

# Citizen's Local Authority Transfer Fund Report Card for Nairobi City Council (Embakasi, Makadara & Kamukunji Constituencies)



© National Taxpayers Association  
March, 2010

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

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Recommendations for His Worship the Mayor and the ward councillors</b>	<b>2</b>
	<b>Summary findings from NTA Audit of LATF Projects in Embakasi Constituency</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>Summary findings from NTA Audit of LATF Projects in Makadara Constituency</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>Summary findings from NTA Audit of LATF Projects in Kamukunji Constituency</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>NTA Research Methodology</b>	<b>6</b>
	<b>Annex 1: Project profiles and digital photographs for all LATF projects visited and assessed</b>	
	• <b>LASDAP Projects in Embakasi</b>	<b>9 - 18</b>
	• <b>LASDAP Projects in Makadara</b>	<b>19 - 23</b>
	• <b>LASDAP Projects in Kamukunji</b>	<b>24 - 27</b>
	<b>Annex 2: CDF/LATF Project Rapid Assessment Form</b>	<b>28</b>
	<b>Annex 3: CDF/LATF Project Users Questionnaire</b>	<b>29</b>
	<b>Annex 4: Technical Project Assessment Form</b>	<b>31</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 in the provincial headquarters. The NTA is establishing Constituency Monitoring Committees of volunteers at the constituency level across Kenya.
- The NTA has researched and published Citizen's Report Cards in 46 constituencies from all provinces in Kenya. The NTA will cover all 210 constituencies by December 2011.
- This Citizen's Report Card presents findings from research (on LATF projects) in Nairobi City Council (Embakasi, Makadara and Kamukunji constituencies)
- The monitoring exercise was conducted between January and May 2009.
- It is important to note that the Financial Year 07/08 was simply used to set the scope of the work based on NTA's interest but financial reporting takes into consideration accumulated allocations to the monitored projects over the years.

## 2.0 Executive Summary

- The main findings from NTAs research in Nairobi City Council (Embakasi, Makadara and Kamkunji Constituencies) are listed in Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3 below.
- Project profiles and digital photographs of all CDF projects visited and assessed are listed in Annex 1.

### Embakasi Constituency

**Kshs 13,967,148 of taxpayers' money has been badly used due to complete and incomplete projects that are not in use**

36% of the total LATF funds awarded in FY 2007-08 were on badly implemented projects

**Kshs. 11,968,997 of taxpayers' money is unaccounted for**

31% of the total LATF funds awarded in FY 2007-08 are missing and unaccounted for

### Makadara Constituency

**Kshs 18,196,385 of taxpayers' money is unaccounted for**

57% of the total LATF funds awarded in FY 2007-08 are missing and unaccounted for

### Kamukunji Constituency

**Kshs 7,534,744 of taxpayers' money is unaccounted for**

75% of the total LATF funds awarded in FY 2007-08 are missing and unaccounted for

### **3.0 Recommendations for His Worship the Mayor and the ward councillors**

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

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

Category	Project Assessment Classification	No. of Projects	Budget Awarded	Budget Spent	Budget Unaccounted For
			Kshs.	Kshs.	Kshs.
A	<b>Well built, complete projects</b> - good quality construction, good value for money for taxpayer's	5	11,483,326	11,483,326	-
B	<b>Badly built, complete and incomplete projects</b> - poor quality construction, money wasted, poor value for money	6	13,981,212	13,967,148	14,064
C	<b>Well built, incomplete projects</b> - project not yet complete, being built in phases, so far well built	1	2,533,405	1,078,472	1,454,933
D	<b>Abandoned Projects</b> - projects are incomplete and not funded in the last year, taxpayer's money is wasted	-	-	-	-
E	<b>Ghost projects</b> - officially allocated funds, but project does not physically exist	7	10,500	-	10,500
F	<b>Missing funds</b> - funds awarded are higher than what the project location had actually spent	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>38,497,943</b>	<b>26,528,946</b>	<b>11,968,997</b>

Main Findings	Summary of Funds (Kshs.)	% of Total
<b>Total Money Badly Used (B Projects)</b>	<b>13,967,148</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>Total Money Wasted (D Projects)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Budget Unaccounted for</b>	<b>11,968,997</b>	<b>31%</b>

**Table 2: Summary Findings from NTA Audit of LATF Projects in Makadara Constituency**

Category	Project Assessment Classification	No. of Projects	Budget Awarded	Budget Spent	Budget Unaccounted For
			Kshs.	Kshs.	Kshs.
A	<b>Well built, complete projects</b> - good quality construction, good value for money for taxpayer's	5	19,927,719	13,694,698	6,233,021
B	<b>Badly built, complete and incomplete projects</b> - poor quality construction, money wasted, poor value for money	-	-	-	-
C	<b>Well built, incomplete projects</b> - project not yet complete, being built in phases, so far well built	-	-	-	-
D	<b>Abandoned Projects</b> - projects are incomplete and not funded in the last year, taxpayer's money is wasted	-	-	-	-
E	<b>Ghost projects</b> - officially allocated funds, but project does not physically exist	4	11,963,364	-	11,963,364
F	<b>Missing funds</b> - funds awarded are higher than what the project location had actually spent	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>31,891,083</b>	<b>13,694,698</b>	<b>18,196,385</b>

Main Findings	Summary of Funds (Kshs.)	% of Total
Total Money Badly Used (B Projects)	-	-
Total Money Wasted (D Projects)	-	-
<b>Budget Unaccounted for</b>	<b>18,196,385</b>	<b>57%</b>

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

Category	Project Assessment Classification	No. of Projects	Budget Awarded	Budget Spent	Budget Unaccounted For
			Kshs.	Kshs.	Kshs.
A	<b>Well built, complete projects</b> - good quality construction, good value for money for taxpayer's	1	2,073,360	1,397,556	675,804
B	<b>Badly built, complete and incomplete projects</b> - poor quality construction, money wasted, poor value for money	-	-	-	-
C	<b>Well built, incomplete projects</b> - project not yet complete, being built in phases, so far well built	1	2,000,000	1,136,635	863,365
D	<b>Abandoned Projects</b> - projects are incomplete and not funded in the last year, taxpayer's money is wasted	-	-	-	-
E	<b>Ghost projects</b> - officially allocated funds, but project does not physically exist	3	5,995,575	-	5,995,575
F	<b>Missing funds</b> - funds awarded are higher than what the project location had actually spent	1	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>10,068,935</b>	<b>2,534,191</b>	<b>7,534,744</b>

Main Findings	Summary of Funds (Kshs.)	% of Total
Total Money Badly Used (B Projects)	-	-
Total Money Wasted (D Projects)	-	-
Budget Unaccounted for	7,534,744	75%

## 4.0 NTA Research Methodology

The research methodology involved the following stages and methods.

### 1. Secondary Data Collection and Analysis

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

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

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

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

### 3. Desk-based Project Classification

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

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

This category was for LATF projects which had scored above 15 marks out of 30 on the Project Rapid Assessment Form (Annex 3)<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 15 marks out of 30 on the Project Rapid Assessment Form, and were found to be poorly constructed with poor value for money, and/or with budgets much larger than what was actually delivered.

#### Category C Projects – Well implemented, incomplete projects

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

#### Category D Projects - Abandoned Projects

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

#### Category E Projects – Ghost projects

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

---

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

<sup>2</sup>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).

#### **4. Desk-based Independent Technical Assessment and Strategic Visits**



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



#### **5. Desk-based Analysis and Final Project Classification**


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


# Annex 1

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



<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E009	
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	Imara Primary School	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Supply of Desks and Furniture	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kayole Ward	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Walter Okeyo Mbata	
<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	12/03/09	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	500,000	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	500,000	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	Nil	
<b>Project Classification</b>	N/A	
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	Category A	
<b>Comments</b>	The school was supplied with a good number of desks and lockers which are in use to date. However, most got burnt in one of the blocks in the school in a suspected arson attack. The school administration is satisfied with the quality of furniture supplied.	



<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E011	
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	Kayole Health Center	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Rehabilitation of the health Centre	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kayole Ward	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Walter Okeyo Mbata	
<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	12/03/09	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	2,923,930	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	2,923,930	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	Nil	
<b>Project Classification</b>	61%	
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	Category A	
<b>Comments</b>	The rehabilitation has been well done using quality materials and the workmanship is no doubt outstanding. The work undertaken on the project indeed reflects value for taxpayers' money.	


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E012	
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	Umoja Dispensary	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Rehabilitation of the health Centre	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kayole Ward	
<b>Councillor Name</b>	Cllr. Walter Okeyo Mbata	
<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	10/03/09	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	3,059,395.90	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	3,059,395.90	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	Nil	
<b>Project Classification</b>	71%	
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	Category A	
<b>Comments</b>	The project is complete and in use. The Dispensary has been satisfactorily done in terms of roofing and paintings which were part of the project in place. However according to the Matron some of the tasks that were to be undertaken were not done for instance, the doors, toilets, water systems and lightings. The project was part of MoH City wide allocation.	



<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E016	
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	Tom Mboya Primary School	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Rehabilitation of school.	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Dandora B	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Mugabe Melitus Were (Late)	
<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	11/03/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	2,500,000	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	2,500,000	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	Nil	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	68%	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category A	
<b>Comments</b>	The project is complete and currently in use by the school. The roofing and painting done were of good quality although the school administration feels that the doors and window panes were not well done as some are falling off or already broken. Generally though, there is value for taxpayers' money.	







<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E 017	
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	Ronald Ngala Primary School	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Rehabilitation of school.	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Dandora B	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Mugabe Melitus Were (Late)	
<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	11/03/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	2,500,000	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	2,500,000	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	Nil	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	68%	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category A	
<b>Comments</b>	The roofing and painting work was well done. The same was the case with the fisher boards and the gutters. The school administration however feels that some parts of the school for instance the gutters were not done. The project is generally well done.	



<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E002	
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	AA-VISION-BIMJI ROADS	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Rehabilitation of roads joining the three places.	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Mukuru Ward	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Patrick Mulili Kaluva	
<b>Project Status</b>	Incomplete and in use.	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	10/03/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	2,486,785	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	2,486,785	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	Nil	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	40%	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category B	
<b>Comments</b>	Although the status report indicates that the project is 70% complete, NTA visit revealed that work on the road has been very poor. It is close to patching using murram as selected areas are worked on. The roads are in bad condition.	



<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E001	
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	Roads Rehabilitation – Kariobangi South	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Rehabilitation of the estate roads	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kariobangi South Ward	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Joseph Muturi	
<b>Project Status</b>	Complete	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	10/03.09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	3,499,567	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	3,499,567	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	Nil	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	37%	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category B	
<b>Comments</b>	The construction work on this particular road exhibits poor workmanship. The road surface is now well done and there are stones that protrude from the surface portending a serious danger to motorists. Besides, there is drainage on only side of the road thus exposing the project to serious storm water effect. There is hardly value for taxpayers' money in the project.	



<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E005	
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	Soweto Estate Inner roads	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Murraming and Grading of the Soweto Estate Roads.	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Savanna Ward	
<b>Councillors Name</b>	Cllr. Amos Ngata Kamau	
<b>Project Status</b>	Incomplete	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	4,000,000	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	3,985,936	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	14,064	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	33%	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category B	
<b>Comments</b>	As at the time of study, work on the road had begun and was moving at a very slow pace. According to the residents, the contractor appears on site at least once or twice a month. The road is in a state of despair and the work already done so far is poor. There is hardly value for money in the project bearing in mind the amount of money in question.	



<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E014	
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	Wangu Primary School	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Supply of desks to schools.	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Dandora A	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Jackson Gachanja Wan-johi	
<b>Project Status</b>	Complete and in use	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	11/03/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	500,000	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	500,000	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	Nil	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	N/A	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category B	
<b>Comments</b>	The lockers and desks supplied to the school are very weak to the extent that the school has resolved to use them only during exams. Usually, they are stored in a store in the school to extend their life span. The quality of the furniture does not reflect value of tax-payers money.	


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E018	
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	Embakasi Social Hall	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Rehabilitation of the play ground and the facilities in use at the place.	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Embakasi Village	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Simon Mwololo Muteti	
<b>Project Status</b>	Incomplete and but in use	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	13/03/09	
<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>	43%	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	42%	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category B	
<b>Comments</b>	The project is incomplete but in use. According to the community, work was started but stopped without any explanation. The workmanship of the portion done is very bad and a portion of the wall is already fallen.	

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E019	
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	Mihango – Utawala roads	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Rehabilitation of the roads in the two estates.	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Simon Mwololo Muteti	
<b>Project Status</b>	Complete	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	13/03/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	2,494,860	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	3,259,888	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	Nil	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	72%	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category B	
<b>Comments</b>	According to the project status report, the work is 100% complete. Physical visitation of the project noted that the road is poorly done and has no drainage system making it highly susceptible to storm water effect.	



<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E004	
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	Toilet Block – Our Lady of Nazareth primary School.	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of a toilet block in the school.	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Mukuru	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Patrick Mulili Kaluva	
<b>Project Status</b>	Project is incomplete	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	10/03/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	2,533,405	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	1,078,472	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	1,454,933	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	55%	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category C	
<b>Comments</b>	The toilet block was eventually built by donors following a lengthy delay in implementation of the same by LATF money. LATF funds were eventually redirected to construct a perimeter wall around the school and at the time of NTA visit, the wall did not cover even a quarter of the school's perimeter although the quality of work so far seems good.	



<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E 003	
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	Kwa Ruben Market	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Rehabilitation of the Market	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Mukuru	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Patrick Mulili Kaluva	
<b>Project Status</b>	Does not exist.	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	10/03/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	2,000,000	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	N/A	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	2,000,000	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	N/A	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category E	
<b>Comments</b>	The market does not exist but there is an open space/land which the area residents say the market would have been built on. The question is, why consider allocating public resources to rehabilitate a facility that is non-existent?	

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E007	
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	Thawabu Primary School	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Supply of Desks and Furnirure	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kayole Ward	
<b>Councillors Name</b>	Cllr. Walter Okeyo Mbata	
<b>Project Status</b>	Does not Exist	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	1,000,000	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	N/A	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	1,000,000	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	N/A	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category E	
<b>Comments</b>	The project does not exist because the school management say they are not aware of any such project in the school. Thus amounts to a ghost project and a waste of taxpayers' money.	


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E 008	
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	Matopeni Community Nursery School.	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of Nursery school	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kayole Ward	
<b>Councillors Name</b>	Cllr. Walter Okeyo Mbata	
<b>Project Status</b>	Does not Exist	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	12/03/09	
<b>T. Funds Awarded to Date</b>	2,500,000	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	N/A	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	2,500,000	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	N/A	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category E	
<b>Comments</b>	The project was non-existent as at the time of visit. According to the school administration, they only had knowledge of the pre-unit classroom that was indeed on-going as at the time of NTA visit.	


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E 010	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Photo Unavailable</b></p>
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	Bondeni Primary School	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Supply of Desks and Furniture	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kayole Ward	
<b>Councillor Name</b>	Cllr. Walter Okeyo Mbata	
<b>Project Status</b>	Does not exist	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	12/03/09	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	500,000	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	N/A	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	500,000	
<b>Project Classification</b>	N/A	
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	Category E	
<b>Comments</b>	The school administration denies receiving any support from the LATF kitty. The desks and other furniture within the school were obtained through PTA & Donor contributions and not LATE. The project does not exist. For fear of misrepresentation, the visiting team was denied opportunity to take photos of the furniture.	

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E013	
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	Dandora Primary School	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Supply of desks to schools.	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Dandora A	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Jackson Gachanja Wan-johi	
<b>Project Status</b>	Does not exist	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	500,000	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	Nil	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	500,000	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	N/A	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category E	
<b>Comments</b>	The project does not exist since the school management say that there has never been any supply of desks to the school. They say the school has recently been visited by the City Council People over the issue but nothing has been done yet.	


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E015	
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	James Gichuru Primary School	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Supply of desks to schools.	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Dandora A	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Jackson Gachanja Wan-johi	
<b>Project Status</b>	Does not exist	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	11/03/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	500,000	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	Nil	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	500,000	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	N/A	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category E	
<b>Comments</b>	The school has not received any supply of desks and are using desks made by parents and well wishers. The newly built classrooms are still empty and need supply in large numbers according to the school Administration.	


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF E020	<b>Photo Unavailable</b>
<b>Constituency</b>	Embakasi	
<b>Project Name</b>	Saika Primary School	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Construction of a new school in the Saika Estate	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Mwiki Ward	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Ferdinand Ndungu Waititu ( Now MP Embakasi)	
<b>Project Status</b>	Does not exist.	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	3,500,000	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	Nil	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	3,500,000	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	N/A	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category E	
<b>Comments</b>	The project is unknown to the area residents. Despite such a significant financial allocation to the project, the council explained that the project is not in their list of priorities. Why then should it be allocated such a significant sum of money?	


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF MAK 001	
<b>Constituency</b>	Makadara	
<b>Project Name</b>	St. Patrick Primary & Dr. Krapft Primary School	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Renovation (Roofing, glazing and painting)	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Ofafa Maringo	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Dickson Wathika (Now MP)	
<b>Project Status</b>	Ongoing	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	8/04/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	3,500,000	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	2,720,477.95	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	779,522.05	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	67%	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category A	
<b>Comments</b>	The schools made a request for full renovation work in the institutions in 2007 but were granted roofing, glazing and painting. There is overall satisfaction with the project from the school administration and community. The workmanship is good and the quality of materials used is equally good. The NTA observes that there is need to provide separate records of funds spent in each of the institutions and the same should happen with regard to financial allocation to projects to enhance transparency and accountability.	

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF MAK 002	
<b>Constituency</b>	Makadara	
<b>Project Name</b>	Kaloleni Primary School	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Roofing & Painting	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Mbotela	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Paul Mutunga Mutungi	
<b>Project Status</b>	Complete	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	8/04/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	7,500,000	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	2,046,501	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	5,453,499	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	68%	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category A	
<b>Comments</b>	The school administration requested for the project. Roofing of the classrooms is complete and they are in use. Generally, there is good workmanship and the materials are of good quality. The scope of work according to the Council included the following: roofing of kitchen, dining hall and classroom blocks. The work also involved painting of the same facilities.	

<b>Project Number</b>	LATFMAK003	
<b>Constituency</b>	Makadara	
<b>Project Name</b>	Mbotela	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Public lighting installation	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Mbotela	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Paul Mutunga Mutungi	
<b>Project Status</b>	Complete	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	8/04/09	
<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>	Nil	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	N/A	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category A	
<b>Comments</b>	The project was undertaken following constant complaints by residents to the area councillor over insecurity in the area. The project is complete and the community is happy with the work done. Security has been enhanced in the area.	

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF MAK 009	
<b>Constituency</b>	Makadara	
<b>Project Name</b>	St Johns Primary & Joseph Apudo Primary Schools	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Roofing, Painting, floor plastering, windows	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Nairobi South	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Eliud Muriithi	
<b>Project Status</b>	Complete	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	8/04/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	4,927,719	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	4,927,719	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	N/A	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	76%	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category A	
<b>Comments</b>	The schools through their respective administrations and the community are generally satisfied with the work done. The projects are complete and in use and manifest good workmanship save for the thin coat of paints applied on the walls. All in all, the projects represent value for taxpayers' money.	

<b>Project Number</b>	LATFMAK 011	
<b>Constituency</b>	Makadara	
<b>Project Name</b>	Jericho Dispensary	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Roofing, painting, repair of toilets, water tank, floor tiles, burglar proof.	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Hamza	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Dick Wathika (Now MP)	
<b>Project Status</b>	Complete	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	8/04/09	
<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>	Nil	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	68%	
<b>Project Classification</b>	A	
<b>Comments</b>	It is important to note that the CDF laid claim to supporting the project in the same financial year. The project that reflects value for tax payers' money according to the project status report was funded from the MOH City Wide Allocation initiative.	

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF MAK 005	
<b>Constituency</b>	Makadara	
<b>Project Name</b>	Mariakani Primary school	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Rehabilitation	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Nairobi South	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Eliud Muriithi Muchai	
<b>Project Status</b>	Does not exist	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	9/04/08	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	3,967,034	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	N/A	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	3,967,034	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	N/A	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category E	
<b>Comments</b>	According to the head teacher, the school sent a proposal but has had nothing yet about the same. It is very interesting that according to the Council, the project is considered complete. This is baffling and there is need for various stakeholders to consolidate efforts to restore accountability and transparency in management of taxpayers' money.	


**Ghost  
Project**

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF MAK 006	<b>Ghost Project</b>
<b>Constituency</b>	Makadara	
<b>Project Name</b>	Njiwa Road	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Drainage rehabilitation	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Mbotela	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Paul Mutunga Mutungi	
<b>Project Status</b>	Does Not Exist	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	8/04/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	2,000,000	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	N/A	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	2,000,000	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	N/A	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category E	
<b>Comments</b>	The community noted that they have not witnessed any major work on the facility that would pass for rehabilitation work. According to the project status report, the project is under tender almost two years down the lane after the project had been reallocated funds. The tendering process needs to be reconsidered in order to ensure timely implementation of projects.	


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF MAK 007	<b>Ghost Project</b>
<b>Constituency</b>	Makadara	
<b>Project Name</b>	Sinai Paradise Road	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Rehabilitation of Sinai paradise road	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Viwandani	
<b>Councillor Name</b>	Cllr. Peter Maina Kangara	
<b>Project Status</b>	Does not exist	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	3,996,330	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	Nil	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	3,996,330	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	N/A	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category E	
<b>Comments</b>	Although the project status report indicates that the project is 100% complete, the community members are unaware if such a project was to be carried out. The road in question is in pathetic state and rehabilitation work to the tune of Kshs 3.9 M is not justifiable.	


<b>Project Number</b>	LATF MAK 008	<b>Ghost Project</b>
<b>Constituency</b>	Makadara	
<b>Project Name</b>	Ngiri Road	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Drainage rehabilitation	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Mbotela	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Paul Mutunga Mutungi	
<b>Project Status</b>	Does Not Exist	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	8/04/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	2,000,000	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	N/A	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	2,000,000	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	N/A	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category E	
<b>Comments</b>	Routine maintenance was done on the drainage according to the community members but no major rehabilitation work. According to the project status report, the project is at the design stage.	

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF KAM 06	<b>Photo Unavailable</b>
<b>Constituency</b>	Kamukunji	
<b>Project Name</b>	Lions Clinic - Biafra	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Health centre rehabilitation	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Eastleigh North	
<b>Councillor Name</b>	Cllr. Ibrahim Haji Kullow	
<b>Project Status</b>	Complete	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	1,999,675	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	1,300,272	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	699,403	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	N/A	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category A	
<b>Comments</b>	The community participated in selection of the project especially after wind carried away the roof. Although the project is well done and represents value for money, the administration found it difficult to allow our team to take pictures of this public facility. It is however well done and represents value for money.	

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF KAM 08	
<b>Constituency</b>	Kamukunji	
<b>Project Name</b>	Muthurwa Primary School	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Rehabilitation of the school – Roofing, painting, and replacing of the 20 doors	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Shaurimoyo/Muthurwa	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. David Kariuki Mbugua	
<b>Project Status</b>	Ongoing	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	14/04/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	1,935,830	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	996,788	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	939,042	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	66%	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category A	
<b>Comments</b>	The school did a proposal for funding of the school. The work is almost complete and the school is using the rehabilitated facilities. The workmanship as well as the quality of materials used seems good save for the doors that seem suspect in terms of quality.	



<b>Project Number</b>	LATF KAM 11	
<b>Constituency</b>	Kamukunji	
<b>Project Name</b>	Uhuru Primary School	
<b>Project Activity</b>	School rehabilitation	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Uhuru	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Lawrence Ngacha	
<b>Project Status</b>	Complete	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	14/04/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	2,073,360	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	1,397,556	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	675,804	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	68%	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category A	
<b>Comments</b>	The fund has supported roofing of two blocks at the institution which are all in use. The roofing is complete and there is satisfaction with the project from the community and school administration. However, there is strong feeling that the amount in question, Kshs 2 M, is very much on the higher side.	

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF KAM 09	
<b>Constituency</b>	Kamukunji	
<b>Project Name</b>	Morrisson Primary School	
<b>Project Activity</b>	School rehabilitation – painting, fixing of window glasses and building 2 rooms	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kimathi	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Benson Mutura Kangara	
<b>Project Status</b>	Ongoing	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	14/04/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	2,000,000	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	1,136,635	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	863,365	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	72%	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category C	
<b>Comments</b>	The school requested for the project through the area councillor. Although the work already done is good, the school administration and part of the community is not satisfied with the pace of implementation which is observed to be slow. All the same, this is a well implemented project.	

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF KAM 04	<b>Ghost Project</b>
<b>Constituency</b>	Kamukunji	
<b>Project Name</b>	Eastleigh Social Hall	
<b>Project Activity</b>	Perimeter Wall	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Eastleigh North	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Ibrahim Haji Kullow	
<b>Project Status</b>	Does Not Exist	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	14/04/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	2,000,000	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	N/A	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	2,000,000	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	N/A	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category E	
<b>Comments</b>	The area around the hall is curved off with iron sheets and not a perimeter wall. The social hall is undergoing redevelopment through public-private partnership and is at the foundation stage. The perimeter wall referred to does not exist.	

<b>Project Number</b>	LATF KAM 10	<b>Ghost Project</b>
<b>Constituency</b>	Kamukunji	
<b>Project Name</b>	Bahati Primary School	
<b>Project Activity</b>	School rehabilitation	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Kimathi	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Benson Mutura Kangara	
<b>Project Status</b>	Does not exist	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	14/04/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	1,995,575	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	419,060	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	1,995,575	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>	N/A	
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category E	
<b>Comments</b>	Although the Council explained that the project was allocated Kshs 1,995,575 and that as at the time of NTA visit Kshs 419,060 had been spent, our physical visit to the project revealed that the project was non-existent. The head teacher was not aware of any project or proposal of a project that was/is to be implemented in the school. In fact it was stated that it is now that the school is contemplating approaching LATF committee for support since the school has never benefited from the fund.	

<b>Project Number</b>	LATFKAM12	<b>Ghost Project</b>
<b>Constituency</b>	Kamukunji	
<b>Project Name</b>	Nairobi River Primary	
<b>Project Activity</b>	School rehabilitation	
<b>Location/Ward</b>	Uhuru	
<b>Councillor's Name</b>	Cllr. Lawrence Ngacha	
<b>Project Status</b>	Project Missing	
<b>Date of Visit</b>	14/04/09	
<b>Total Funds Awarded to Date</b>	2,000,000	
<b>Total Funds Spent to Date</b>	N/A	
<b>Total Unaccounted Funds</b>	2,000,000	
<b>Technical Performance Score</b>		
<b>Project Classification</b>	Category E	
<b>Comments</b>	Nothing has been done so far on the project. The school is at present in the dark about what is happening with regard to the project. This amounts to a waste of taxpayers' money.	

**Annex 3**  
**CDF/LATF Project Rapid Assessment Form**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Field Visit Assessment Information**

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

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

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

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

## Annex 4

### CDF Project Users Questionnaire

Quest. No.:
-------------

Name of RO
------------

#### Instructions for ROs

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

1. Name of District	2. Constituency Name	
3. Name of Project	4. Location Name	
5. Gender of person interviewed (circle one answer number)		1. Female      2. Male
6. Age of person interviewed		_____ years
7. Occupation (circle one answer number)	1. Farmer	4. Private Sector Employee
	2. Business Owner	5. Government employee
	3. Labourer /Housekeeper	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	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 projects?	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
29. RO Verification -- What is the actual completion status of the project based on observation? (visit the project and then complete this question)	1. Project is completed and in use		
	2. Project is completed and not in use		
	3. Project is incomplete and in use		
	4. Project is incomplete and not in use		
	5. Project is “missing”, does not exist		

Name of interviewer	Signature of interviewer	Date and time of interview

## Annex 5

### Technical Project Assessment Form

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

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

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

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

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

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