project Name	Eshiralumwa - Lusuma road	
Project Activity	Grading	
Location/Ward	E. Wanga	
Councillor's Name.	Cllr. James Musira.	
Project Status	Complete	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	67,800	
Total Funds Spent to Date	67,800	
Total Unaccounted for Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	63%	
Date of assessment	15/01/09	
Project Category	A	
Comments	Although it is unlikely that the above amount allocated to the project would have been enough to support the project, the work was well done. The road has a good drainage system and the cumber is sufficient. There is no doubt value for taxpayers' money in the project.	



Project Number	LATF/030	
Constituency	Mumias	
Project Name	Shianda –Lusumu road	
Project Activity	Road grading	
Location/Ward	E. Wanga	
Councilor's Name.	Cllr. James Musira.	
Project Status	Complete	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	67,000	
Total Funds Spent to Date	67,000	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	57%	
Date of assessment	21/05/09	
Project Category	A	
Comments	Although it is unlikely that the above amount allocated to the project would have been enough to support the project, the work was well done. The road has a good drainage system and the cumber is sufficient. There is no doubt value for taxpayers' money in the project.	



Project Number	LATF/035	
Constituency	Mumias	
Project Name	Ikoli-Maraba road	
Project Activity	Construction of road	
Location/Ward	Shibinga	
Councilor's Name.	Cllr. Washington Khwale.	
Project Status	Complete	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	283,000	
Total Funds Spent to Date	283,000	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	73%	
Date of assessment	12/01/09	
Project Category	A	
Comments	Bearing in mind the amount of money allocated to the project, the work done represents value for money. The grading was well done with a fine end slope with a hard pad. The drainage system is also sufficient to guard the road from storm water effect. It is a well done project.	



Project Number	LATF/046	
Constituency	Mumias	
Project Name	Rubia spring	
Project Activity	Protection of one spring	
Location/Ward	E. Wanga	
Councilor's Name.	Cllr. James Musira.	
Project Status	Complete	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	50,000	
Total Funds Spent to Date	50,000	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	70%	
Date of assessment	22/05/09	
Project Category	A	
Comments	The funding enabled adequate protection of the spring and the community members affirmed their satisfaction with the protection. The water pointed is now well protected and the community has access to clean and safe water. There is value for money in the project.	



Project Number	LATF/004	
Project Name	Epanje –Khaunga Bridge	
Project Activity	Construction of a bridge	
Location/Ward	Malaha/Mukulu	
Councilor's Name	Cllr. Fabiano Akwata & Cllr. Sylvester Chweyi	
Project Status	Ongoing	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	370,000	
Total Funds Spent to Date	370,000	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	49%	
Date of assessment	14/01/09	
Project Category	B	
Comments	Adjacent to bridge slab, compaction of the layers was not done thus the top has been eroded by surface run off. The concrete slab remains exposed dangerously and it is clear that the project may not serve the community members for long. There is hardly value for money in the project.	

Project Number	LATF/007	
Project Name	Epanja –Khaunga RD	
Project Activity	Road grading	
Location/Ward	Malaha/Mulukku	
Councilor's Name	Cllr.Fabiano Akwata Makana and Cllr. Sylvester Chweyi	
Project Status	Incomplete	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	370,000	
Total Funds Spent to Date	370,000	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	37%	
Date of assessment	14/01/09	
Project Category	B	
Comments	Various roads have been graded well within the Local Authorities jurisdiction and this is certainly not one of them. The surface is poorly compacted and the drainage system is very poor. As at the time of project visit, the road was already suffering from storm water effect. This amounts to a waste of taxpayers' money.	



Project Number	LATF/010	
Project Name	Mulufu water project	
Project Activity	Protection of Mulufu water project	
Location/Ward	Lusheya	
Councilor's Name.	Cllr. Stephen Osutare.	
Project Status	Complete	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	30,000	
Total Funds Spent to Date	30,000	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	40%	
Date of assessment	30/01/09	
Project Category	B	
Comments	The workmanship in the project was quite shoddy as the concrete is already exhibiting deep cracks and it is clear that the facility will need repair soon. The base of the water point was not screeded and the community is openly dissatisfied with the work undertaken. There is hardly value for money in this project.	



Project Number	LATF/016	
Project Name	Stock ring Maraba market	
Project Activity	Construction of stock ring	
Location/Ward	Shibinga	
Councilors Name.	Cllr. Washington Khwale.	
Project Status	Complete	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	75,890	
Total Funds Spent to Date	75,890	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	3%	
Date of assessment	22/01/09	
Project Category	B	
Comments	The project was not well implemented; the wooden structure is not functional as animals can easily get out. So far, there is no value for taxpayers' money in the project.	



Project Number	LATF/018	
Project Name	Shikulu market toilet	
Project Activity	Construction of latrines	
Location/Ward	Mukulu.	
Councilor's Name.	Cllr.Fabiano Akwata & Cllr. Sylvester Chwayi.	
Project Status	Incomplete	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	90,000	
Total Funds Spent to Date	90,000	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	27%	
Date of assessment	08/01/09	
Project Category	B	
Comments	Whereas the amount in question should have been adequate to complete the project, the work was shoddily implemented. The materials used are of poor quality as indicated in the rotten timber. Besides, the doors have not been fixed and the iron sheets are of very inferior quality. The overall workmanship is also quite deplorable and this perhaps explains why it is not being used despite the high need for the facility. This is a waste of taxpayers' money.	


Project Number	LATF/024	
Project Name	Bulechia -Epanja RD	
Project Activity	Construction of Bulechia -Epanja RD	
Location/Ward	Mukulu.	
Councilor's Name.	Cllr.Fabiano Akwata Makana and Cllr. Sylvester Chwayi.	
Project Status	Ongoing	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	1,066,000	
Total Funds Spent to Date	1,066,000	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	20%	
Date of assessment	10/01/09	
Project Category	B	
Comments	Despite the grading work, there is no clear carriage way and the road has a width of less than 3 Meters. Although the road is highly used by tractors, it is clear that substantial work was not done on the facility especially bearing in mind the amount of money allocated to it.	


Project Number	LATF/025	Photo Unavailable
Project Name	Mwitoti –Lusheya road	
Project Activity	Road rehabilitation	
Location/Ward	Lusheya	
Councilor's Name.	Cllr. Stephen Osutare.	
Project Status	Complete	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	551,888	
Total Funds Spent to Date	551,888	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	43%	
Date of assessment	09/01/09	
Project Category	B	
Comments	Although the road was rehabilitated, pot holes are already appearing indicating either poor compaction of the road surface or storm water effect. The project won't serve the community for long and it is clear that the quality of work done on the road is not indicative of value for taxpayers' money.	


Project Number	LATF/036	 
Project Name	Lusheya –indangalasia Rd	
Project Activity	Construction of road	
Location/Ward	Shibinga	
Councilor's Name.	Cllr. Washington Khwale.	
Project Status	Complete	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	180,000	
Total Funds Spent to Date	180,000	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	48%	
Date of assessment	14/01/09	
Project Category	B	
Comments	Whereas it is certain that the project was underfunded, the work undertaken was shoddily done. There is no hard pad and the top soil was not properly excavated from the road surface. The blooming vegetative growth is an indication of poor work on the road surface. There is hardly value for money in it.	

Project Number	LATF/041		
Project Name	Lusheya AP camp		
Project Activity	Purchase of land and construction of AP camp		
Location/Ward	Shibinga		
Councilors Name.	Cllr. Washington Khwale.		
Project Status	Ongoing		
Total Funds Awarded to Date	180,000		
Total Funds Spent to Date	180,00		
Total Unaccounted Funds	0		
Technical Performance Score	40%		
Date of assessment	24/01/09		
Project Category	B		
Comments	Although good land has been purchased for the construction of the APs houses, it is amazing that those concerned decided to construct semi permanent mud houses. These will not last and it is common knowledge that they can only serve for a limited period of time. There is no value for money in this project.		

Project Number	LATF/043		
Project Name	Shianda Resource centre		
Project Activity	Construction of a resource centre		
Location/Ward	Bukaya.		
Councilor's Name.	Cllr. Ken Mulongo.		
Project Status	Incomplete		
Total Funds Awarded to Date	280,000		
Total Funds Spent to Date	280,000		
Total Unaccounted Funds	0		
Technical Performance Score	N/A.		
Date of assessment	07/02/09		
Project Category	B		
Comments	This project indicates total misuse of Taxpayers' money. Although underfunded, the allocated amount should have clearly done more than digging of the foundation. In this state, the project at best amounts to a waste of taxpayers' money.		

Project Number	LATF/005	
Project Name	Emukhuwa primary school	
Project Activity	Construction of classes	
Location/Ward	Bukaya	
Councilor's Name.	Cllr. Ken Mulongo.	
Project Status	Ongoing	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	400,000	
Total Funds Spent to Date	400,000	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	60%	
Date of assessment	20/02/09	
Project Category	C	
Comments	The work done so far is quite commendable but incomplete largely due to limited funding. The materials are of good quality and the workmanship is impressive. There is need to avail more funding to the project. So far, there is value for money in the project.	

Project Number	LATF/006	
Project Name	Shibale primary school	
Project Activity	Construction of a kitchen	
Location/Ward	Central	
Councilors Name.	Cllr. Shaban Mola	
Project Status	Ongoing	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	150,000	
Total Funds Spent to Date	150,000	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	50%	
Date of assessment	14/01/09	
Project Category	C	
Comments	So far the kitchen is well done and represents value for the amount in question. The workmanship is good and the materials are of standard quality. There is need to allocate more funding to the project to enable its completion.	

Project Number	LATF/045	
Project Name	Lusheya health centre	
Project Activity	Construction of a health centre	
Location/Ward	Shibinga	
Councilors Name.	Cllr. Washington Khwale.	
Project Status	Ongoing	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	4,198,500	
Total Funds Spent to Date	4,198,500	
Total Unaccounted Funds	0	
Technical Performance Score	80%	
Date of assessment	14/01/09	
Project Category	C	
Comments		
Comments	Although work was still ongoing as at the time of NTA visit, it is evident that the project has been implemented well so far. The materials used are of standard quality and the workmanship noticeable as reflected in the quality of finishing and fittings work that was ongoing at the time of our visit. There is overall satisfaction with the amount of work done and it reflects value for taxpayers' money.	

Project Number	LATF/001	<p style="text-align: center;">Ghost Project</p>
Project Name	Shianda bus park	
Project Activity	Construction of a bus park	
Location/Ward	Mukulu	
Councilor's Name	Cllr. Fabiano Akwata Makana and Cllr. Sylvester Chweyi	
Project Status	Does not exist	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	500,000	
Total Funds Spent to Date	0	
Total Unaccounted Funds	500,000	
Technical Performance Score	N/A	
Date of assessment	24/01/09	
Project Category	E	
Comments	Despite the decent financial allocation to the project, there was no evidence of any work undertaken on the facility more than one year after allocation of the funds. This is a waste of taxpayers' money and proper actions should be taken to recover the money.	

Project Number	LATF/042	Ghost Project
Project Name	Eluche police post	
Project Activity	Construction of houses for police	
Location/Ward	Mukulu.	
Councilor's Name	Cllr.Fabiano Akwata Makana and Cllr. Sylvester Chweyi.	
Project Status	Does not exist	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	250,000	
Total Funds Spent to Date	0	
Total Unaccounted Funds	250,000	
Technical Performance Score	N/A.	
Date of assessment	07/02/09	
Project Category	E	
Comments	Whereas this should be such a conspicuous project in a region, the NTA could not trace it and the community confirmed lack of knowledge about its existence. There is need for drastic actions to recover this money. It is a waste of taxpayers' money.	

Annex 3
CDF/LATF Project Rapid Assessment Form

Recommendation (mark one box)	Stage 1 = OK	Stage 2 = Further Investigation		Report No.

Constituency Name		Location/Ward	
Project Name		Project Number	
Project Activity		Rural/Urban	
MPs Name (2007)		MPs Name (2008)	

Project Status	Complete		Incomplete/stalled		Ongoing		Does not exist	
----------------	----------	--	--------------------	--	---------	--	----------------	--

Amount Awarded	FY 2007/08	FY 2006/07	FY 2006/05	FY 2005/04
Kshs.				

Total CDF Funds Spent to date (April 2009) Kshs.	
--	--

Total Other Funds Spent to date (April 2009) Kshs. (NGOs, CBOs, FBOs, Private Sector, etc.)	
--	--

Total Funds Spent to date (April 2009) Kshs.	
--	--

CDF Project Manager Name		Contact Nos	
Project Contractor Name		Contact Nos	
Other Contact Person		Contact Nos	

Field Visit Assessment Information

Name or general position of people met at project site	
1.	3.
2.	4.

Project Score	Out of 10	Comments
Community participation in selection/community/users satisfaction		
Project completion status -- on time/within budget?		
Visual assessment of overall quality of construction and finish		
Total Project Rapid Score (out of 30)		

Note: A mark of 10 is excellent, while a mark of 1 is very bad

Signature of RO:		Time and Date:	
------------------	--	----------------	--

Annex 4

CDF Project Users Questionnaire

Quest. No.:

Name of RO

Instructions for ROs

- Explain who you are, and the purpose of your visit. Clearly state that the interview is anonymous.
- Ask the person if they know about the concerned project before starting the interview, if they have no knowledge then do not interview them.
- If the person agrees to be interviewed, ask how long they have been resident in the community. If it is less than six months do not undertake the interview. Do not interview people directly or officially involved in managing the project as they will have a bias.
- ROs must interview a mix of women and men at all project locations.
- The minimum requirement is 4 user interviews/project.
- In questions with written answers be very clear and concise.

1. Name of District	2. Constituency Name	
3. Name of Project	4. Location Name	
5. Gender of person interviewed (circle one answer number)		1. Female 2. Male
6. Age of person interviewed		_____ years
7. Occupation (circle one answer number)	1. Farmer 2. Business Owner 3. Labourer /Housekeeper	4. Private Sector Employee 5. Government employee 6. Other (explain) _____
8. RO -- Why have you selected this person? (list relationship to project)	1. Resident lives near project 2. Resident from community uses the project 3. Other (explain) _____	
9. Do you know who funded the project?	1. Yes 2. No	
10. If yes, can you say who?	1. CDF 2. LATF 3. MP	4. Community 5. Donors/NGOs 6. Government
	7. Councillor 8. Private company	9. Do not know 10. Other (explain) _____
11. Is the project complete and in use, or incomplete and in use?	1. Project is completed and in use 2. Project is completed and not in use 3. Project is incomplete and in use 4. Project is incomplete and not in use 5. Project is "missing", does not exist	
12. Please explain your answer? (If the person choose option 2, 3, 4, or 5)		
13. Did you or people you know in the community participate in project selection?	1. Yes, community participated 2. No, community did not participate 3. Do not know	
14. If yes, please explain how you know this?	1. I attended the meeting 2. I know people who attended and they told me 3. Other (explain) _____	
15. If yes, do you know approximately how many people attended the meeting to select the project?	1. _____ people (write the number) 2. Do not know	
16. If yes to Q10, (community participated in project selection), Was this project selected as a priority for this community?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Do not know	

17. If no to Q10, do you know who selected the project?	1. MP 2. Councillor	3. Chief/Govt. official 4. Do not know	5. Other _____
18. Did you or people you know in the community participate in project implementation?	1. Yes, community participated 2. No, community did not participate 3. Do not know		
19. If yes, how?	1. They contributed labour/security/supervision/goods/materials/land etc. 2. They gave money 3. Other (explain) _____		
20. Was there a Project Management Committee formed for this project?	1. Yes	2. No	3. Do not know
21. If yes, who selected this Committee?	1. MP selected 2. Community selected 3. MP and community	4. Councillor selected 5. Govt. selected	6. Do not know 7. Other (explain) _____
22. What is your satisfaction in terms of quality of the facility and value for money spent on this project?	1. Very satisfied 2. Satisfied	3. Dissatisfied 4. Very dissatisfied	
23. If Dissatisfied or Very dissatisfied, explain why?			
24. Was this project transparently managed?	1. Yes 2. No	3. Do not know	
25. If no, explain why not?			
26. How would you rate the project in terms of impact on beneficiaries?	1. High impact – many people in community benefited 2. Medium impact – some people in community benefited 3. Low impact – none/few people in community benefited		
27. What are the three most important future projects for this community?	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
28. Can you suggest ways to improve implementation of CDF projects?	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
29. RO Verification -- What is the actual completion status of the project based on observation? (visit the project and then complete this question)	1. Project is completed and in use		
	2. Project is completed and not in use		
	3. Project is incomplete and in use		
	4. Project is incomplete and not in use		
	5. Project is “missing”, does not exist		

Name of interviewer	Signature of interviewer	Date and time of interview

Annex 5

Technical Project Assessment Form

Project Score (Out of 100)	%	Project No.	
-----------------------------------	---	--------------------	--

Project Type (LATF/CDF)		Project No.	
--------------------------------	--	--------------------	--

Project Name		Constituency Name	
---------------------	--	--------------------------	--

District Name		Location / Ward Name	
----------------------	--	-----------------------------	--

Area	Out of 10	Justify the score you gave with explanation below (write clearly and neatly)
(1) Quality of materials used		
(2) Project completion status -- on time/within budget?		
(3) Project cost – does it represent value for money		
Total (total the marks given out of 30, then list %)		What is your overall recommendation (circle one answer) 1. Project <u>has been</u> well implemented and looks as though there is good value for money for the community. 2. Project <u>has not been well</u> implemented and looks as though funds have not been well used. 3. Is difficult to fully assess.
	%	

Note: A mark of 10 is excellent, while a mark of 1 is very bad.

Name of technical reviewer:	Date:
Signature of technical reviewer:	Time: