

# Citizen's Constituency Development Fund Report Card for Keiyo South Constituency, Keiyo County



This publication was made possible through support provided by the Department for International Development (DfID) through the Governance and Transparency Fund (GTF).

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>Table 1: CDF Allocations to Keiyo South Constituency (FY) 2003/04 - 2007/08</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Recommendations for Hon. Jackson Kiptanui and Keiyo South CDFC</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>Table 2: Summary of Findings from NTA Audit of CDF Projects (FY)2007-08</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>NTA Research Methodology</b>	<b>6</b>
	<b>Annex 1: Project Classification Summary Tables, Project Profiles and digital photographs for all CDF projects visited and assessed in the Financial Year (FY) 2007-08</b>	
	<b>Category A projects</b>	<b>9 - 16</b>
	<b>Category B projects</b>	<b>17 - 18</b>
	<b>Category C projects</b>	<b>19 - 20</b>
	<b>Category E projects</b>	<b>21</b>
	<b>Annex 2: CDF Project Rapid Assessment Form</b>	<b>22</b>
	<b>Annex 3: CDF Project Users' Questionnaire</b>	<b>23</b>
	<b>Annex 4: Technical Project Assessment Form</b>	<b>25</b>
	<b>Annex 5: Correspondence between NTA and Member of Parliament</b>	<b>26</b>

## 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 Constituency Development Fund (CDF).
- 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 at 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 82 constituencies and 15 Local Authority Transfer Fund (LATF) Reports from all provinces in Kenya. The NTA will cover all 210 constituencies by December 2011.
- This Citizen's Report Card presents findings from research in Keiyo South Constituency. The report covers one government Financial Year 2007/08. The NTA has not researched the 2008/09 Financial Year as much of the funds have not been spent to date.
- The monitoring exercise was conducted between January and October 2010.
- 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

- A summary of total funds allocated to Keiyo South Constituency is listed in Table 1 below. A total of **Kshs. 140,869,976** has been allocated to the constituency since Financial Year 2003/04 to Financial Year 2007/08.
- The main findings from NTAs research in Keiyo South Constituency are listed in Table 2 below.
- Project profiles and digital photographs of all CDF projects visited and assessed are listed in Annex 1.
- Correspondence with the area Member of Parliament on the Constituency Citizen Report Card are listed in Annex 5.

**Table 1: CDF Allocations to Keiyo South Constituency Financial Years 2003/04 - 2007/08**

Constituency Name	2003/2004	2004/2005	2005/2006	2006/2007	2007/2008	Total
Keiyo South	6,000,000	22,907,468	29,626,071	41,041,472	41,294,965	<b>140,869,976</b>

- The key findings for projects funded and monitored in Financial Year 2007/2008 are as follows:

**Kshs. 4,510,000 of taxpayers' money has been wasted due to badly implemented projects**

16% of the total CDF funds allocated to the monitored projects in FY 2007-08 were on ineffective projects

**Kshs. 500,000 of taxpayers' money is unaccounted for**

2% of the total CDF funds allocated to the monitored projects in FY 2007-08 are unaccounted for

### **3.1 Recommendations for Hon. Jackson Kiptanui and Keiyo South CDFC**

1. Complete all incomplete CDF projects.
2. Trace and fully account for all missing funds.
3. Reduce by 80% badly implemented CDF projects.
4. Make available all records of CDF projects, plus Bills of Quantities

### **3.2 Recommendations for the CDF Board**

1. Ensure quick response to requests for reallocation of funds from the Constituency Development Fund Committees (CDFCs). The Board is widely accused of delay in approving decisions on reallocation of funds at the constituency level.
2. Regularly update the information listed in the Project Status Reports on the CDF web site to ensure that accurate and up to date information is available to the public.

**Table 2: Summary of Findings from NTA Audit of CDF Projects (FY) 2007-08 in Keiyo South Constituency**

Category	Project Assessment Classification	No. of Projects	Budget Awarded	Budget Spent	Budget Unaccounted For
			Kshs.	Kshs.	Kshs.
A	<b>Well built, completed projects</b> - good quality construction, good value for money for taxpayers’.	<b>30</b>	13,400,000	13,400,000	-
B	<b>Badly built, complete and incomplete projects</b> - poor quality construction, money wasted, poor value for money	<b>5</b>	4,510,000	4,510,000	-
C	<b>Well built, ongoing projects</b> - project not yet complete, being built in phases, so far well built	<b>10</b>	9,620,000	9,620,000	-
E	<b>Ghost projects</b> - officially allocated funds, but project does not physically exist	<b>1</b>	800,000	300,000	500,000
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>46</b>	<b>28,330,000</b>	<b>27,830,000</b>	<b>500,000</b>

Main Findings	Summary of Funds (Kshs.)	% of Total
<b>Total Money Badly Used (B Projects)</b>	<b>4,510,000</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>Total Money Wasted (D Projects)</b>	-	-
<b>Budget Unaccounted For</b>	<b>800,000</b>	<b>2%</b>

## 4.0 NTA Research Methodology

The research methodology involved the following stages and methods.

### 1. Secondary Data Collection and Analysis

NTA Regional Officer held a series of meetings with district and constituency officials to collect information on CDF projects funded in FY 2007/08.

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

NTA Regional Officer visited all selected CDF 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 2)<sup>1</sup>.

### 3. Desk-based Independent Technical Assessment and Strategic Visits

At this stage NTA Regional Officer 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.

### 4. Desk-based Analysis and Final Project Classification

Following the independent technical assessment, the NTA Regional 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 as follows:

#### Category A Projects – Well implemented, completed projects

This category was for CDF projects which had scored above 50% on the Project Technical Assessment Form (Annex 4)<sup>2</sup>, 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 CDF projects which had scored less than 50% on the Project Technical 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, ongoing projects

This category was for CDF projects which had scored above 50% on the Project Technical 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 ongoing.

#### 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 CDF Act provides for continuous allocation to projects until completion.

#### Category E Projects – Ghost projects

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

---

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

<sup>2</sup> The Regional 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) Technical assessment of overall quality of construction and finish (10 marks).

### **Category F Projects – Reallocated Funds**

This category was for CDF projects that were not implemented for the reason that the funds were reallocated to other projects and with authority from the CDF Board in accordance with the CDF Act.

### **5. Comments and Review**

Following the elaborate process of compiling the Citizen's Report Card, the NTA developed a draft report of the findings. This report was then sent to the area Member of Parliament (copied to the CDF Board) for his/her comments (see letter in Annex 5). The MP was given a period of one month to comment on the draft report. In cases where the NTA did not receive any communication a reminder letter was sent at the end of week four. If the NTA had no comments by the end of week six then the draft CDF CRC was processed for publishing.


In response to comments from the NTA, a number of MPs requested a meeting to discuss our findings or sent letters with comments. The NTA considered all comments and made changes in the draft CDF CRC where we had adequate supporting documentation.


# Annex 1


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


## Member of Parliament


2002 - 2007	Hon. Nicholas K. Biwott
2008 - 2012	Hon. Jackson K. Kiptanui


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/02/2007-08				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Kamelil Primary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 2 classrooms				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Marichor East				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	17/8/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	650,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	650,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<p><b>Comments:</b> The construction and workmanship were neatly done. Implementation was within time and the set budget. Good quality materials were used and the finishing and painting well done. The fascia board was well fixed and painted. The community proposed the project and participated in its implementation. It reflects good value for taxpayer's money.</p>					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/03/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Chepkorio Primary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 1 classroom				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Marichor West				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	17/8/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	200,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	200,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	83%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<p><b>Comments:</b> The ECD classroom is complete and in use. It was finished within time and budget. The materials used were of sound quality. The fascia board and building were well painted. Good workmanship was exhibited in the construction. The community is happy with project implementation since funds allocated were well spent.</p>					

<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/05/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Nyaru Community Centre				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of community centre				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Nyaru				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	17/8/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	900,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	900,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<p><b>Comments:</b> The project that was well implemented with very good finishing. Work was carried out in good time and within budget. The materials used were of good quality. Painting was professionally done on both the building and fascia board. The community was involved and is happy with implementation.</p>					


<b>Project Number</b>	KN/CDF/07/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Kipsaina Primary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of administration block				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Nyaru				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	17/8/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	350,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	350,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<p><b>Comments:</b> The project was a well constructed ;the verandah is well supported with support columns. The materials used were of standard quality. The fascia board was fitted on the front &amp; back only. Generally the project was well implemented and reflects value for the funds allocated.</p>					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/12/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Kaptarkok Primary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Completion of 2 classrooms & Administration block				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kaptarakwa				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	17/8/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	250,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	250,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The construction was done with regard to the bills of quantity, within time and budget. The work done corresponds to the funds allocated. The overall workmanship was good. The community was involved in selection and implementation.					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/06/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Kapsamich Primary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 2 classrooms				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Marichor East				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	17/8/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	650,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	650,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The classrooms were completed and are in use. The materials used were of good quality with good finishing although there is no fascia board. The community proposed the project and participated in its implementation. The workmanship displayed was fair.					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/09/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Rural Electrification				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Mutwo Kapserto Village				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kitany				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	23/4/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	300,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	300,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> This electrification project was completed and area residents are now supplied with electricity. They can easily access the power network and were involved in the selection & implementation. The implementation was within time and budget and the community is benefiting from it.					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/11/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Cherorget Simit Road				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Marruming & Road maintenance				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Soy				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	17/8/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	500,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	500,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The project entailed road construction and marruming of the Cherorget Simit road. The works carried out were of standard quality. The murrum used was of standard quality and the community is happy with the project. This project reflects good value for the money allocated.					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/13/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Chekobei Primary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 2 classrooms				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kibargoi				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	19/8/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	300,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	300,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The classrooms were well constructed and completed within time and the set budget. The walls were well constructed, verandah with support columns and external wall finishing was well done. The roof was well erected but there is no fascia board. The project was well implemented and is in use.					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/19/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Rural Electrification				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Maoi Electrification				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Maoi				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	23/8/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	500,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	500,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> This rural electrification was done in time and within budget. A transformer was installed and cable network well laid. The community proposed the project and own it. They have access to electricity supply and the project generally reflects good value for the funds allocated.					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/18/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Kiptchorwa Primary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 2 classrooms				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kapkwoni				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	23/8/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	200,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	200,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	73%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The workmanship is good. The finishing both inside and outside was well done. The fascia board was well fitted and painted. Steel windows and doors were fitted with glass. The project was well constructed and the community involved.					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/20/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Flax Boarding Primary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 2 classrooms				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Marichor West				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	23/8/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	200,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	200,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	76%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The construction of the classrooms was done according to the bills of quantity and the community is happy with its implementation. The project has a raised verandah with support columns. The workmanship and painting was good and a fascia board fitted. It represents good value for money for the taxpayer.					

<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/21/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Kombatich Primary		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 2 classrooms		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kamwosor		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	23/8/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	300,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	300,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		<b>Category</b> A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	78%		<b>Project Status</b> Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The materials used in construction are of standard quality. The walls and floor were well done. The project has a verandah although the fascia board was not fitted. The project is well implemented and within budget. The classrooms are serving the community.			


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/23/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Chepsamoo Water Project		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of Water Tank & Piping		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Mosop		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	10/10/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	600,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	600,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		<b>Category</b> A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	70%		<b>Project Status</b> Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> Construction of water tank and laying of pipes were completed within time and budget. The workmanship was good and materials used are of good quality. The community is supplied with water. The funds allocated were put to good use.			

<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/27/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Kaptilile Water Project		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of Water Tank & Piping		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kaptarakwa		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	10/10/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		<b>Category</b> A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	70%		<b>Project Status</b> Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The laying of underground pipes and tank construction were well done and completed within time and budget. Materials used were of good quality. The workmanship was also good and the community is happy with its implementation since they are now supplied with water.			


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/22/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Rural Electrification		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Kapkomol/Torok Electrification		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kitany		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	10/10/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	300,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	300,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		<b>Category</b> A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%		<b>Project Status</b> Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> Electrification was successfully undertaken and completed within the set budget. The power cables were well installed and the community is able to enjoy reliable electricity supply.			

<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/26/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Kapkee Water Project		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of water tank & piping		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kaptarakwa		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	10/10/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	450,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	450,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		<b>Category</b> A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	70%		<b>Project Status</b> Complete and in use


**Comments:** Construction of the water tank and piping was completed within time and budget. The workmanship was fair and the community is supplied with water from the tank. It reflects good value for the money allocated.

<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/28/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Kitany Water Project		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of water Tank & Piping		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kitany		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	10/10/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	200,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	200,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		<b>Category</b> A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%		<b>Project Status</b> Complete and in use


**Comments:** Materials used in constructing this tank were of good quality. The external finishing and rough cast was professionally done and all the pipes laid well. This water project was completed within time and budget. The community is also happy with the project management and implementation.


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/31/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Kiptabach Primary		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of Administration block and electrical wiring		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kocholwo		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	9/10/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	200,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	200,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		<b>Category</b> A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%		<b>Project Status</b> Complete and in use


**Comments:** The workmanship displayed was good. The project entailed construction of an administration block and wiring which were well done. The materials were of good quality and work was completed within time and budget. It is value for the funds allocated


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/33/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Tugumoi Secondary		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 2 classrooms		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Metkei		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	8/10/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	350,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	350,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		<b>Category</b> A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	70%		<b>Project Status</b> Complete and in use


**Comments:** Construction was done within time and budget. The finishes are fair. For the funds allocated the work done is good value for money. The windows were fitted with glass though there is no fascia board.


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/35/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Ketigoi Primary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 2 classrooms				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Maoi				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	12/10/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	700,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	700,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The workmanship displayed was fair, the roof was well erected though it doesn't have a fascia board. The materials used were of standard quality. Implementation was within time and budget and the community is happy with the project.					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/30/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Enego Primary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 3 classrooms				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kocholwo				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	9/10/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	1,000,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	1,000,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The classrooms have a well constructed verandah with support columns. Steel windows and doors were fitted with glass and the roof well erected. Painting was fairly done but not on the fascia board. Project was completed in time and building materials used were of good quality. The community was involved in selection and implementation.					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/32/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Kabirirsus Primary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 3 classrooms				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Metkei				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	8/10/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	400,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	400,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> Workmanship was good. The roof was well done although there is no fascia board. The windows were fitted with glass and verandah well constructed with support columns. The community proposed the project and are happy with its implementation since pupils are able to learn in a friendly environment.					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/37/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Tambul Primary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of Administration block				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Tumeiyo				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	8/10/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	200,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	200,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> For the funds allocated the project is value for money. Excellent workmanship is displayed in construction and finishes. The paint was well applied both on the building and fascia board. Implementation was within budget. The community proposed the project and were involved in its implementation. It is good value for taxpayer's money.					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/43/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Biwott Mixed Secondary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 2 classrooms				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kitany				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	20/8/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	650,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	650,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	70%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The classrooms were well constructed and within time and budget. The workmanship displayed was fair though the roof would have been done better. The verandah is well constructed with support columns. There is no fascia board. The community was involved in the selection of the project.					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/38./2007-08				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Samabul Primary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Completion of 2 classrooms				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kabiemit				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	8/10/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	250,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	250,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> This is another project that was well implemented. The workmanship is excellent and finishing professionally done. The windows are of good dimension and a painted fascia board is in place. Work was carried out in accordance to the bills of quantity and implementation done within time and budget. The project is value for money for the community.					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/42/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Kipsanai Primary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of Administration block				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Nyaru				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	17/8/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	350,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	350,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The administration block was well constructed within time and budget. Materials used were found to be of good quality after technical assessment. The roof was well fixed although there is no fascia board. The community proposed the project and were dully involved in its implementation.					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/45/2007-08				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Chepkosom Primary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 4 classrooms				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Tumeiyo				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	20/8/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	700,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	700,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	70%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The external wall finishing for this project was excellent. Workmanship displayed in construction is good. The roof was well erected with treated timber. A painted fascia board is in place and the windows are of good dimension. Implementation was within time and budget. The project is good value for money for the taxpayer.					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/49/2007-08		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Kipsaos Secondary		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of water tank & piping		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kapkwoni		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	23/8/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	450,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	450,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	80%	<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The construction of water tank was done to standard quality and within budget and piping was well done. The materials used were of standard quality. Students and the surrounding community are able to access clean and reliable water supply.			


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/04/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Koptega secondary school.		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Installation of water tank.		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Marichor west.		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	27/01/2011		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	500,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	500,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	55%	<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The project was well implemented as the installation of the water tank is complete and the community is enjoying the service. Good value for taxpayers money.			


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/24/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Korober Water Project				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of Drawing area & Piping				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Chepsigot				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	13/10/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	500,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	500,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	B
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	30%			<b>Project Status</b>	Ongoing and not in use
<b>Comments:</b> This is a co-funded project. CDF funded only the construction of the water intake which has already been constructed and 142 pipes which are on the site. The work is not ongoing because the other partner KVDA and ministry of works have not implemented their part					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/36/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Werep Primary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 3 classrooms				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Metkei				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	8/10/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	2,250,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	2,250,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	B
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	48%			<b>Project Status</b>	Ongoing and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The project is ongoing and well constructed. Roofing has been well done though there is no fascia board. Although the implementation is within time, the money spent is too much for three classroom.					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/34/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Tugumoi Primary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 2 classrooms				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Metkei				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	8/10/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	210,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	210,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	B
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	23%			<b>Project Status</b>	Incomplete and not in use
<b>Comments:</b> By the time of assessment, the project was abandoned and the workmanship is very poor. No proper explanation was given as to why the project was abandoned. There is no value for taxpayer's money and we recommend action to ensure work is completed or funds recovered.					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/25/2007-08.				
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South				
<b>Project Name</b>	Kitany Community Centre				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of Community Centre				
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kitany				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	10/10/2010				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	900,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	900,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-			<b>Category</b>	B
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	47%			<b>Project Status</b>	Ongoing and not in use
<b>Comments:</b> The project is not complete, the floor and the wall have not been plastered. The doors and the windows are not of good quality; most windows have no window panes because of poor fitting.					


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/44/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Chepketeret Primary		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 3 classrooms		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kabiemit		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	20/8/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	650,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	650,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-	<b>Category</b>	B
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	45%	<b>Project Status</b>	Incomplete and not in use
<b>Comments:</b> This project is poorly implemented. The funds allocated were not sufficient to construct and finish the 3 classrooms but the workmanship is very poor. . The implementation is also behind schedule. The project is not good value for the taxpayers.			


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/41/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Metkei Girls		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Dormitory construction		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Matkei.		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	23/8/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	1,000,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	1,000,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		<b>Category</b> C
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	57%		<b>Project Status</b> Ongoing and not in use
<b>Comments:</b> This is a well implemented project as good quality materials are being used and the workmanship is also impressive. There was community participation as parents also contributed an additional 1 million towards the project.			


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/40/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Kapsowek Primary		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Dormitory construction		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Maoi		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	23/8/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	1,200,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	1,200,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		<b>Category</b> C
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	56%		<b>Project Status</b> Ongoing and not in use
<b>Comments:</b> The funds allocated were insufficient to construct and complete the entire project. The work done so far is commensurate to funds allocated but the CDF should consider allocating more funds to the project to complete it.			


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/16/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Luguitany water project		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of water tank & piping		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Chemoibon		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	19/8/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	400,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	400,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		<b>Category</b> C
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	66%		<b>Project Status</b> Ongoing and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The workmanship in construction was good although it was under funded and there were delays in funds disbursement. The work done so far is good though the project is behind schedule. Its implementation should be speeded up to ensure the community fully enjoys the facility.			


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/47/2007-08		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Kipsaos Primary		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Dormitory construction		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kapkwoni		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	23/8/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	1,700,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	1,700,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		<b>Category</b> C
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	60%		<b>Project Status</b> Ongoing and not in use
<b>Comments:</b> This project has good support columns. The fascia board has been fitted and painted. The roof was professionally erected. Steel windows and doors have been fitted but the glasses are yet to be fixed. Implementation was within budget and the materials used are of good quality. The community is happy with its implementation and it reflects good value for money for the taxpayer.			


<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/14/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Rockchocho Primary		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 4 classrooms		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kibargoi		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	19/8/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	1,000,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	1,000,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		<b>Category</b> C
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	63%		<b>Project Status</b> Ongoing and in use
<b>Comments:</b> This project has been well implemented with good workmanship displayed to the roof level. The materials used are good quality. Work is ongoing and once completed it will be good value for money for the community. So far the implementation has been impressive and reflects good value for funds allocated.			

<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/01/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	St. Joseph Kipsaina Seco.		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Laboratory Construction		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Nyaru		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	17/8/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	500,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	500,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		<b>Category</b> C
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	70%		<b>Project Status</b> Ongoing and in use
<b>Comments:</b> Laboratory construction has been well executed even though the funds allocated were not sufficient to complete the project. Steel windows and doors have been fitted. The effort towards good workmanship were noted and the materials used in construction were of good quality. The community was involved in selection and implementation of the project.			

<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/15/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Emsea Primary		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of administration block and library		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kibargoi		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	19/8/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	200,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	200,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		<b>Category</b> C
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	50%		<b>Project Status</b> Ongoing and not in use
<b>Comments:</b> This project was very well implemented given the insufficient funding. Construction is ongoing with windows, doors being fitted. Workmanship and materials used are of good quality. More funds should be mobilized to finish the otherwise good project.			

<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/29/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Turesia Dispensary		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Dispensary construction		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Soy		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	9/10/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	2,000,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	2,000,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		<b>Category</b> C
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	50%		<b>Project Status</b> Ongoing and not in use
<b>Comments:</b> This project though well constructed has taken time and is behind schedule. The workmanship is excellent and materials used are good quality. The fascia board is fitted and painted. The design is also impressive. The project should be completed to ensure citizens fully benefit from its implementation. It is good value for the funds allocated.			

<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/39/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Kipkabus Forest Primary		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 1 Classroom		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kabiemit		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	8/10/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	350,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	350,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	50%	<b>Project Status</b>	Ongoing and not in use
<b>Comments:</b> The classroom is well constructed using good quality materials. The workmanship is also impressive. The project requires more funds.			

<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/10/2007-08.		
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Lelboinet Secondary		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Library construction		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Marichor East		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	23/8/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	1,270,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	1,270,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	-		
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	53%	<b>Project Status</b>	Ongoing and not in use
<b>Comments:</b> So far the project has been well done as good quality materials have been used. The project is taking too long to complete and the community is not happy with the slow pace of implementations. The community donated timber towards the implementation of the project.			

<b>Project Number</b>	KS/CDF/017/2007-08.	?	
<b>Constituency</b>	Keiyo South		
<b>Project Name</b>	Kipsaos Dispensary		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Dispensary construction		
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kapkwoni		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	23/8/2010		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	300,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	500,000	<b>Category</b>	E
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	N/A	<b>Project Status</b>	Does not exist
<b>Comments:</b> There is court dispute over land where the project is to be located; kshs.300,00 re-allocated to another project but kshs.500,000 is claimed to have been spent on non-existing project.			

**Annex 2**  
**CDF/LATF Project Rapid Assessment Form**

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

Constituency Name		Location	
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 (October 2010) Kshs.	
--	--

Total Other Funds Spent to date (October 2010) Kshs. (NGOs, CBOs, FBOs, Private Sector, etc.)	
--	--

Total Funds Spent to date (October 2010) 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 3

## 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 4

### Technical Project Assessment Form

<b>Project Score (Out of 100)</b>	%	<b>Project No.</b>	
<b>Project Type (LATF/CDF)</b>		<b>Project No.</b>	

<b>Project Name</b>		<b>Constituency Name</b>	
---------------------	--	--------------------------	--

<b>District Name</b>		<b>Location / Ward Name</b>	
----------------------	--	-----------------------------	--

Area	Out of 10	Justify the score you gave with explanation below (write clearly and neatly)
<b>(1) Quality of materials used</b>		
<b>(2) Project completion status -- on time/within budget?</b>		
<b>(3) Project cost – does it represent value for money</b>		
<b>Total (total the marks given out of 30, then list %)</b>		<b>What is your overall recommendation (circle one answer)</b> 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.**

<b>Name of technical reviewer:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Signature of technical reviewer:</b>	<b>Time:</b>



November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

Hon. Jackson Kiplagat,  
MP. Keiyo South Constituency,  
National Assembly,  
Nairobi.

Dear Hon. Kiplagat,

**RE: KEIYO SOUTH CDF CONSTITUENCY CITIZEN REPORT CARD**

The National Taxpayers Association (NTA) is a national, independent and non-partisan organization committed to working in partnership with the government and other stakeholders to promote transparency, effectiveness and accountability in the use of government resources. The NTA is currently compiling and disseminating Citizens' Report Cards on the provision of services and the management of devolved funds in constituencies and local authorities across Kenya. On 6<sup>th</sup> April 2010, the NTA published 22 Citizen Report Cards on the management of CDF in 22 constituencies in all eight provinces.

In Phase 3 of the NTA's national CDF monitoring programme an additional 33 constituencies were selected and audited, one of which is the constituency you represent. In honor of your esteemed office as the representative of Keiyo South constituency, the NTA herein encloses a draft copy of the Keiyo South Constituency CDF Citizens' Report Card for your comments and feedback prior to printing and dissemination through a formal launch.

Please call Mr. Martin Napisa on 0734500940 at the NTA Secretariat to arrange a meeting to discuss the draft CRC or send written comments to the NTA Secretariat. Kindly note that lack of feedback by Wednesday December, 8<sup>th</sup>, 2010 on the draft CRC will be considered as a confirmation of the report and we shall proceed with the printing and dissemination through a formal launch.

We look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours Faithfully,

**Kizito Wangalwa,  
National Coordinator,  
National Taxpayers Association (NTA)**

C.C. Ms. Agnes Odhiambo  
Chief Executive Officer  
CDF Coordination Board  
Harambee Co-operative Plaza, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Nairobi.

The NTA is a national, volunteer-based, independent and non-partisan organization established to improve the delivery of services and the management of devolved funds for the benefit of all Kenyans.

NTA is a citizen initiative currently steered by the following National Governing Council members: Kenya Private Sector Alliance (KEPSA) - Chair, National Informal Sector Coalition (NISCO) - Vice Chair, Institute of Certified Public Accountants of Kenya (ICPAK) - Treasurer, Centre for Governance and Development (CGD) - Secretary, Kenya Female Advisory Organization (KEFEADO) - Deputy Secretary, Supreme Council of Kenya Muslims (SUPKEM) - Member, Kenya Private Sector Network (KPSA Network) - Member, African Woman and Child Feature Service (AWCFS) - Member, United Business Association (UBA) - Member, Catholic Justice & Peace Commission (CJPC), Kenya Alliance of Resident Associations (KARA) and Transparency International Kenya (TI-K) - Member.

National Taxpayers Association, P.O. Box 4037-00506, Nairobi, Kenya. Tel: 020-3861813/4. Website: www.nta.or.ke