

Annex V

Kerio Center For Community Development and Human Rights

“Advocating for the people, Advocating with people to empower the people to advocate on their own”

Views, comments and substantive issues raised by members of the public on 2015/16 Budget estimates for Uasin Gishu.

Timothy Kiprono and Judith Chelagat

With support from the International Budget Partnership Kenya

15

Acknowledgement

In developing the document, the collection and collation of the views and proposals from the public benefited from the experience and the work of other professionals in the fields of advocacy, management, and policy analysis.

Kerio Center for Community Development and Human rights is a national NGO operating in Uasin Gishu, Trans Nzoia, Elgeyo Marakwet and Nandi Counties in partnership with other like-minded networks of non-state actors who share common interest to promote good governance. The document elaborates on the views of members of the public and incorporates new and creative approaches to promote participatory decision making process. Formulation of the document acknowledges the financial and technical support from **International Budget Partnership (IBP), technical support and contribution from the following individuals;**

Technical Writers;

Timothy Kiprono | Kerio Center

Judith Chelagat | Kerio Center

Philemon Kimutai | Kerio Center

Technical Reviewers;

Jason Lakin, PhD | International Budget Partnership Kenya

Albert Kimutai, PhD | Chief Executive Officer | Kerio Center



This publication has been developed by the under stewardship of the Kerio Center for Community Development and Human Rights with financial and technical support from International Budget Partnership (IBP) Kenya. The content of this publication reflects the views of Kerio Center and can in no way be taken to represent the views of IBP Kenya.

[@Kerio Center2014](#)

Executive summary

The constitution of Kenya 2010 and subsequent laws require that the public is given a chance to influence decisions taken and choices made with view of aligning the same to needs and preferences. It is on this note that the paper is developed to provide alternative input and contributions from the public on the budget making process for 2015/16 in Uasin Gishu County. This is the second paper after one developed in February 2015 and therefore a series of papers. The first paper in this series carried views, comments and substantive issues on sector budget with view of influencing the sector level funding while this second paper is a culmination of the presentation of the first and aims at ensure that sector ceilings are allocated to the right priorities. This second paper presents the views, comments and substantive issues collected and collated from members of the public of Uasin Gishu on the budget estimates for 2015/16 financial year. It identifies challenges facing the public and interrogates the executive proposals on projects and programs presented and tabled before the assembly on May 5, 2015.

In developing the paper, Kerio Center held a series of discussions across the sub-county and a final forum at the county level that brought together professionals in various fields, representatives of interest groups identified during the sub-county forums and the County Assembly Budget office. The final forum discussed the views, comments and substantive issues raised by participants at the sub-county budget debates with view of strengthening and aligning the executive proposals to the needs and preference of the people. We did this by guiding the public to formulate proposals they thought if government implemented could address these issues and then looked at the budget to identify whether there are proposals in the budget aimed at addressing those identified issues that could be strengthened as part of the process to align this to public needs and proposals.

The proposals presented in this paper include identified and documented challenges and services the public thought could be improved, proposals on strategies to be executed to address these challenges, a list of budget items whose funding should be reduced or items that could be removed completely to create funding for the execution of proposed strategies and a few other budget lines whose funding should increase to improve delivery of the respective services. In summary, the issues identified include:

- poor access to quality and affordable healthcare,
- lack of sufficient subsidized farm inputs and poor prices of farm produce,
- lack of incentives to encourage youth, women and people with disability to do farming hence creating job opportunities and
- lack of budget notes to facilitate understanding of the proposed programs and rationale behind the choices made and decision taken.

Proposed strategies include:

postponement of proposed construction of a sub county hospital across the six sub-counties while the funding to be reallocated to upgrade and strengthen the current facilities in terms of medical supplies,

personnel and equipment, reallocation of funds for proposed purchase of agricultural machinery to strengthen the national government strategy on subsidized farm inputs and

redesign of empowerment programs targeted at youth and women to focus on new and in demand farm produce and methods of farming, value addition in consultation with the target groups while on the same issues, create funding for programs targeted at people with the disability and finally, phasing the construction of high capacity cereal stores over 2 -3yrs to create funding for renovation and upgrade of buying centers.

Table of Contents

Summary of challenges and services the public would want see addressed and improved in 2015/16 financial year	7
Proposed strategies to address the issues identified above	8
1. Access to quality and affordable healthcare	8
2. Access to subsidized farm inputs, creating markets for farm produce and post harvest loses	9
3. Lack of clarity and poor supervision of civil works hence low quality infrastructure and confusion on use public funds	11
4. Creating additional funding for programs targeted at addressing immediate concerns and challenges facing the public	12
5. Strengthening public participation by creating structures for effective consultations with public to align government decisions to public needs and preference	15
6. Economic empowerment and job creation through incentive to encourage youth, women and people living with disability embrace farming and value addition to create jobs:	15
7. Lack of justification of choices made, decisions taken and feedback after public consultation affects attendance and participation of public in government convened forums	16

Summary of challenges and services the public would want see addressed and improved in 2015/16 financial year

1. **Access to quality and affordable healthcare:** At public facilities, the public is given prescriptions to purchase essential medical drugs from private facilities. Members of the public who reside away from the county headquarters, especially towards western part of the county attest to crossing over to Bungoma in search for accessible and affordable healthcare.
2. **Access to subsidized farm inputs and markets for farm produce:** 90% of the people we consulted are farmers. The major challenges facing this group is high cost of farm seeds, fertilizer and lack of ready markets and poor prices for farm produce, maize and wheat are examples. Farmers access sufficient quantity of farm inputs from neighboring Trans Nzoia and Bungoma counties.
3. **Post harvest loses:** farmers informed us that they lose a lot during harvesting and post harvesting period. The challenges are attributed to distance to access to storage and driers facilities.
4. **Poor supervision of civil works hence low quality infrastructure:** members of the public appreciate the good work done on roads and 30% tenders preserved for special interest groups. However, they are concerned with the poor supervision and technical support accorded to these groups when executing their contracts.
5. **Lack of public participation structures for effective consultations with public hence poor alignment of government decisions to public needs and preference:** even in the absence of a law and functioning CBEF, the county assembly being the representative of the public stands a good chance to provide avenues for public participation through expanded space for the various committees at the assembly to expeditiously discharge their mandate and adequate space at the public gallery to enable members of the public to follow through the proceedings of the committees and the county assembly.
6. **Unemployment among the youth, women and People living with disability; lack of incentive to encourage this target group to embrace farming as alternative job creation and economic empowerment:** farming has been identified as one of the numerous opportunities for job creation while improving on food security. However, lack of incentives such as credit, farm inputs and lack of access to markets and poor market prices for the farm produce are among the major challenges experienced.
7. **Lack of justification of choices made, decisions taken and feedback after public consultation affecting attendance and participation of public in forums:** Most of the proposed choices made

on programs and projects are not clearly understood by the public for purposes of making an informed input to these choices. Lack of feedback on how much public input was used or not and why not is another discouragement.

Proposed strategies to address the issues identified above

1. Access to quality and affordable healthcare

- Economic development and growth depends on the health status of the people and members of the public appreciates that the county has shown commitment on healthcare by allocating it the lion's share of the budget for 2015/16. However the public is concerned that the resources are not aimed at addressing the immediate challenges experienced in the health sector. For example in 2015/16 about 13% of the total budget is allocated to construction of six new sub county health facilities while in the view of the public, the immediate concerns are not infrastructure but the following;
 - **Poor access to medical supplies in health facilities:** members of public across the county informed us that upon visiting public health facility most at times they are given prescriptions to purchase essential medical drugs from private facilities. For example, residents of Ziwa, Moi's Bridge and Jua kali informed us that they normally access healthcare from neighboring counties of Bungoma and Trans Nzoia Counties.
 - The overall capacity of the existing facilities is not adequate to deliver the required standard of healthcare services. For example, the current facilities suffer insufficient medical personnel and equipment and medical supplies.
 - Funding for medical drugs is coming down in 2015/16 from an allocation of KES 115 million in 2014/15 to KES 100 million. This is reducing despite the fact that it is not accessible even with the allocation of KES 115 million.
 - The county assembly committees to strengthen oversight on supply of medical drugs as well establish the real cost of sufficient medical drugs to meet at least 80% of the needs of the total annual facility visits in the county.

- These are few among many other concerns that the public views the failure of the construction of six new sub county hospitals to address immediately and therefore they proposed that;
 - What happened to the upgrade program started last year that aimed at upgrading 3 facilities from level 3 to level 4?
 - The funding provided for construction should be directed towards continuation of the upgrade programs that was started in 2014/15 while funding for infrastructure should be reduced from the allocation of KES 211 million to 100 million so that funding for other immediate concerns are available.
 - Using the remaining funds reduced from health infrastructure, increase funding medical supplies from the current proposed allocation of KES 100 million to at least KES 180 million in 2015/16
 - Allocate the remaining about KES 31 million to commence the construction of county referral hospital to complement the existing national referral hospital (MTRH) whose resources has been stretched to the limits as a result of public lack faith in the capacity of county facilities to provide quality healthcare.

2. Access to subsidized farm inputs, creating markets for farm produce and post harvest loses

- The public welcomes the construction of high cereal stores budgeted for under agriculture, livestock and fisheries; however they believe that the challenges facing farmers at post harvest can best be addressed by among other interventions, reducing the distance to access to cereal storage and driers facilities.
 - The public is therefore proposing that the high capacity cereal stores be constructed in phases over 2 -3 yrs, while at the same time renovating and operationalizing buying centers as these are the closest units of the larger cereals stores to ease the distance and reduce transportation costs since farmers will access them at door steps. This will achieve at least one clear objective: address

post harvest challenges facing farmers at the lowest level possible, the efficiency and affordability of cereals storage.

- The purpose of subsidizing AI and purchase of 50 surrogate mothers is assumed to achieve the similar objective of improving breeding stock. AI has been proven to be effective methodology of breeding while surrogate mothers is a new initiative being tested. The allocation of KES 3 million for piloting is not a priority.
 - Members of the public are proposing that while surrogacy is new initiative whose effectiveness is yet to be established, AI has been proven to be effective and therefore should be a priority for now and therefore the allocation for the purchase of surrogate mothers should be reduced by KES 2 million and be reallocated to increase the funding of AI subsidy from KES 5 million to 7 million in 2015/16. The county assembly committee for agriculture should also tighten the role of oversight in the execution of the programs to avoid wastage and skewed distribution.

- The government has proposed purchase of several Agricultural Machinery (AMS) as proposal in 2015/16 with allocated KES 91 million. This is a good idea to provide alternative accessibility to farm implements at subsidized cost, however, it surprising that;
 - The public is not aware that this service already exists, yet the government proposes to invest more money for it in 2015/16/. 90% of the people we consulted across the county are not aware of this service, and of course have not accessed it as a result.

 - Secondly, agriculture is the main livelihood supporting 70% of the total households of Uasin Gishu and it is a fact that, they require machinery for efficiency and effectiveness. However, the county may require a huge number of each of this machinery to meet at least 80% of the farmers' needs at single agricultural season which is usually about a month, given that the agriculture is rain fed and everyone requires the machinery at the same time of year. For example, a single Harrow costs KES 1.6 million, while about 150,000 households is agriculture dependent. Assuming a harrow serves two households in a single day, the entire agriculture dependent households will require units of Harrow equivalent to half of these households to meet at least 80% needs of farmers to access in a month of farming season. This implies that, the government will require KES

112 billion to purchase Harrow alone, maintenance not factored in and therefore as it stands, this initiative is meant for few individuals rather than a service accessible to the wider public.

- The public is proposing that this investment be done away with completely and instead; the funding be relocated to complement the national government program on farm inputs subsidy, particularly on seeds and fertilizer.. The current machinery may be moved to Chebororowa ATC.
- Members of the public welcomes the capacity building programs proposed under Trade, Tourism and Cooperative Development; however the concerns are that the programs are designed without involvement of the targets groups of youth and women.
 - They are proposing that department consults the public and conducts the target groups' capacity assessment on the hindrances of successes in social development empowerment. They are also proposing that the department conducts a study on ready markets for specific agricultural ventures and advice farmers and business groups on the farm produce or value added goods that are on high demand, this may also form part of the capacity building programs.
- The cooperative society support programs should be based on research conducted on ready markets for agricultural ventures; farm produce and value added agricultural products on high demand either within or outside county as opposed to usual empowerment programs.
 - Proposal: 50% of the programs should be designed to target the youth women and people living with disability who are vulnerable and need support particularly on farming and agricultural value addition undertakings. This also applies to capacity building programs proposed under Trade, Tourism and Cooperative Development which members of the public say they should also be structured to avoid wastage of resources.

3. Lack of clarity and poor supervision of civil works hence low quality infrastructure and confusion on use public funds

- Members of the public acknowledge the good work done by the county government on Infrastructure in 2014/15. At least the access roads have and are being improved across the county. However, they have concerns with supervision of works done by the youth and other groups given the 30% special slots in tenders. They said this groups do not have expertise on roads construction, drainage or

related civil works for example; **Matunda to Laimewet road in Kapkures Ward** that was constructed but did not last long and therefore, the county engineer should be on hand to provide leadership and guidance on what needs to be done and therefore, in 2015/2016, the monitoring and evaluation of projects should be strengthened and facilitated to do their work effectively before they are held accountable on poor infrastructure works done.

- The allocation for construction of roads to bitumen standard is not clearly understood by readers. For example, in 2014/15, Panvilla – Rivertex and Coca Cola – Iten Junction roads were allocated KES 28 million for construction of 1.5km being indicator for target. At this point, the budget does not give more details on how much each road was allocated while in 2015/2016, the construction of roads to bitumen standard has been allocated KES 65 million for construction of 2km being the target, however the same roads are lined up for construction as second phases with allocation of additional KES 30 million for Panvilla – Rivertex and KES 10 million for Iten Junction - rd and, an addition of Hellens – Komora to the list which is a new construction at KES 10 million.
- The whole story is not adding up and the county assembly should find out the complete story of this proposed program/project. First, the difference between the allocation for construction of road to bitumen standard in 2014/15 and 2015/16 is KES 37 million while the targets for these two years is 0.5km. Does it then imply that the additional KES 37 million will construct 0.5km of road only? This is not realistic. Secondly, Coca –Iten Junction road is half or less than half a kilometer, what is not clear at this point is how this short distance is constructed in two phases and finally, no construction has been started as of the time financial year to which this road was budget for implementation is a week away from closure.

4. Creating additional funding for programs targeted at addressing immediate concerns and challenges facing the public

- Public Service Management (PSM) has proposed an establishment of broadcast station at a cost of KES 7.2 million while under ICT and E-Government, KES 10 million has been set aside for the implementation of countywide radio communication system. This brings the total budget for establishment and operationalization of broadcast station. According to the public, there is no clear objective to be achieved upon successful of this project. Key questions that arose from our discussion

with public included; what difference will successful implementation of the establishment of broadcast station brings to the lives of the people that it isn't there now? What will make the youth to abandon other established broadcast stations to listen to the county broadcast station? According to simple calculation on cost maintenance and running of the stations, salaries alone will require a minimum of KES 400 million annually, what measures are in place to ensure this project sustains itself after implementation?

- Based on this critical question, the public proposes that, the project be allocated KES 200,000 for feasibility and viability study and the report to be presented to the public before the formulation of the next budget.

- Under Public Service Management, construction of Sub County offices has been allocated KES 30 million in 2015/16. This is an ongoing project started in 2014/15 with allocation of the KES 35 million. What is not clear at this point is whether this construction is new or renovation and expansion of existing structures of former county councils and secondly, people are not aware of any offices constructed or upgraded this year while the indicators in the budget programs shows that 3 offices has been constructed and furnished in 2014/15.
 - The public proposes that, the funding for this office be reduced and used for upgrading existing structures rather constructing the new offices while for cub counties which may require completely new structures, this should be done in phases to free resources to fund programs that aims to address immediate concerns and challenges facing delivery of services to the public.

- There are three proposals for land purchases for various uses across three departments; PSM at KES 3 million purposes not clear, Lands, Housing and Physical Planning at KES 15 million for land banking and Water, Environment and Natural Resources at KES 2 million for water supplies in 2015/16. The public understanding of Land banking budgeted for under Lands is for future use to construct public utilities which include construction of offices and water supplies facilities and as such, the other allocation for purchase of land under PSM and Water, Environment and Natural Resources are duplications. The indicators for the purchase of land banking shows that the department bought 10.5 acres of land in 2014/15 and intends to purchase additional 15 acres in 2015/16.
 - **Proposal:** The provision of land purchase under lands, environment and natural resources should be sufficient to provide space for construction of public utilities including offices etc and as such, the function of land purchase falls under this department and therefore the county assembly

should remove allocations for the same purpose in the other departments and reallocate the resources for priority programs and projects in 2015/16.

- Under the Finance and Economic Planning, Ward projects and Development (GV) are the projects proposed for implementation for 2015/16 financial year with an allocation of 90 million and 30 million respectively. From the onset, these two budget items are not clearly understood by readers. Assumptions are that the ward projects item is meant to be allocation to Ward Development Fund (WDF), similar to the Constituency Development Fund (CDF) at national level, while we failed to guess what Development (GV) project meant.
 - **Proposal:** The public is proposing that at the moment there are no laws and regulations to operationalize Ward Development Fund (in the assumption that this means the same thing as ward projects) and therefore, together with the Development (GV) these funds should then be directed to strengthen programs targeted at empowering the Youth, Women and people with disability.
- Purchase of motorcycles is amongst the numerous projects proposed across several departments; Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries and Water, Environment, Energy and Natural Resources departments. However the cost per unit varies for budget lines, for example, under Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries, the department has proposed to purchase 5 motorcycles at a cost of KES 1 million. see the table below for more details;

Department	Budget line item	Units	Cost
Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries	Purchase of 1motor vehicle and 5 motorbikes to revamping of extension services	5 motorcycles and 1 vehicle	5.5 million
	motorbikes (livestock department)	5	1 million
Water, Environment and natural resources	Purchase of motor bikes	2	600,000
	Purchase of a surveillance Motor Cycle 125CC	2	800,000

- **Proposal:** The public is concerned with the varied prices for the purchase of motorcycles across departments as shown in the table above and therefore request the county assembly to set a

standard price according to the markets rates and not more that KES 200,000 for a 150cc motorcycle.

5. Strengthening public participation by creating structures for effective consultations with public to align government decisions to public needs and preference

- The county assembly has proposed construction of new county assembly offices block phase1 with allocation of KES 60 million in 2015/2016. Members of the public believe that the county assembly should utilize the current offices and instead address immediate concerns facing the institution in executing its mandate. For example, the county assembly should focus on creating more space for the committees to discharge their respective mandate on time in this financial year by designing, restructuring and expanding the current structures to create more committee rooms and, also promoting and encouraging public participation during assembly business by expanding the current public gallery.

6. Economic empowerment and job creation through incentive to encourage youth, women and people living with disability embrace farming and value addition to create jobs:

- Under Agriculture, the government aims to empower 20,000 women groups through the *innua mama* projects at the cost of KES 20,000,000 in 2015/16. This is an ongoing program that was initiated in 2014/15 at a cost of KES 2.8 million. Another project in this category is the *Kijana na Acre* strategy with allocation of 35 million in 2015/16. It was during our discussion with the public that huge percentage of the participants learnt of these two initiatives. A few of the members of the public during this discussion were beneficiaries of the initiatives and shared their experiences on the implementation of the initiatives. According to the experience, members of the public appreciated the government move to empower women and the youth, however they are concerned about a few things;
 - **Design and implementation of the initiatives:** Despite these initiatives receiving praise, members of the public are concerned that they are not designed and implemented to

empower the target groups and no consultation happened in the conception of these two initiatives.

- The allocation for KES 20 million for 20,000 women groups means that each women group will get KES 1,000. According to women participants that we consulted during the forums, a group of women is composed of average of 15 women per group. What kind of program for 15 people can be funded with KES 1,000? Members of the public are also concerned that it is unlikely that this number of groups exists in the county and looks like the department did not research well before designing the program and therefore since no notes are provided to help readers to understand how this program is going to work, the county assembly committee for Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries should unfold the story behind the conception of this program.
- The budget has no proposal targeting people with disability and therefore, as proposed in point number five, the county assembly in undertaking the business of approving the budget should create resources and convene a special session with people living with disability to propose and design a program that is best suited to address unique challenges facing them and improve access to services.

7. Lack of justification of choices made, decisions taken and feedback after public consultation affects attendance and participation of public in government convened forums

A number of projects are not clearly understood by readers and require explanatory notes within the budget itself. Many at time the public is given verbal explanations on projects that later turns out not be correctly implemented thus such kind of explanations are not anchored anywhere in the official documents approved by the county assembly. This becomes difficult to hold the government accountable on that account. A few of these that require notes in this financial year include;

- Fencing of public utility under budget for lands while we have 2 other separate programs on fencing under Agriculture. The difference between these three budget lines is not clear as public utilities include the Chebororwa. We also need to know from reading the budget, the type of fence and the objective intended to be achieved with budget for that; a perimeter wall, aluminum or wrought iron fence or chain link fence?
- Reductions for ECDE funding. The public is concerned that the funding for ECDE infrastructure is reducing while the ECDE infrastructure is not yet adequate. The government might have justifications why this is reducing,

however without notes the public is not able to makes sense out of the changes made; why is the funding reducing this year, how many classrooms were constructed last year? Etc.

- The allocation for spatial planning is huge amount of resources and requires justification. The county assembly should seek advice from experts in this field to establish the actual estimated cost of the exercise and then revise this allocation appropriately, otherwise as it stands, this looks like an exaggerated budget.
- Financial reporting and feedback: members of the public are concerned that while the consultations on decision making have been inadequate the government, has also never given them feedback on how their input was used for few forums they attended and participated; how much of the view and proposals was taken in and not and why not. This also applies to implementation of the budgets; there are no reports on implementation progress and achievements made. This is discouraging the public from participating in future consultation as one of the key incentives that motivates to public participate is seeing the impact their input had in the decisions taken. Otherwise if this is not happening, people will not see the need of participating as the assumption will be that the government makes the decisions but then uses the public consultations to rubber stamp those decisions.
- The objective of a program based budget is to provide the objective, outputs and indicators for measuring performance through targets and link these to the resources that programs convert to these outputs and subsequently achieve the intended objective. The current budget estimates are not in a proper PBB format, although this is required by the PFM Act. In addition, the human resources in the programs are not provided. The budget should provide number of employees per job grade to which the allocation for salaries is provided for as well as; the number employees devolved from national government and those inherited from the local authorities, the newly employed and the personnel deficit for over the medium.

CONTACT:

All enquiries and questions related to the Proposals On Sector estimates, 2015/2016 should be directed to;

Kerio Center for Community Development and Human Rights (KCCDHR)

Governance and Social Development Program | Policy, Research and Advocacy

P.O BOX 8165 – 30100

ELDORET, KENYA.

EMAIL: org.cecode@gmail.com