Citizen's Local Authority Transfer Fund Report Card for

Dujis Constituency, Garissa District

© National Taxpayers Association
January, 2009

This publication was made possible through support provided by the Department for International Development (DfID), Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) and German Technical Cooperation (GTZ).

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 His Worship the Mayor and the ward councillors	1
	Summary findings from NTA Audit of LATF Projects in Dujis Constituency	2
4.0	Challenges in undertaking this work	3
5.0	NTA Research Methodology	3
	Annex 1: Project profiles and digital photographs for all LATF projects visited and assessed	
	• Dujis Constituency	6 - 8
	Annex 2: CDF/LATF Project Rapid Assessment Form	9
	Annex 3: CDF/LATF Project Users Questionnaire	10
	Annex 4: Technical Project Assessment Form	12

1.0 Introduction

- This Citizen Report Card (CRC) has been researched and published by the National Taxpayers Association (NTA) to sensitize citizens, elected officials, and civil society organisations on the management of devolved funds, and the provision of district services.
- The publication has been developed by the NTA Secretariat and Regional NTA staff.
- 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 committed to working with the Government of Kenya to improve service delivery at the district level and the management of devolved funds.
- The NTA assessed all CDF/LATF projects funded in the financial year (FY) 2006-07 in 23 constituencies and 8 municipalities in 8 districts[1] across all provinces.
- This report presents the findings from research in Dujis Constituency, Garissa district.

2.0 Executive Summary

- A summary of the main findings from the NTA research in Dujis Constituency are listed below.
- Project profiles and digital photographs of all LATF projects visited and assessed are listed in Annex 1.
- The key findings are as follows:

Kshs. 800,000 of taxpayer's money has been wasted, due to badly built, complete and incomplete projects

8% of the total CDF funds awarded in FY 2006-07 were on badly implemented projects

3.0 Recommendations for His Worship the Mayor and the ward councillors

1. Complete all incomplete LATF projects as soon as possible.
2. Trace and fully account for all missing funds.
3. Reduce by 100% badly built LATF projects in FY 08-09.
4. Make available all records of LATF projects, plus Bills of Quantities.

[1] These are Garissa, Garissa, Mombasa, Nyeri, Garissa, Kisumu, Busia and Machakos districts.

Table 3: Summary Findings from NTA Audit of LATF Projects in Dujis Constituency

Category	Project Assessment Classification	No. of Projects	Budget Awarded	Budget Spent	Budget Unaccounted For
			Kshs.	Kshs.	Kshs.
A	**Well built, complete projects -** good quality construction, good value for money for taxpayer's	**2**	1,978,213	1,978,213	-
B	**Badly built, complete and incomplete projects -** poor quality construction, money wasted, poor value for money	**1**	800,000	800,000	-
C	**Well built, incomplete projects -** project not yet complete, being built in phases, so far well built	**2**	7,195,233	7,195,233	-
D	**Abandoned Projects** - projects are incomplete and not funded in the last year, taxpayer's money is wasted	-	-	-	-
E	**Ghost projects** - officially allocated funds, but project does not physically exist	-	-	-	-
F	**Missing funds** - funds awarded are higher than what the project location had actually spent	-	-	-	-
Total		**5**	**9,973,446**	**9,973,446**	**-**

Main Findings	Summary of Funds (Kshs.)	% of Total
Total Money Badly Used (B Projects)	**800,000**	**8%**
Total Money Wasted (D Projects)	-	-
Budget Unaccounted for	-	-

4.0 Challenges in undertaking this work

4.1 Inadequate/ lack of access to information from government offices

- In some instances, custodians of information were blatantly uncooperative, especially in cases where project implementation was suspicious. While in other cases, relevant information was hidden by the fund managers and the users for fear of victimisation and other unexplained reasons.

4.2 Threats from those managing devolved funds

- These threats raise concerns on security of the field officers whose lives are put at risk.

4.3 Joint funding and multiple financing of projects

- In some instances, projects recieved funding from non state actors, in addition to funds awarded by CDF/LATF. This made categorization of such projects difficult.

5.0 NTA Research Methodology

The research methodology involved the following stages and methods.

5.1 Secondary Data Collection and Analysis

NTA Research Officers held a series of meetings with district and constituency officials to collect information on CDF/LATF projects funded in FY 2006-07.

5.2 Project Site Visit and Rapid Assessment, and User Interviews

NTA Research Officers visited all CDF/LATF projects funded in FY 2006-07. At each project site they:

(i) took digital photographs of the project;

(ii) interviewed project users living around the project, using a structured CDF/LATF Project Users Questionnaire (see Annex 3); and,

(iii) undertook a rapid assessment of the project using a structured questionnaire called CDF/LATF Project Rapid Assessment Form (see Annex 2)[2].

5.3 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 six categories below:

Category A Projects – Well built, complete projects

- This category is for CDF/LATF projects which scored <u>above</u> 15 marks out of 30 on the Project Rapid Assessment Form (Annex 2)[3], 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 built, complete and incomplete projects

- This category is for CDF/LATF projects which scored <u>less than</u> 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 received.

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

[3] The 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).

Category C Projects – Well built, incomplete projects

- This category is for CDF/LATF projects which scored above 15 marks out of 30 on the Project Rapid Assessment Form, and were well built but incomplete, i.e. money was used to build something useful and of good quality, but the infrastructure was incomplete.

Category D Projects - Abandoned Projects

- This category is for CDF/LATF projects which are incomplete and not funded in the last financial year, thus taxpayer's money wasted.

Category E Projects – Ghost projects

- This category is for CDF/LATF projects which had been officially allocated funds but the project did not physically exist, i.e. it was a ghost project.

Category F Projects – Missing funds

- This category is for CDF/LATF projects where the funds awarded was higher than what the project received and spent, e.g. a school was officially awarded Kshs. 600,000 for classrooms and it only received and spent Kshs. 200,000.

5.4 Desk-based Independent Technical Assessment and Strategic Visits

At this stage the 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; (iii) scoring projects out of 30 marks[4] and, (iv) classification of all projects into one of the six categories above (See Annex 4 for the Technical Assessment form).

5.5 Desk-based Analysis and Final Project Classification

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

[4] Projects were scored out of 30 marks covering: (i) quality of materials used: (ii) project completion status - on time/within budget?; (iii) project cost - does the project represent value for money?

Annex 1

Project profiles and digital photographs for all LATF projects visited and assessed

Project Number	016	
Constituency	Dujis	
Project Name	Boulargi Primary School	
Project Activity	Construction of two class-rooms	
Location/Ward	Boulargi	
Councillors Name	Mr. Abdi Sirat Abdirabe	
Project Status	Completed and in use	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	1,030,934.40	
Total Funds Spent to Date	1,030,934.40	
Total Unaccounted Funds	Nil	
Technical Performance Score	77%	
Project Classification	A	
Comments	The classrooms were structurally very sound with fine finishing.	

Project Number	022	
Constituency	Dujis	
Project Name	Danyere Pry. School	
Project Activity	Renovation of four Class-rooms	
Location/Ward	Danyere	
Councillors Name	Mr. Abdi Sirat Abdirabe	
Project Status	Completed and in use	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	947,279	
Total Funds Spent to Date	947,279	
Total Unaccounted Funds	Nil	
Technical Performance Score	70%	
Project Classification	A	
Comments	The renovation of the 4 classrooms was well done with the painting, fixing of the doors and the rehabilitation of the floor.	

Project Number	018	
Constituency	Dujis	
Project Name	Modika Primary School	
Project Activity	Supplying 800 Desks and Seats	
Location/Ward	Sankuri	
Councillors Name	Mr. Abdi Sirat Abdirabe	
Project Status	Completed and in use	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	800,000	
Total Funds Spent to Date	800,000	
Total Unaccounted Funds	Nil	
Technical Performance Score	50%	
Project Classification	B	
Comments	The desk and seats are sub standard with poor timber quality and rough surface. The writing surface of the desk is too narrow for a book and student find it hard to write on it comfortably.	

Project Number	002	
Constituency	Dujis	
Project Name	Engine for Korakora	
Project Activity	Installation of water pump engine for irrigation at Khadija farm	
Location/Ward	Korakora	
Councillors Name	Mr. Abdi Sirat Abdirabe	
Project Status	Incomplete	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	692,500	
Total Funds Spent to Date	692,500	
Total Unaccounted Funds	Nil	
Technical Performance Score	N/A%	
Project Classification	C	
Comments	Though the engine pump and the pipes were bought it has not yet been installed pending survey by the officials of ministry of Agriculture and irrigation so that they can advice where the engine should be installed.	

Project Number	042	
Constituency	Dujis	
Project Name	Extension of Balich Primary School	
Project Activity	Construction of four classrooms and an Administration Block	
Location/Ward	Sankuri	
Councillors Name	Mr. Abdi Sirat Abdirabe	
Project Status	Incomplete	
Total Funds Awarded to Date	6,502,733.34	
Total Funds Spent to Date	6,502,733.34	
Total Unaccounted Funds	Nil	
Technical Performance Score	60%	
Project Classification	C	
Comments	The 4 classrooms and the Administration block are structurally sound and remain with minor finishes to be completed. The school though lack fence around its compound.	

Annex 2
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	

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 2008) Kshs.	

Total Other Funds Spent to date (April 2008) Kshs. (NGOs, CBOs, FBOs, Private Sector, etc.)	

Total Funds Spent to date (April 2008) 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/LATF Project Users Questionnaire

Quest. No.:

Name of DMO	

Instructions for DMO

- 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.
- DMOs 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. DMO -- 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/LATF projects?	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
29. DMO 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

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 has been well implemented and looks as though there is good value for money for the community. 2. Project has not been well 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: