

# Citizen's Local Authority Transfer Fund Report Card for Makueni County Council Makueni 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>3.0</b>	<b>Recommendations for the County Clerk and Chairperson of the council</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>Table 1: Summary of Findings from NTA Audit of LATF 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 LATF projects visited and assessed in the Financial Year (FY) 2007-08</b>	
	<b>Category A projects</b>	<b>9 - 11</b>
	<b>Category B projects</b>	<b>12 - 13</b>
	<b>Category D projects</b>	<b>13</b>
	<b>Annex 2: LATF Project Rapid Assessment Form</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>Annex 3: LATF Project Users' Questionnaire</b>	<b>15</b>
	<b>Annex 4: Technical Project Assessment Form</b>	<b>17</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 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 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.
- This Citizen's Report Card presents findings from research in Makueni County Council. The report covers one government Financial Year 2007/08.
- 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

- The main findings from NTAs research in Makueni County Council 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 in Financial Year 2007/2008 are as follows:

### **Kshs. 1,600,000 of taxpayers' money has been wasted on abandoned projects**

13% of the total CDF funds allocated to the monitored projects in FY 2007-08 were abandoned projects

**3.1 Recommendations for the County Clerk and Chairperson of the council.**

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

**Table 2: Summary of Findings from NTA Audit of LATF Projects (FY) 2007-08 in Makueni County Council**

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’.	12	8,150,000	8,150,000	-
C	<b>Well built, ongoing projects</b> - project not yet complete, being built in phases, so far well built	5	2,800,000	2,800,000	-
D	<b>Abandoned Projects</b> - projects are incomplete and did not receive financial allocation in the subsequent Financial Year.	3	1,600,000	1,600,000	-
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>12,550,000</b>	<b>12,550,000</b>	<b>-</b>

Main Findings	Summary of Funds (Kshs.)	% of Total
<b>Total Money Badly Used</b> (B Projects)	-	-
<b>Total Money Wasted</b> (D Projects)	<b>1,600,000</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>Budget Unaccounted For</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 LATF projects funded in FY 2007/08.

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

NTA Regional Officer 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 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 LATF 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 LATF 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 LATF 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 LATF Act provides for continuous allocation to projects until completion.

#### Category E Projects – Ghost projects

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


# 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


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/02/07-08				
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council				
<b>Project Name</b>	Kyanginywa secondary school				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of administration block				
<b>Ward</b>	Kikumbulyu				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	13.01.2011				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	400,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	400,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0			<b>Project Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	88%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The project was co-funded by Makueni county council and Parents Teachers Association. The materials used are of good quality and the workmanship is commendable. The structure has improved working environment for the school teachers.					


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/04/07-08				
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council				
<b>Project Name</b>	Kambo drift				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of a drift				
<b>Ward</b>	Makindu				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	13.01.2011				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	800,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	800,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0			<b>Project Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	56%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The drift has made it easy crossing of Kambo seasonal river by vehicles and other means of transport, which was a problem during the rain season. Materials of good quality have been used and the workmanship is good.					


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/07/07-08				
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council				
<b>Project Name</b>	Kiteng'ei secondary school				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of a classroom				
<b>Ward</b>	Mtito andei east				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	15.01.2011				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	400,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	400,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0			<b>Project Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	77%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The materials used are of high quality and the workmanship exhibited is commendable. The classroom has helped the recently established school to grow in terms of facilities and student intake.					


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/08/07-08				
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council				
<b>Project Name</b>	Ngwata dispensary				
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of maternity				
<b>Ward</b>	Mtito Andei east				
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	15.01.2011				
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	400,000				
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	400,000				
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0			<b>Project Category</b>	A
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	69%			<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and not in use
<b>Comments:</b> The project was initiated by the community up to the window level. Materials from makueni local authority were used to complete the construction. The structure is well constructed, fitted with metallic door and window frames. Good workmanship is exhibited. The facility is not operational due to lack of equipment to support maternity services.					

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/13/07-08		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council		
<b>Project Name</b>	Mavindini health centre		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of a special clinical ward		
<b>Ward</b>	Mavindini		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	08.02.2011		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0		<b>Project Category</b> A
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	72%		<b>Project Status</b> Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The facility was well constructed with good quality materials used. The workmanship is commendable. It's serving the community well as they have access to basic health care services. The project was implemented with funds meant for Muusini dispensary which was later funded by LATF as planned.			


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/14/07-08		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council		
<b>Project Name</b>	Harambee earth dam		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of a check dam		
<b>Ward</b>	Mavindini		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	08.02.2011		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	250,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	250,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0		<b>Project Category</b> A
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	76%		<b>Project Status</b> Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The construction of the check dam which was well executed, was important to protect the main dam from rapid siltation and damage from high speed flowing water. The project was well done.			

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/15/07-08		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council		
<b>Project Name</b>	Maseve sand dam/drift		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of a special clinic ward		
<b>Ward</b>	Kalawa		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	08.02.2011		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0		<b>Project Category</b> A
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	70%		<b>Project Status</b> Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The drift has improved transportation across the seasonal river. The materials used are of good quality and the workmanship is excellent. The project has improved transportation and communication in the area.			


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/16/07-08		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council		
<b>Project Name</b>	ABC kakuli primary school		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 2 classrooms		
<b>Ward</b>	Katangini		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	08.02.2011		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	400,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	400,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0		<b>Project Category</b> A
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	84%		<b>Project Status</b> Complete and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The classrooms were well constructed with good quality materials used. The workmanship exhibited is standard. The classrooms have helped reduce congestion of pupils during learning sessions. The parents participated in the project implementation by providing sand, ballast, water and unskilled labour.			

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/10/07-08		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council		
<b>Project Name</b>	Kyuasini youth polytechnic		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 2 classrooms		
<b>Ward</b>	Ukia/Iuani		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	07.02.2011		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0		<b>Project Category</b> A
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	87%		<b>Project Status</b> Complete and not in use


**Comments:** The community participated in the project implementation by providing sand, water and unskilled labour. Materials provided were of good quality and the workmanship is excellent. The facility is not in use due to lack of basic tools and equipment.

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/12/07-08		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council		
<b>Project Name</b>	Kwakalui dispensary		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Completion of the dispensary		
<b>Ward</b>	Kalamba		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	07.02.2011		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0		<b>Project Category</b> A
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	76%		<b>Project Status</b> Complete and not in use


**Comments:** The dispensary construction was initiated by the community up to the wall level. LATF funds were used in roofing, flooring, plastering, fitting metallic doors and window frames and painting the building. A verandah was also constructed. Materials used are of high quality and the workmanship is good.


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/17/07-08		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council		
<b>Project Name</b>	Watema - ndumani drift		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of a drift		
<b>Ward</b>	Watema/Kee		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	09.01.2011		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0		<b>Project Category</b> A
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	86%		<b>Project Status</b> Complete and in use


**Comments:** The drift has made transportation of people and goods across the river easier especially when it rains and the river floods. High quality materials were used and good workmanship is evident.


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/18/07-08		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council		
<b>Project Name</b>	Nunguni market shed		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of a shed		
<b>Ward</b>	Kithembe		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	09.01.2011		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	1,500,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	1,500,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0		<b>Project Category</b> A
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	90%		<b>Project Status</b> Complete and in use


**Comments:** The project was co-funded by makueni county council and Danish international development agency (DANIDA). The market was well implemented with high quality materials and good workmanship exhibited. The project has enabled traders to sell their wares in a place devoid of direct sunlight and rain.


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/11/07-08		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council		
<b>Project Name</b>	Kithoni water project		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Electricity installation, fencing & purchase of 2 water tanks		
<b>Ward</b>	Ukia / Iuani		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	07.02.2011		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	400,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	400,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0		<b>Project Category</b> C
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	64%		<b>Project Status</b> Ongoing and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The fencing is well done with good quality materials, the plastic tanks were well installed; placed on a concrete base. The electricity is yet to be installed to the facility despite connection fee having been paid to KPLC.			


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/20/07-08		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council		
<b>Project Name</b>	Malaa secondary school		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of a laboratory		
<b>Ward</b>	Tulimani		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	10.02.2011		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0		<b>Project Category</b> C
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	67%		<b>Project Status</b> Ongoing and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The school lacked a science laboratory and hence proposed the project to enable the students to improve their performance in science subjects. Materials used are of high quality and once complete it will serve the school very well.			


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/05/07-08		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council		
<b>Project Name</b>	Utini polytechnic		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of 2 classrooms		
<b>Ward</b>	Masongaleni		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	15.01.2011		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	400,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	400,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0		<b>Project Category</b> C
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	63%		<b>Project Status</b> Ongoing and not in use
<b>Comments:</b> The community proposed the polytechnic to absorb the local youths to gain technical skills. Materials received from the county council were used to construct two classrooms and the community raised money to construct toilets. The facility is not operational since basic tools and equipment are lacking to commence any meaningful learning.			

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/03/07-08		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council		
<b>Project Name</b>	Yimwaa secondary school		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of laboratory		
<b>Ward</b>	Twaandu		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	13.01.2011		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0		<b>Project Category</b> C
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	65%		<b>Project Status</b> Ongoing and not in use
<b>Comments:</b> The newly established school lacked important facilities like a science laboratory. Even though the construction of the structure is complete, its not equipped with the required equipment for it to function as a laboratory.			

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/01/07-08		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council		
<b>Project Name</b>	Kalungu secondary school		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of administration block		
<b>Ward</b>	Kikumbulyu		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	13.01.2011		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	400,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	400,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0		<b>Project Category</b> C
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	73%		<b>Project Status</b> Ongoing and in use
<b>Comments:</b> The community proposed a new school project in the area since their children walked long distances to get to school. The community through the school management committee of Kalungu primary school received materials from the county council of Makueni, hired a local contractor and participated in implementation. Window panes and external plastering were yet to be done by the time of assessment. The materials used are of good quality and good workmanship is displayed.			

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/06/07-08		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council		
<b>Project Name</b>	Miumoni dispensary		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of dispensary		
<b>Ward</b>	Masongaleni		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	15.01.2011		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	400,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	400,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0		<b>Project Category</b> D
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	68%		<b>Project Status</b> Incomplete and not in use
<b>Comments:</b> The project was meant to provide the community with basic health services. Area residents walk long distances to Kibwezi to access the services. Materials received were not enough to complete the dispensary and make it functional. The dispensary has been in this state for a long period of time.			

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/19/07-08		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council		
<b>Project Name</b>	Maiani dispensary		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of a dispensary		
<b>Ward</b>	Mukaa / kitaingo		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	09.02.2011		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	400,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	400,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0		<b>Project Category</b> D
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	50%		<b>Project Status</b> Incomplete and not in use
<b>Comments:</b> Though available, the doors and windows are yet to be fitted. Plastering and work on the floor have not been done. It is now more than a year since any work was carried out to complete the project. There is no value for money spent on the project.			

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF/M/09/07-08		
<b>Local Authority</b>	Makueni county council		
<b>Project Name</b>	Nthongoni dispensary		
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of maternity		
<b>Ward</b>	Mtito andei west		
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	15.01.2011		
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	800,000		
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	0		<b>Project Category</b> D
<b>Technical Assessment Score</b>	53%		<b>Project Status</b> Incomplete and not in use
<b>Comments:</b> Construction work has stalled, attributed to lack of funds to pay the contractor. The remainder of materials delivered by the County Council of Makueni lie in some of the dispensary rooms. The rooms would otherwise be used to provide health services. The locals will continue travelling long distances to seek maternity services unless the project is completed.			

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

<b>Recommendation (mark one box)</b>	<b>Stage 1 = OK</b>	<b>Stage 2 = Further Investigation</b>	<b>Report No.</b> <span style="border: 1px solid black; display: inline-block; width: 100px; height: 20px; vertical-align: middle;"></span>

<b>Constituency Name</b>		<b>Location</b>	
<b>Project Name</b>		<b>Project Number</b>	
<b>Project Activity</b>		<b>Rural/Urban</b>	
<b>MPs Name (2007)</b>		<b>MPs Name (2008)</b>	

<b>Project Status</b>	<b>Complete</b>		<b>Incomplete/stalled</b>		<b>Ongoing</b>		<b>Does not exist</b>	
-----------------------	-----------------	--	---------------------------	--	----------------	--	-----------------------	--

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

<b>Total LATFFunds Spent to date (April 2009) Kshs.</b>	
---	--

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

<b>Total Funds Spent to date (April 2009) Kshs.</b>	
---	--

<b>LATFProject Manager Name</b>		<b>Contact Nos</b>	
<b>Project Contractor Name</b>		<b>Contact Nos</b>	
<b>Other Contact Person</b>		<b>Contact Nos</b>	

**Field Visit Assessment Information**

<b>Name or general position of people met at project site</b>	
1.	3.
2.	4.

<b>Project Score</b>	<b>Out of 10</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Community participation in selection/com- munity/users satisfaction</b>		
<b>Project completion status -- on time/within budget?</b>		
<b>Visual assessment of overall quality of con- struction and finish</b>		
<b>Total Project Rapid Score (out of 30)</b>		

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

<b>Signature of RO:</b>		<b>Time and Date:</b>	
-------------------------	--	-----------------------	--

### Annex 3

## LATF 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 LATF 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</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>