

Citizen's Constituency Development Fund Report Card for Dagoretti Constituency, Nairobi West District



© National Taxpayers Association
September, 2008

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 Hon. Beth Mugo | 1 |
| | Summary findings from NTA Audit of CDF Projects in Dagoretti Constituency | 2 |
| 4.0 | Challenges in undertaking this work | 3 |
| 5.0 | Challenges in CDF/LATF Implementation | 3 |
| 6.0 | NTA Research Methodology | 3 |
| | Annex 1: Project profiles and digital photographs for all CDF projects visited and assessed | |
| | • CDF Project D40 to D43 | 6 - 7 |
| | • CDF Project D44 to D47 | 8 - 9 |
| | • CDF Project D48 to D50 | 10 - 11 |
| | Annex 2: CDF/LATF Project Rapid Assessment Form | 12 |
| | Annex 3: CDF/LATF Project Users Questionnaire | 13 |
| | Annex 4: Technical Project Assessment Form | 15 |

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 districts¹ across all provinces.
- This report presents the findings from research in Dagoretti Constituency, Nairobi West district.

2.0 Executive Summary

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

Kshs. 4,596,726 of taxpayers money is badly used to complete and incomplete projects that are not in use

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

Kshs. 3,590,204 of taxpayers money is missing and unaccounted for

6% of the total CDF funds awarded in FY 2006-07 are missing and unaccounted for

3.0 Recommendations for Hon. Beth Mugo

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

¹ These are Nairobi West, Garissa, Mombasa, Nyeri, Uasin Gishu, Kisumu, Busia and Machakos districts.

Table 1: Summary Findings from NTA Audit of CDF Projects in Dagoretti 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 taxpayers. | 9 | 44,517,701 | 40,968,105 | 3,549,596 |
| B | Badly built, complete and incomplete projects - poor quality construction, money wasted, poor value for money | 1 | 4,596,726 | 4,596,726 | - |
| C | Well built, incomplete projects - project not yet complete, being built in phases, so far well built | 1 | 7,187,737 | 7,147,129 | 40,608 |
| D | Abandoned Projects - projects are incomplete and not funded in the last year, taxpayers money is wasted | 0 | - | - | - |
| E | Ghost projects - officially allocated funds, but project does not physically exist | 0 | - | - | - |
| F | Missing funds - funds awarded are higher than what the project location had actually spent | 0 | - | - | - |
| TOTAL | | 11 | 56,302,164 | 52,711,960 | 3,590,204 |

| Main Findings | Summary of Funds (Kshs.) | % of Total |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|
| Total Money Badly Used (B Projects) | 4,596,726 | 8% |
| Total Money Wasted (D Projects) | - | - |
| Budget Unaccounted for | 3,590,204 | 6% |

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 received funding from non state actors, in addition to funds awarded by CDF/LATF. This made categorization of such projects difficult.

5.0 Challenges in CDF/LATF Implementation

5.1 Ignorance/ lack of information on CDF/LATF funds and how they are managed

5.2 Lack of adherence to CDF Act and regulations

- Although the law puts a cap of between 5 and 25, as the minimum and maximum number of projects respectively, which shall be initiated in a financial year, most constituencies initiated between 2 – 8 times the maximum allowed. This has led to implementation of numerous projects across the constituencies beyond the recommended number per financial year. The result is the ever increasing number of incomplete projects. This, however, has been blamed on demand by citizens to have projects in their locality, failure to do so is normally misconstrued to mean neglect of certain areas by the MPs.

6.0 NTA Research Methodology

The research methodology involved the following stages and methods.

6.1 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.

6.2 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 1); and,
- (iii) undertook a rapid assessment of the project using a structured questionnaire called CDF/LATF Project Rapid Assessment Form (see Annex 2)².

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

6.3 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 above 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 less than 15 marks out of 30 on the Project Rapid Assessment Form, and were found to be poorly constructed with poor value for money, and/or with budgets much larger than what was actually received.

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.

6.4 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 marks⁴ and, (iv) classification of all projects into one of the six categories above (See Annex 4 for the Technical Assessment form).

6.5 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.



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



⁴ 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
CDF projects visited and assessed







| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Project Number | CDF D 40 |  |
| Constituency | Dagoretti | |
| Project Name | AP Units/DO's Office | |
| Project Activity | Building AP units & Renovating DOs office | |
| Location/Ward | Waithaka | |
| MPs Name | Beth Mugo | |
| Project Status | Project is completed and in use | |
| Total Funds Awarded to date | 1,664,680 |  |
| Total Funds Spent to date | 1,664,680 | |
| Total Unaccounted Funds | Nil | |
| Technical Performance Score | 25/30 (83%) | |
| Project Classification | Category A | |
| Comments | Out of the 30 officers at the camp, the units only accommodate three families leaving the rest in the horrid living conditions. For the project to have a meaningful impact there is need to increase the units to adequately cater for the officers at the camp. | |



| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Project Number | CDF D 41 |  |
| Constituency | Dagoretti | |
| Project Name | Mutuini Dispensary | |
| Project Activity | Building health facility | |
| Location/Ward | Mutuini | |
| MPs Name | Beth Mugo | |
| Project Status | Project is completed and in use | |
| Total Funds Awarded to date | 8,346,784 |  |
| Total Funds Spent to date | 8,622,230 | |
| Total Unaccounted Funds | -275,446 | |
| Technical Performance Score | 25/30 (83%) | |
| Project Classification | Category A | |
| Comments | Although the building is well done, it is not well fenced and there are already cases of vandalism. This can lead into poor functioning of the facility if not dealt with as soon as possible. | |



| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Project Number | CDF D 42 |  |
| Constituency | Dagoretti | |
| Project Name | Ngando Road | |
| Project Activity | Rehabilitation All Weather | |
| Location/Ward | Riruta | |
| MPs Name | Beth Mugo | |
| Project Status | Project is completed and in use |  |
| Total Funds Awarded to date | 2,291,522 | |
| Total Funds Spent to date | 2,291,522 | |
| Total Unaccounted Funds | Nil | |
| Technical Performance Score | 24/30 (80%) | |
| Project Classification | Category A | |
| Comments | The road is generally well done save for the few instances of storm water related erosion. | |



| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Project Number | CDF D 43 |  |
| Constituency | Dagoretti | |
| Project Name | Nyakinyua & Muhia Roads | |
| Project Activity | Rehabilitation- All Weather | |
| Location/Ward | Riruta | |
| MPs Name | Beth Mugo | |
| Project Status | Project is completed and in use |  |
| Total Funds Awarded to date | 2,690,272 | |
| Total Funds Spent to date | 2,180,080 | |
| Total Unaccounted Funds | 510,192 | |
| Technical Performance Score | 22/30 (73%) | |
| Project Classification | Category A | |
| Comments | The work done on the road is satisfactory and represent value for money. | |



| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Project Number | CDF D 44 |  |
| Constituency | Dagoretti | |
| Project Name | Macharia Link Salim Roads | |
| Project Activity | Rehabilitation - All weather | |
| Location/Ward | Kawangware | |
| MPs Name | Beth Mugo | |
| Project Status | Project is completed and in use |  |
| Total Funds Awarded to date | 4,596,726 | |
| Total Funds Spent to date | 4,596,726 | |
| Total Unaccounted Funds | Nil | |
| Technical Performance Score | 13/30 (43%) | |
| Project Classification | Category B | |
| Comments | The work done on the road does not fit the clients instruction and fails to represent value for money. | |



| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Project Number | CDF D 45 |  |
| Constituency | Dagoretti | |
| Project Name | Kahuho Link & Ngina Road | |
| Project Activity | Rehabilitation - All Weather | |
| Location/Ward | Waithaka | |
| MPs Name | Beth Mugo | |
| Project Status | Project is completed and in use |  |
| Total Funds Awarded to date | 5,250,568 | |
| Total Funds Spent to date | 5,080,140 | |
| Total Unaccounted Funds | 170,428 | |
| Technical Performance Score | 24/30 (80%) | |
| Project Classification | Category A | |
| Comments | Some sections of the road seem to have poor bearing capacity hence the pot holes and the muddy surface during rainy seasons which are indications of settlement. | |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Project Number | CDF D 46 |  |
| Constituency | Dagoretti | |
| Project Name | Ngumo Neera Road | |
| Project Activity | Rehabilitation -Tarmac | |
| Location/Ward | Kenya | |
| MPs Name | Beth Mugo | |
| Project Status | Project is completed and in use |  |
| Total Funds Awarded to date | 1,168,574 | |
| Total Funds Spent to date | 1,160,082 | |
| Total Unaccounted Funds | 8492 | |
| Technical Performance Score | 25/30 (83%) | |
| Project Classification | Category A | |
| Comments | The road is a private road only used by the residents of Ngumo Neera Court. The work meets the client's instruction. | |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Project Number | CDF D 47 |  |
| Constituency | Dagoretti | |
| Project Name | CDF Office | |
| Project Activity | Building | |
| Location/Ward | Riruta | |
| MPs Name | Beth Mugo | |
| Project Status | Project is completed and in use |  |
| Total Funds Awarded to date | 4,550,780 | |
| Total Funds Spent to date | 4,196,383 | |
| Total Unaccounted Funds | 354,397 | |
| Technical Performance Score | 29/30 (97%) | |
| Project Classification | Category A | |
| Comments | The project was meticulously undertaken and currently hosts various constituency offices including the DCs office. | |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Project Number | CDF D 48 |  |
| Constituency | Dagoretti | |
| Project Name | Dagoretti Mixed Secondary | |
| Project Activity | Building | |
| Location/Ward | Kawangware | |
| MPs Name | Beth Mugo | |
| Project Status | Project is incomplete and in use | |
| Total Funds Awarded to date | 7,187,737 |  |
| Total Funds Spent to date | 7,147,129 | |
| Total Unaccounted Funds | 40,608 | |
| Technical Performance Score | 27/30 (90%) | |
| Project Classification | Category C | |
| Comments | Work finished to very good state of decoration and workmanship within the budget. However, landscaping is not yet done and the upper storey is incomplete. | |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Project Number | CDF D 49 |  |
| Constituency | Dagoretti | |
| Project Name | Muchene & Mukiri Roads | |
| Project Activity | Rehabilitation of the all-weather road | |
| Location/Ward | Uthiru/Ruthimitu | |
| MPs Name | Beth Mugo | |
| Project Status | Project is completed and in use | |
| Total Funds Awarded to date | 4,059,420 |  |
| Total Funds Spent to date | 3,515,380 | |
| Total Unaccounted Funds | 544,040 | |
| Technical Performance Score | 05/30 (17%) | |
| Project Classification | Category A | |
| Comments | | |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Project Number | CDF D 50 |  |
| Constituency | Dagoretti | |
| Project Name | Multi-Purpose Social Hall | |
| Project Activity | Building the hall | |
| Location/Ward | Riruta | |
| MPs Name | Beth Mugo | |
| Project Status | Project is completed and in use |  |
| Total Funds Awarded to date | 14,495,101 | |
| Total Funds Spent to date | 12,257,608 | |
| Total Unaccounted Funds | 2,237,493 | |
| Technical Performance Score | 28/30 (93%) | |
| Project Classification | Category A | |
| Comments | | |

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 | |
| MPs Name (2007) | | MPs Name (2008) | |

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

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

| | |
|--|--|
| Total CDF Funds Spent to date (April 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 | 4. Private Sector Employee |
| | 2. Business Owner | 5. Government employee |
| | 3. Labourer /Housekeeper | 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 | 4. Community |
| | 2. LATF | 5. Donors/NGOs |
| | 3. MP | 6. Government |
| | 7. Councillor | 9. Do not know |
| | 8. Private company | 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 <u>has been</u> well implemented and looks as though there is good value for money for the community. 2. Project <u>has not been well</u> implemented and looks as though funds have not been well used. 3. Is difficult to fully assess. |
| | % | |

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

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