

KERIO CENTER FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Eldoret International Airport Road,
Along Eld –Iten Rd, Action estate
Tel: 053 26 45 142,
Cell: 0735144317/0723757574/0722145536.



P.O. Box 8165-30100,
Eldoret, Kenya.

In collaboration with;

County Budget Group (CBG)

UASIN GISHU COUNTY FISCAL STRATEGIC PAPER

-

Civil Society Comments on the Process and Substantive Issues

Proposal to the county assembly of Uasin Gishu County.

February 27, 2014

Introduction:

Kerio Center for Community Development and Human Rights (KCCDHR) is a national NGO which was established in the year 2010 and registered in 2012, operating in the Kenyan counties of Elgeyo-Marakwet, Trans Nzoia, Uasin Gishu, Baringo and Nandi. We strive to advocate for and empower citizen to realize their rights that are necessary for effective participation in policy making process with current focus in county government budgeting process.

To achieve its goals, KCCDHR established a network of civil society organization, County Budget Group (CBG). The group is comprised of six independent and impartial civil society organizations operating in one or all the counties in the North rift region. All the organizations share a common goal: proactive engagement with the county governments to achieve optimal success in service delivery by promoting effective public consultation and public consultation structures.

In playing our role as citizen organized group as required by the PFM Act 2012, the constitution of Kenya and county government Act 2012 on public participation, KCCDHR and CBG deliberated over the CFSP over the last few weeks and therefore would like to take this opportunity to appreciate the efforts put in by the county government of Uasin Gishu to consult the public on the CFSP development. The network (CBG) through KCCDHR has been engaging with the government of Uasin Gishu through the department of finance and economic planning over the last few months over various issues regarding the processes regarding management of public finance. In November 2013, we fully participated in Uasin Gishu county finance bill where we later presented our observation and recommendation regarding the processes of public engagement. In February 2014, we presented a document on CFSP process that resulted in the current stage of the document. KCCDHR and its partner networks in CBG would like to present the following specific proposals in regards to CFSP for consideration.

Summary

In recognizing and appreciating our role as organized citizen group in the process of implementing devolution, county fiscal strategic paper (CFSP) being the first official document required of the government by the PFM Act 2012 through its CEC member for finance to set the ground for the county budget making processes for FY 2014/2015 which lays out the broad plans of the county in the next financial year, public input is priceless. Our proposal is informed by the requirements of the law in regards to the public input in the CFSP process that seeks to determine priority areas and estimation of allocation of resources, overview of the budget implementation 2013/2014 and estimation of revenues for the next FY 2013/2014.

After thorough review and analysis of the 2013/2014 county budget and the recent Budget Policy Statement (BPS) including its subsequent legislations which determine the shareable revenue among the governments, we are estimating the total county revenue for Uasin Gishu county government budget for FY 2014/2015 at KES 5.5 billion. The BPS in Section 138 on page 45 provides for the proposed vertical division of revenue; see table 4.2 on page 46 of the BPS which indicates the vertical allocation of revenue to county governments for 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 financial year). Section 138 estimates vertical allocation between the National and county governments, see table 4.3 on page 47 of the BPS which is broken down in section 139 - reflected in the Division of Revenue Bill 2014 as follows;

National Government: - KES 846.2 billion, less rural electrification (REA-Fund) KES 7.3 billion and equalization fund of KES 3.4 billion

Counties: - KES 228.5 inclusive of Rural electrification (REA, Fund) KES 7.3 billion and conditional allocation loans/grants of KES 13.9 billion. The total equitable share for counties is KES 221.2 billion (221,175,000,000 actual figure).

The BPS in section 146, see table 4.6 in page 53 of the BPS No. 44 goes further to estimate the allocation of the counties shareable revenue per county. Uasin Gishu County is estimated to get 2% of the KES 221, 175,000,000 which is equivalent to **KES 4,419,574,966**, however the total allocation for Uasin Gishu county inclusive of **Rural electrification** and **the conditional grants** totals up to **KES 4,662,157,588**. This allocation is estimated out of the lowest proposed shareable allocation for counties by treasury through DOR and CAR bills 2014, it could be more if the proposals for vertical allocation for counties by Commission of Revenue Allocation's (CRA) KES 279.1 billion, the Intergovernmental Budget and Economic Council's (IBEC) KES 238 billion and the Senate's KES 300 billion are considered. To arrive at our estimation of KES 5.5 Billion approximate total county revenue for the 2014/2015 FY, we have considered the possible allocation from the equitable share of revenue at KES 4.4 billion and, estimated the local revenue at KES 1 billion unlike the target for 2013/2014 at KES 1.7 billion. According to controller of budget (COB), UGC collected 18% of its target and we are of the view that, the county government overestimated its target for local revenue and therefore recommend to the county government to be realistic in its estimation of local revenue not to make the same mistake. Surplus will be safer than deficit!

In terms of priority areas for the next financial year, we are recommending an increase funding for agriculture, livestock and fisheries and public health service departments and decrease for roads and education respectively as follows;

- Public works, Roads and Transport sector to remain a priority for the 2014/2015 FY, however, we are recommending a reduction of 10% from its total allocation in the current FY at KES 1, 815,

Our mission is to advocate for the people, and advocate with the people in order to facilitate the people to advocate for democratic governance on their own.

544, 841 representing 31.2% to 21.2% (KES 1, 234, 123, 740) of the total county revenue to fund the increase of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries.

- Increase allocation for agriculture, livestock and fisheries department to 18% (KES 990, 000, 000) from 5.3% (KES 309, 369,235). 10% (KES 581, 421,101) deduction from Public Works, Roads and Transport department will aid this increase.

- Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries and Public Works, Roads and Transport sectors are the backbone of the county's economy while agriculture is main economic activity in the county. Therefore, the two sectors should be balanced for now as the infrastructure improves.

- Increase allocation for Public health Services to 15.3% (approx KES 841, 500, 000) from 13.3% (KES778, 558, 513), the increase can be compensated from among other reductions, 10% (KES 75, 279, 240) reduction of Education, Culture and Social Services from KES 376,396,200 to KES 301, 116, 900 representing 5.5% of the total budget.

- Our health centers and dispensaries lack enough capacity to serve the residents at grassroots leading to congestion at MTRH. An increase allocation of supply of drugs is one among very man solutions to this situation therefore the proposed allocation increase. We are also calling for close look at the procurement process at KEMSA in supply of drugs.

- In terms of estimating its equitable share of revenue, Uasin Gishu should note that, the economy grew by 12% of the 2011/2012 FY audited accounts; it will be very unrealistic for the county to estimate its revenue for 2014/2015 FY below KES 4.2/3 billion. If proposals by CRA/IBEC and Senate at KES 279.1 billion, KES 238 billion and KES 300 billion are to be considered in allocating counties equitable share of revenue, it is likely to be more.
- There is no one right way to distribute scarce public resources and determining priority areas, but good practices. Even within the public itself, there are numerous competing interests which at most are resolved via dialogue, good practice demands of an effective public consultation. Structures and regulations to guide effective public consultation should be put in place immediately. In particular, County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEF) is a necessity; this forum must be in place before April 2014 when budget hearings kicks off.
- To complement its efforts, the county government should recognize and appreciate the good work done by CSOs in the county. There are local, national and international non-governmental institutions with immense expertise and priceless willingness to build the capacity of the county governments to be able to effectively implement the constitution.

Introduction

Background information:

CFSP is the first official document released by county government laying out its broad plans for the next budget year. It normally includes a discussion of economic trends and an estimate of overall spending and revenues. It also gives an overview of the implementation of the current financial budget.

The 2013/2014 is the first full financial year of the government of Uasin Gishu like the rest of the 47 counties of Kenya under the devolved system of governance. We recognize and appreciate that

everything was rushed into during the first FY. Formulation and legislation of the 2013/2014 county budget, appointments to executive committees offices, the county public services board and legislation of policies to guide raising of revenue at the local level, just to mention a few, consumed almost the first quarter of this financial year. It is therefore a little too early to assess the performance of the county using this first quarter; however, it is important for the citizens of Uasin Gishu to be given an overview of the implementation processes, progress, challenges and achievements of the county government of Uasin Gishu for them to indulge in the successes, beware of the progress and understand the task ahead for the government in making Uasin Gishu a model county.

Sector allocation of resources according to Uasin Gishu budget version which was accessible to us

The Uasin Gishu county government budget document for 2013/2014 FY was not and remains not accessible to many ordinary citizens, it is therefore good for us to share how the county allocated resources to its priority areas in 2013/2014 FY. The government of Uasin Gishu county's top five priority areas by allocation is:

- Roads and transport department with allocation of KES 1, 815, 544, 841 representing 31.2% of the total county revenue, KES 1.3 million of this allocation was for capital expenditure;
- Public health services department received KES 778, 558, 513 representing 13.3% whereas out this allocation, KES 260 million went to capital expenditure;
- Education, Culture and Social Services received KES 376,396,200 representing 6.5% of which KES 200 million went to capital.
- Agriculture, livestock and fisheries was allocated KES 309, 369,235 representing 5.3% being the fourth highest ranked sector in terms of allocation. KES 105, 000, 000 representing 34% of the total sector allocation went to capital investment.
- Water, energy, forestry and natural resources got KES 154, 735, 804 representing 2.7% of the total budget; KES 50,000,000 went to capital expenditure.
- Last but not least due to its importance in sharing and access to information, Information communication and E-government sector was allocated KES 90, 126, 214 representing 1.5%.

Weaknesses in Budget Presentation 2013/14”

Beyond these sector allocations, the 2013/14 Uasin Gishu county budget falls short of good practice in terms of budget notes and narrative explanation of expenditure making difficult to tell whether the budget is being implemented as planned or not. It is not enough to allocate amount for example to a sub sector without further explanation on what exactly is required of such monies. For example, this vote copied from the county budget, the department of public works, roads and transport unit sector

“0901-01-00 PUBLIC WORKS, ROADS AND TRANSPORT UNIT: 2-9000 CAPITAL EXPENDITURES & INVESTMENTS”

2-9111 Material / Construction / Installation Cost **890,300,000**

2-9121 New Equipment Cost 288,400,000

TOTAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES & INVESTMENTS 1,178,700,000 is a lump sum allocation.

Minimum recommendations for Improved Budget Presentation 2014/15”

Good practice will answer questions such as: what materials? How many materials? Constructing what? If roads, how many roads of what length, how much money allocated per road- tarmac or gravel? Another good example is allocation of money to supply of computer and office supplies. This line doesn't tell how

many computers at how much, how many offices etc? It is therefore difficult to tell whether the budget is being implemented or not, whether public funds are prudently managed etc.

It is not good practice to simply provide tables with data without a good explanation. While the budget speech or statement that accompanies the budget may provide some information about county priorities, it is not a substitute for a detailed narrative within the budget documents that explains key tables and charts.

In order to assess the degree to which the budget is allocating resources equitably; we want to know where buildings and infrastructure will be located – which sub county, which ward, which village etc. This requires that spending information be broken down below the county level (to sub-county or ward). Generally, this information should be included in the part of the budget that details development (capital) expenditure. In brief, the county budget should give;

- + more narrative explanation
- + more detailed information on projects
- + number of units and unit cost for assets

Our proposals on priority areas: County Fiscal strategic paper (CFSP) 2014.

Good practice in the management of scarce public resource is when the priorities come from the people. Please note that we appreciate that there is no one right way to distribute scarce public resources, but rather, good practices in the processes. The public may be consulted, but even within it, there are competing interests. The following are our proposals for the top priority sectors for the next budget.

1st Public Works, Roads and Transport department: 21% of the total county revenue in 2014/2014 FY down from 31.2% in 2013/2014.

According to the county budget for 2013/2014 (version within our possession), public works, roads and transport sector was allocated major share of the county revenue as also indicated earlier in this document, this was really appropriate. Considering the role roads and general infrastructure play in development, it was good for the county government to put money in the said departments. Our view is that roads/transport is a critical area, but its allocation must reduce over time to ensure that other priorities are also receiving adequate funding. For this reason, we advocate a fall in the share of the budget going to roads, while remaining a major priority, and an increase, as described below, in the priority given to agriculture.

It is important to note that there were challenges of implementation of these departments especially during the early part of the first quarter. There was confusion on whose function was roads between the national and county governments; we believe this might have affected the implementation of roads to some extent. Even if that might be a valid reason for initial problems, it should not be enough reason to say nothing was implemented throughout the year because, the confusion was later resolved. Taking into consideration all the above arguments, it is our proposal that the sector be given another chance in the next financial year; however, we recommend that, 10% from sector's 2013/2014 allocation be taken to agriculture, livestock and fisheries sector to raise the allocation to about 18% of the total 2014/2015 financial.

2nd - Agriculture as priority area in 2014/2015 FY: 18% of the total county revenue up from 5.3% in 2013/2014.

As stated above, we believe that there should be a shift from roads to agriculture. Both are priorities, but agriculture merits an increase from last year's budget, which we propose should come from reducing the public works, roads and transport budget.

Our reasoning is that, Uasin Gishu being an agricultural county and one of the most fertile and suitable for farming by default, the agriculture sector should be the foundation of the economic growth of the county. However, it is important to remember that transport and other infrastructures are very critical for efficient implementation of the rest of the budget sectors therefore the linkage between the two sectors in terms of interdependency. Poor infrastructure such as roads, markets will definitely slow the development. Farmers will not access markets due to poor roads and infrastructure while on the other hand, the roads yield little or nothing if the farmers do not have anything or low quality farm produce to take to an improved market both locally and openings in other counties and international. This is where the county government economic growth comes into play. Another advantage of combining the prioritization of the two sectors is that, Eldoret town not only hosts the major agricultural market in the North Rift region serving other agricultural towns such as Trans Nzoia, Nandi and Elgeyo Marakwet counties, but also major national and international linkage; through roads (UG links Uganda - Nairobi, Nairobi – Trans Nzoia, Kisumu and entire western region), the Eldoret international airport is one golden opportunity and an asset to the county. With these linkages, the major and sustainable business items for the county are agricultural products. The improved road infrastructure means easy access to markets for agricultural produce within the county, region and international exports. This will not only benefit farmers and business fraternity within UG County but also from the neighboring counties who have similar commodities and would want to utilize UG's infrastructure.

Sector priority:

a) *Crop farming*

- **Build a strong and sustainable revenue base and improve the County's food security** – As an immediate strategy, the county government should make farm inputs readily accessible and affordable and, organize and build the capacity of farmers through agricultural extension services in order to encourage more farming. The extension services are currently offered at the district level, we are recommending an extension of the services to ward levels. High prices of farm inputs in addition to the combination of high cost of production and poor prices of farm produce and, lack of knowledge for modern farming is an impediment to farming as commercial business. Large scale farmers make losses and therefore, fail to see the need of farming. The government should consider establishing fertilizer factory in future and build partnerships with seed companies, technical assistance institutions both at the local and international levels.
- **Agribusiness** – with the infrastructural linkages beyond the borders of UG county, value added commodities are ideal for exports to generate sustainable income for the farmers, revenue for the county which in turn will improve the county's economic growth.
- **Market accessibility to help farmers increase their income, the county economic growth and sustainability** – there is a need therefore for the county government of Uasin Gishu to go beyond its borders to create market opportunities in other counties for its farmers' farm produce particularly value added ones. This will boost its chances of sustaining and growing its economic growth. This will not only improve the revenue base of the county but also livelihoods of its citizens.
- **Our medium term priority for this sector is maize milling plant and fertilizer factory.** We are not very sure what the CIDP says about these two items, but we believe it is necessary for

Our mission is to advocate for the people, and advocate with the people in order to facilitate the people to advocate for democratic governance on their own.

improving agribusiness farming. This is the very reason why the law is clear in the CIDP being a public document. We are appealing to the county government to launch and publish the document as soon as possible.

b) *Livestock farming*

Immediate

Owing to the poor road network and far flung markets, there is need for the county government to budget for milk cooling plants in the next financial year. This will reduce wastage in the form of spoilt milk and ensure farmers get a return for their produce.

- Agricultural extension services (livestock veterinary) –there is need for the government to build the capacity of the livestock farmers to improve the quality of their livestock. This will be achieved if other means, agriculture extension offices are efficient and accessible to the farmers.

Medium term

- Value addition: Milk cooling and Meat processing plant as medium term priority, however, we are proposing to the government to invest in and improve the capacity of the existing facilities, such as slaughter houses and milk cooling plants.

3rd - Health sector: 15.3% of the total county revenue up from 13.3% in 2013/2014 financial year. 10% from education sector is transferred to health.

- Adequate provision of drugs and equipments to public health facilities, in 2013/2014 financial year, the county government with a population of close 1 million, allocation of KES 4, 7 million of less including maternity provisions (maternity for provision for west health center only), supply of water and insecticides out of the total capital expenditure of KES 260 million is very low, unless otherwise, money is being allocated through different vote of the sector budget other than “Special Supplies (Bulk Water, Insecticides, Medicines)”. Health centers such as Kapsoya, Kapyemit, Kipkeino and Kimumu getting allocation of between KES 150,000 to KES 200,000 each for supply of medicine is very low allocation. Government cannot under fund supply of drugs when there is evidence all over the place that, patients are referred to private clinics/pharmacies/chemists to purchase drugs. It is our feeling that, something is wrong with the supply chain of drugs and equipments to the public hospitals and we would ask the government a very pertinent question. How well is the procurement with KEMSA working?
- It is very rare for one to be referred to a public health facility from a private health facility unless otherwise, a complex issue (s) that the private facilities would want to avoid being held accountable of. Please note that, private health facilities are far much expensive than public facilities thus, common *Mwananchi* strains to access medical services in such situation. Have you ever wondered why private health facilities never run out drugs/medicine? Of course public facilities such MTRH are fairly equipped, which is a plus for the county residents, but what about the unnecessary congestion? This is why the dispensaries, health centers, district health facilities must be equipped to improve the delivery of health services. We are recommending that, the

Our mission is to advocate for the people, and advocate with the people in order to facilitate the people to advocate for democratic governance on their own.

allocation for Special Supplies (Bulk Water, Insecticides, and Medicines) be increased from the current KES 4.7 million to KES 30 million at least for now. (Like earlier said, unless there is another vote allocating money for supply of drugs/medicine) and, a close look be paid to the procurement processes at KEMSA.

- Make ambulance services available and affordable – we are appealing to the county government to amend the finance bill. The bill in S/No. 20 (c) has increased the charges from KES 200- KES 2,500 (1,250%) very unrealistic change from previous fees. Given that the people are entitled to affordable healthcare service, the increase is not very good practice.
- Maternal health care is a primary health care function according to fourth schedule of the constitution of Kenya, however the national government is implementing this function, the county government should equip health centers, dispensaries and district hospitals and any other units with enough maternal health care facilities to reduce congestion in referral hospital facilities such MTRH which is suppose to handle high complex issues. Due to inadequate maternal health care resources at the dispensaries, health centers and district hospitals, people do not have faith and therefore refer themselves to MTRH over petty issues such normal delivery that could have been very handled at the district, health or dispensary level health facilities. The county should aim to improve services at lower levels and educate the public on the need to use these facilities first.

4th - Trade, commerce and industrialization: sub sector priority

- Cottage industries – the government should create conducive and an enabling environment for cottage industries to create employment for youth and improve its revenue base. Through the department of trade, commerce and industrialization should create opportunities and develop strategies to invite and encourage medium to large scale investors. This will create job opportunities as well strengthen the county revenue base.

Areas of concern

5th - physical planning, land and housing: implementing the bill of rights in the constitution visa a Vis revenue collection.

- County governments were basically meant to provide accessible and affordable housing for the poor. The constitution of Kenya article 43. In (1) provides that” Every person has the right— (b) to accessible and adequate housing, and to reasonable standards of sanitation; It is saddening for a common citizen to imagine that, the government has plans to increase the cost of renting a government house whereas the same government is supposed uphold and protect the constitution which through the bill of rights in the articles above provides for a right to shelter. The county government of Uasin Gishu through its 2013/2014 finance bill in part VI S/No 33 (a-p) and S/No.34 has increased the government rent charges by over 100%. What is the logic? The constitution in article 174: tasks in (f) the county governments to promote social and economic development and the provision of proximate, easily accessible services throughout Kenya; it is never too late for County Government of Uasin Gishu to correct this one though.

County revenue: maintain current budget to allow accurate estimation, stability and predictability local of revenue.

The total revenue for Uasin Gishu County for 2013 /2014 FY is KES 5, 821, 338, 398 (at least according to the budget version in our possession). Local sources was estimated to fund KES 1, 487, 407, 074 (but controller indicates KES 1.7 billion) while equitable county revenue funded the rest of the budget at KES 4, 353, 931, 320 (however the county indicates KES 3.8 billion). According to the controller of budget, Uasin Gishu County in its 1st quarter July - September 2013/2014 FY, raised KES 307,088,776 rep 18% of its annual target of 1.75billion. What does this tell us in terms of Uasin Gishu meetings its own county own annual target? What happens to the deficit resulting from the unrealized target?Uasin Gishu County overestimated its local revenue for 2013/2014 FY; they must not repeat the same mistake the next FY.

We are not very sure what Uasin Gishu County has estimated to expect from the counties equitable revenue, but as stated earlier, we are relying on the BPS figures which stands at KES 4.4 billion. The economy grew by 12% according to audited accounts 2011/2012 FY; it is very unrealistic for the county to estimate its revenue for 2014/2015 FY below KES 4.2/3 billion.

Estimating the county local revenue

Predictability and stability of local revenue growth

Thanks to the treasury for assuring protection of the county shareable revenue from any unanticipated shortfall at the national level. What about the local sources, how much is the county expecting to collect? As stated earlier, in 2013/2014 FY, the county estimated to collect KES 1.7 billion, which was positively ambitious. However, telling by the county performance in terms of collecting this revenue, meeting the 1.7 billion estimates is unlikely - meeting and exceeding this target cannot be ruled out yet, though till the end of the FY.

Our view/opinion on the county estimation of revenues is that, it is safer and more beneficial for the county government to have a surplus compared to the harm that may result in case of deficit due to failure to meet target of its local revenue target. We would advice for local revenue estimate at KES 1 billion which means maintaining county budget for 2013/2014 at close to 5.5billion at least for now to be able to asses and predict the county's local revenue growth/inflation rates. Surpluses can be pushed to the next budget if the county exceeds its target. It is a good practice to keep the budget within manageable levels.

UG County interest;

Public Debt and Other National Obligations: In 2014/15, the national treasury allocation for public debt and other national obligations is KES. 414.4 Billion, up from KES. 381.5 billion In 2013/14. - What does the CFSP for my county say on the issue of county debt? – Did the county inherit any debts from the local authorities? Does the county owe any other monies to any other institutions, which institutions and how much, what are the county plans to offset such debt? Is the county owed any money or any monetary-worth by any individual, institutions etc, which institutions/individuals, how much, what are the plans to collect these funds? Of cause the list of land rates debtors is available in the county website, very good practice for the county government.

Need for Flexibility in Responding to Emergencies and Other Temporary Needs –Does my budget have an emergency fund kitty? We were not able to find any clear allocation for a County Emergency Fund for the 2013/2014 FY as encouraged by the Public Finance Management Act 2012. In 2013/2014 financial year, the county budgetary allocation for Fire, ambulance and emergency services was KES 62, 542, 081, but there was no obvious allocation to an Emergency Fund. We believe the county should consider following good practice and dedicating up to 2% of revenues to such a fund.

Conclusions:

- Every budget must make choices about how to use limited amounts of money. As stated earlier, there is no one right way of allocating scarce public resources to different sectors; however, there are good practices. Notes, narrative explanation on why certain choices were made in a certain way, such as prioritizing and allocation of resources should be provided. Our concerns are basically in regards to proper consultation of the public that, the government must put in place measures and structures to consult and give feedback to the public on matters public finance. Forums such as CBEF should be put in place immediately and, properly constituted to facilitate the consultation between the government and the public during the ongoing county budget making processes.
- Good practice...Cont...: Good practice is to give an indication of the number of units (say, vehicles) and the total cost, along with a unit cost to know how much each asset is estimated to cost. This allows comparison with market rates and with other parts of the budget. In our review of some budgets, unit costs are missing and there is some evidence that they differ across departments within a single budget.
- *Demonstrating equitable sharing of resources and, transparent and accountable process in the management of scarce public resources:* In order to assess the degree to which the budget is allocating resources equitably and, monitor and evaluate the implementation of the county government budget, information on where buildings and infrastructure or in general projects will be located or implemented is necessary. This requires that spending information be broken down below the county level (to sub-county or ward). Generally, this information should be included in the part of the budget that details development (capital) expenditure.
- *Public documents: county budgets, county plans (CIDP for example) and implementation reports (quarterly and annually) are all public documents which the law require and provide timelines that, be made available to the public. The major function and role of the county website and departments such as “information, communication and e-government” are basically meant to aid sharing of public information. Where is the 2013/2014 budget? Where is the CIDP? Where are the implementation reports for the 1st and 2nd quarters?*
- *Public participation: we have shared with the county government more than once, the standard requirements of public participation. We need to see this change if the county government really means business with consulting the public.*
- *The task of consulting the public on matters of serious concern should be taken with same seriousness it carries. Structures and policies to guide proper implementation of public*

Our mission is to advocate for the people, and advocate with the people in order to facilitate the people to advocate for democratic governance on their own.

consultation are paramount and for concerns of effectiveness, the county government cannot do everything by itself. The county requires partners to offer expertise and consultancy in areas it considers challenging. Consulting the public in fulfilling the requirements of the constitution is one such area that, the county should welcome and appreciate the support of local, national and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs).