



act:onaid

**CONSTITUENCY DEVELOPMENT FUND (CDF) TRACKING REPORT FOR
RUMPHI WEST, CENTRAL AND EAST CONSTITUENCIES**

Title

**“TURNING CDF IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES INTO POSITIVE
IMPLEMENTATION CHANGES – “Change is not made without inconvenience”**

Submitted by

RUMPHI CIVIL SOCIETY NETWORK (RUSCN)

June 2017



This publication has been produced with the assistance of the European Union. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of Actionaid Malawi and CISANET and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | 1 |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | 2 |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONMYS | 3 |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 4 |
| 1.0 Background and Introduction | 7 |
| 1.1 Project Brief | 7 |
| 1.2 Objectives of the CDF Tracking Exercise | 7 |
| 1.3 CDF Guidelines and related Instruments | 8 |
| 1.4 Justification of Tracking CDF | 9 |
| 2.0 Methodology | 10 |
| 3.0 Limitations of the CDF Tracking Exercise | 11 |
| 4.0 Summary of Assessed Areas | 12 |
| 5.0 General Achievements in the Tracking Exercise | 13 |
| 6.0 Findings and Analysis of the Findings | 13 |
| 6.1 CDF Project Allocations and Disbursements in 2016/17 | 13 |
| 6.1.1 Rumphi West Constituency | 13 |
| 6.1.2 Rumphi Central Constituency | 15 |
| 6.1.3 Rumphi East Constituency | 16 |
| 6.2 Sampled CDF Projects Funded between 2014 and 2017 | 17 |
| 6.3 Community Access to Information on Public Funds | 18 |
| 6.4 Monitoring of CDF Projects | 19 |
| 6.5 Planned CDF versus Implemented Projects | 19 |
| 6.6 Procuring of CDF Goods and Services | 19 |
| 6.7 Sustainability of CDF Projects | 21 |
| 6.8 Impact of CDF Projects | 21 |
| 7.0 Recommendations | 22 |
| 8.0 References | 25 |
| 9.0 Appendices | 26 |
| 10.0 Photo Gallery | 32 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Rumphi Civil Society Network (RUCSN), working in collaboration with ActionAid Malawi (AAM) and Civil Society Agriculture Network (CISANET) extends its gratitude and appreciation to the District Commissioner and his team, for Rumphi District Council for willingly giving us the information that the budget tracking exercise used. Without the information herein, the tracking of the Constituency Development Funds (CDF) and their related activities would not have been a possible.

At RUCSN, we would fail in our duty to forget the immense contribution that ActionAid and CISANET have invested in CSO members in Rumphi by enabling us with skills and knowledge in budget tracking and policy advocacy. Without such empowerment drives from them, we would not have had the capacity to track the CDF budgets and related activities in three Traditional Authorities that fall under 3 constituencies (Rumphi West, Rumphi Central and Rumphi East) in Rumphi District.

For each and every progress we made in tracking the CDF funds and their related activities, RUCSN appreciates and commends the support of Rumphi District Executive Committee (DEC) for the support and encouragement that RUCSN has had from all its members in the spirit of transparency and accountability and indeed the enhancement of service provision.

RUCSN leadership, last but not least, applauds the team working spirit that existed and continues to exist among RUCSN members in the district. The members invested their energies, time and other resources in this exercise. It is your collective energies and other sacrifices that have brought us thus far and have also energized those that support us to be by our side in so many ways. I urge you that we move with clasped hands and collective voices for us to bring the results of the exercise to a successful conclusion and end, as the exercise is but a means to an end.

Lastly, our appreciation goes to all that contributed in one way or the other in this exercise that has enabled us to produce this report, an instrument that helps us to engage MPs and the district council, as we seek to facilitate the improvement of service delivery to community members.

LIST ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

| The following is a list of acronyms and abbreviations used in the report | | |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | CISANET | Civil Society Agriculture Network |
| 2 | CPA | Corrupt Practices Act |
| 3 | CSO | Civil Society Organisation |
| 4 | DC | District Commissioner |
| 5 | DDF | District Development Fund |
| 6 | DDP | District Executive Committee |
| 7 | DEC | District Executive Committee |
| 8 | DPD | Director of Planning and Development |
| 9 | EU | European Union |
| 10 | KII | Key Informant Interviews |
| 11 | LC | Local Council |
| 12 | LDF | Local Development Fund |
| 13 | LGA | Local Government Act |
| 14 | MP | Member of Parliament |
| 15 | PFMA | Public Finance Management Act |
| 16 | PIC | Project Implementation Committee |
| 17 | PPA | Public Procurement Act |
| 18 | RUSCN | Rumphi Civil Society Network |
| 19 | TA | Traditional Authority |
| 20 | VDC | Village Development Committee |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), in Rumphi district, through their CSO Network - Rumphi Civil Society Network (RUCSN) – organized themselves to undertake a CDF tracking exercise in 3 constituencies of Rumphi East, Central and West. The tracking mainly targeted some areas of TAs Mwamlowe, Chikulamayembe and Katumbi. The main objective of tracking the CDF budgets and related activities was to learn from challenges and best practices that exist in the implementation of CDF projects and to seek strategies of addressing or avoiding similar bottlenecks in future CDF projects. In the 3 TAs mentioned above, ActionAid Malawi (AAM) and CISANET are implementing an accountability project funded by the European Union. Therefore, both AAM and CISANET are working in close collaboration with Rumphi Civil Society Network.

Parliament in 2006 created CDF with the aim of spreading development in the country evenly. CDF seeks to provide MPs and their constituent communities with the opportunity to make choices and implement projects that maximise the people’s social and economic welfare. The fund exists to respond to immediate and short term community development needs.

The CDF tracking exercise unearthed a couple of findings, both positive and negative that the report encourages all key CDF stakeholders to use as stepping stones for attaining efficiency and effectiveness in the implementation of future CDF projects. Some of the findings include:

(1) The tracking exercise revealed that there is immense knowledge of CDF among community members, as a funding facility for short term community social needs. It was encouraging to hear that in Rumphi Central Constituency at the electrification project of TA Mwankhunikira’s office, community members were aware of the project cost, though they were not initially aware of how much had been allocated to the project. (2) Another finding highlighted that well constituted Project Implementation Committees (PIMs) were available in the following projects: Kaduku School block maintenance, (Rumphi West Constituency); Mzokoto ADMARC (Rumphi Central Constituency); REDF, Zowo Primary School teacher’s house and the maintenance of the TA’s office (Rumphi East Constituency). These committees were not available in the following projects: the electrification project of a CDA’s house and the maintenance of a police officer’s house in Rumphi West constituency; the electrification project of the TA’s Office at Chinyolo and the maintenance project of a school block at Chivwaradi primary school in Rumphi Central Constituency. (3) Another worrying finding was that large sums of CDF funds in the 2016/17 fiscal year in all the 3 constituencies (Rumphi West, Central and East) were not accounted for. Allegedly, they were spent on unnamed projects or on expenditures whose materials were not known. It involved 58% of K10,030,700 in Rumphi West Constituency; 42% of K11,148,004.92 in Rumphi Central Constituency and 88.5% of K10,764,330 in Rumphi East Constituency. Expenditures whose materials were not known and spending on unnamed projects creates a loophole for loss of funds, funds that cannot be identified with any project. (4) In all the projects that the tracking exercise went to, respondents bemoaned the lack of community access to information on public funds and other areas in terms of identification of projects, allocations to projects and expenditures thereof. These projects are: Chivwaradi, Mzokoto and TA Mwankhunikira’s office in Rumphi Central Constituency; REDF, Zowo School Teacher’s house and the TA’s office in

Rumphu East Constituency and Katowo Police House, CDA's house and Kaduku School block in Rumphu West Constituency. (5) In all the 9 sampled projects in Rumphu, in all constituencies, it was noted that CDF projects are hardly supervised or monitored by professionals from the council on the basis that the 5% earmarked for administration and monitoring is not released for the same. Any incompliance to the CDF guidelines is an accountability deficit. Monitoring is paramount, as incompetence and deviation from meeting acceptable government standards can be noted and corrected on time. (6) It was also noted that in all the 3 constituencies – the implemented activities were very different from those approved in the fiscal plans. What happens is that myriad last minute projects are identified and funded. This just fulfils the distribution of funds to cover very small projects, most of which might not change the social economic needs of constituents. Others felt that the last minute identification and funding of small projects is a deliberate consolidation of political power by MPs, as this statement by some respondents from Chivwaradi, in Rumphu Central Constituency can confirm: *‘we think this is part of a political campaign by our MP.’* (7) Yet another finding is the assertion by other quarters that the office of the DC is bypassed in the collection of quotations, deliveries of goods and negotiating contracts with contractors. This presents a risk of loss of funds, poor quality of workmanship and noncompliance to the Public Procurement Act (PPA). (8) In all the sampled projects, in all the 3 constituencies there was not a single CDF Constituency committee that comprised all relevant stakeholders charged with the administration of CDF projects. What is present, in each constituency, is a structure that consists of the representatives of the MPs at the pinnacle of administering CDF projects in liaison with MPs. However, in Rumphu West Constituency, the practice is buoyed by the presence of a well-coordinated structure that comprises the ADC chairpersons that convene to deliberate what funding goes to which project in the constituency. This is one of the best practices in the district worth emulating by other constituencies (9) it was also noted that a number of projects remain incomplete even after funding from the CDF project funding facility. The REDF and Zowo projects in Rumphu East; TA Mwanikhunikira's office and Mzokoto ADMARC, in Rumphu Central Constituency and the CDA's and police officer's houses in Rumphu West Constituency are some of the projects that remain incomplete. It is this piece meal funding of projects that is contributing to bottlenecks that prevent the full completion of projects and attainment of objectives for such projects. (10) While CDF guidelines are clear on the roles of councillors, at the Chivwaradi School block maintenance project, the councillor of the area was in the forefront participating in some processes of procuring project goods and services. The main role of a councillor is to provide oversight over all CDF projects in his or her ward and to inform Full Council on progress of projects in his/her ward. (11) Without community ownership of projects, the 3 constituencies cannot talk about sustainability too. In 2 projects (CDA's house and Katowo Police house), in Rumphu West Constituency, community members did not participate in the identification and implementation of the projects. In Rumphu Central, the Chivwaradi school project is another case in point, where community participation was not there. (13) The impact of some funded CDF projects was applauded in some project areas. For instance, the Mzokoto ADMARC project was hailed by the community for they now access maize within the area. *‘Money that we could have used for transport, had it been we were buying maize from Rumphu, was used to beef up our maize purchases’*, said one of the women.

A number of recommendations have been put in place to help key CDF implementers to put in place desirable changes that will enhance the delivery of CDF services in the district. The challenges that were identified, if we are a learning people, present an opportunity that if ceased can bring about desirable changes. It is about turning these negatives into positives. In RUSCN, we hope the tracking exercise will bring about changes, in line with the CDF guidelines, in the way the council implements all CDF projects. We wish you well for continued and improved service provision, as Horace says, ‘*who has begun has half done. Have the courage to begin. Begin.*’ In summary, the following are some of the recommendations:

- (1) Employ transparency and accountability in all CDF projects. Communities need information on funding and expenditure. Transparency and accountability boards can be used to display such information besides meetings and the print media.
- (2) It is strongly recommended that the 5 % meant for CDF projects’ administration is always released for its intended purposes. Lack of monitoring breeds incompetence and bad workmanship.
- (3) There is need to stick to planned CDF activities during implementation. Again, consultations on which projects could be included in the district budget based on communities’ priorities for approval by parliament need to start early. Further, identified projects need to be in line with priorities set out in the District Development Plans (DDP) and that Rumphi District council will need to always ensure that the DDP is up-to-date always
- (4) Ensure that all procurement processes need not bypass the office of the District Commissioner, as this presents a risk of loss of funds, poor quality of workmanship and noncompliance to the Public Procurement Act (PPA). Further, as Controlling Officers, DCs should ensure that funds are released when all necessary documents have been attached
- (5) CDF Constituency level committees, constituted with all relevant stakeholders, to administer and spearhead all CDF projects are a must. This avoids the creation of divisive politics and the politicization of CDF projects.
- (6) CDF Project Implementation Committees need to be instituted as per CDF guidelines comprising 5 members – with only 1 member appointed by the MP and the others by ADCs and Councilors.
- (7) for maximum benefit from CDF projects, there is need to initiate new big projects that can receive more funds from the CDF facility than to just rely on piece meal projects that prevent the full realization of the communities’ social and economic rights.
- (8) Councilors are advised to refrain from participating in the procurement of CDF project goods and services. Their main role is to provide oversight over all CDF projects in their wards.
- (9) Community participation being an inherent right for community members should be observed at all times. Community members can derive maximum benefits if they own the projects.
- (10) it is further recommended that unaccounted for Funds – 42% for Rumphi Central; 88% for Rumphi East and 58% for Rumphi central Constituencies be accounted for with speed.

1.0 BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Brief

ActionAid and CISANET are currently implementing a three year European Union (EU) funded project that started in February 2016. The project seeks to enhance CSOs' contributions to governance and development processes in Malawi. Further, the project also seeks to enhance citizen's participation in budget tracking and monitoring for equitable and sustainable development in Malawi. The overall objective of the project is to contribute to improved transparency and accountability in public expenditure at national and district council levels.

The project strategy is to enhance the capacities of CSOs, district councils, councillors and parliamentarians, media, and other relevant government line ministries in Nsanje, Phalombe, Mchinji and Rumphi to contribute to pro-poor budget planning and in the spirit of enhancing service delivery to marginalised groups and communities. The project's activities focus on enhancing interrelationships between key actors in order to provide institutionalized entry - points for citizens and their organizations in social accountability processes.

In Rumphi, after presenting the project to DEC, the project was allocated 3TAs, where it is being implemented. These are TAs – Mwankhunikira, Mwamlowe and Katumbi. Apart from working with Area Development Committee (ADC) and Village Development Committee (VDC) members, the project is also working with other citizens that have organised themselves through Reflection Action Circles (RACs) in the 3 TAs. In Rumphi, ActionAid and CISANET are working hand in hand with CSOs through Rumphi Civil Society Network (RUCSN). So far, the project, in Rumphi, continues to build and strengthen the capacities of RUCSN, ADCs, VDCs and some circle members in governance and accountability. One of the areas under accountability where RUCSN, ADC, ADC and RAC members' capacities were either built or strengthened is budget tracking.

In RACs, citizens identify, analyse and discuss their right to public services and how to promote transparency and accountability in the delivery of public services. In their discussions, they eventually come up with action points that seek address identified accountability gaps. Each circle is led by 2 trained facilitators, male and female. Participants sit in a circle, facing each other in their discussions. This methodology is helping to build the consciousness of citizens on their rights and their responsibilities in the process of claiming their right to quality public services.

Reflection action circles (RACs) are thus providing time and space for citizens to engage in sustained identification, reflection and analysis of accountability issues affecting them. They then plan for actions that seek the changes they want in the delivery of social services. The circles are providing some space, where citizens fulfil some democratic principles, as each one's voice is given equal weight, as members participate equally in decisions made.

1.2 Objectives of the Budget Tracking Exercise

The main objective of tracking the CDF budget and related activities was to learn about challenges and best practices that exist in the implementation of CDF projects in some

constituencies within Rumphi district and to seek strategies of addressing bottlenecks thereof, in future CDF projects. 1

Other objectives of the budget tracking exercise on CDF in Rumphi were as follows:

- To review and appreciate the flow and use of Constituency Development Funds (CDF) on a few sampled projects in line with the CDF guidelines and other related frameworks from 2014/15 to 2015/16 government fiscal years
- To identify and document lessons learned in the implementation of CDF projects and prescribe recommendations for improvements for other ongoing and future works on CDF funded projects.
- To provide a basis for citizens from various CDF sampled projects to hold duty bearers on their actions or inactions in the delivery of CDF related projects.
- To create an enabling democratic and policy environment where citizens seek accountability, claim their rights and participate in governance processes.
- To provide space and time for citizens to review if the provision of CDF related services is done in compliance with or contrary to standards for, which such services are supposed to be delivered.
- To provide room for duty bearers and citizens to interact, discuss CDF service delivery gaps and to agree on how best improvements in the delivery of CDF services could be attained.

1.3 CDF Guidelines and Related Instruments

The Constituency development fund (CDF) was created by Parliament in 2006 to among other things help to spread rural development in the country evenly. CDF is in line with the fiscal decentralisation processes in the country and involves the transfer of funds from Central Government (CG) to Local Authorities (LA). CDF is therefore subject to public funds management laws and procedures that include: The Public Finance Management Act (PFMA) 2003; The Public Procurement Act (PPA) 2003; The Corrupt Practices Act (CPA) 1995.

CDF seeks to provide MPs and their constituent communities with the opportunity to make choices and implement projects that maximise their welfare in line with their needs and preferences. The fund therefore exists to respond to immediate and short term community development needs.

CDF is just one of the many decentralised delivery mechanisms, in Malawi that were put in place to further increased and improved service delivery to the people of Malawi. CDF therefore is supposed to comply with all decentralised frameworks that the country had been able to put in place. One of the frameworks is the Local Government Act (LGA) 1998 that was put in place to further the constitutional order based on democratic principles of accountability, transparency and participation of citizens in decision making and development processes. Grassroots participation in planning, implementation, monitoring and delivery of services furthers, therefore, the realisation of the right to development, as without the participation of citizens, this right cannot be

achieved. The right to Development is stipulated in the Republican Constitution in Section 30 under Chapter 4.

CDF, as it is, furthers the fulfilment of the Decentralised policy frameworks whose objectives are to:

- Create a democratic environment and institutions for governance and development at the local level which facilitate participation of grassroots in decision making. This aims at making public service more efficient, economical and cost effective
- Promote accountability and good governance at the local level in order to help Government reduce poverty
- Mobilize the masses for socio-economic development at the local level

According to the 2010 amendment to the Republican Constitution, MPs are voting members of the councils in Malawi while the elected members of the councils are councillors, who are also voting members. Some of the windows of public development funds for the councils in Malawi include: The Local Development Fund (LDF), District Development Fund (DDF) and the Constituency Development Fund (CDF).

In line with section 37 of the Republican Constitution, on the *right of access to all information held by the state or any of its organs*, in 2016, Parliament passed the Access to Information (ATI) Bill. In February 2017, ATI was assented into law. Knowing very well that information and knowledge are power, this will go a long way to help citizens in the country to obtain information from any organ of the state and the state, as they participate in the monitoring and tracking of public budgets and expenditures. ATI aims at making government more open, transparent and accountable, in so doing enhance the protection of state resources for more and quality service delivery.

Further to this, the news, in February 2017, that the State President had approved the implementation of reforms in 16 district and town councils, is in the right direction. These are reforms on local governance, revenue generation and financial management systems, infrastructural development and management and urban planning and development among others. The reforms also include: Individual staff performance agreements and annual assessments; improvement of delivery of social services and redeployment of teachers to understaffed schools among many areas. Through this arrangement, councils are expected to implement their service charters. They are required to communities in planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of development projects and processes. All these are in the right direction, as long as the legal institutional frameworks are strengthened.

1.4 Justification of tracking CDF

Because CDF projects are funded with public funds that originate from taxes that Malawians pay, issues of transparency and accountability are primary in the use of CDF funds. Looking at the Decentralised frameworks that promote participation of citizens in the planning and implementation of projects, as a right, it is justifiable that citizens have a say on how CDF planning and implementation are undertaken. It is to this effect that the tracking itself will

generate learning on effective strategies that are being used in the implementation of CDF projects. Thus, the findings of the tracking of CDF resources will be used to inform programming on future CDF projects within Rumphi district and the country, as a whole. For this reason, lessons learned are going to be surfaced, which could be applied successfully in different development programmes and projects that are funded from the public purse.

The primary audience of the budget tracking report are the citizens of Rumphi, the District Council and Members of Parliament (MPs).

2.0 METHODOLOGY

The CDF budget tracking exercise employed a mixed bag of data collection methods that included primary and secondary, qualitative and quantitative methods. These methods helped to gather data, as the tracking sought to meet the objectives of the exercise.

- **Secondary data** was collected through a brief review of literature from the district council. This involved the review of relevant policies, laws, legislative and administrative documents related to the implementation of the CDF funding facility. These included the CDF guidelines, Council budgets, other CDF tracking reports, the Decentralization Policy, the Local Government (LG) Act (1998), the Republican Constitution, the Public Finance Management Act (PFMA) 2003, The Public Procurement Act (PPA) 2003; The Corrupt Practices Act (CPA) 1995.
- **Primary data** was collected through Key Informant Interviews (KII) with some beneficiaries of the CDF funded projects in all the 3 TAs that are implementing the social accountability project by AAM and CISANET. The other targets included community leaders. Primary data was further collected through Group Discussions (GDs) – these were groups of citizens and leaders from the areas where CDF projects have been implemented in the 3 TAs that are implementing the transparency and accountability project, funded by the EU. These assembled together to respond to a structured questionnaire on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact of CDF funded projects in their localities. Observations were also made in the process of verifying what some primary sources had said on CDF projects.

The team also developed and used structured questions for purposes of collecting relevant information on the implementation of CDF projects. This was administered to groups of people and individuals.

Number of people consulted for each project in the 3 TAs

| Item | Name of Project | TA | Number of people | Males | Females |
|------|------------------------------------|----------|------------------|-------|---------|
| 1 | Zowo Teacher's House - maintenance | Mwamlowe | 35 | 23 | 12 |
| 2 | REDEF | Mwamlowe | 32 | 22 | 10 |
| 3 | TA's office | Mwamlowe | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| 4 | Katowo Police house – re-roofing | Katumbi | 27 | 18 | 09 |
| 5 | Electrification of CDA’s house | Katumbi | 33 | 21 | 12 |
| 6 | Kaduku Primary school Block maintenance | Katumbi | 59 | 27 | 32 |
| 7 | Mzokoto ADMARC | Mwankhunikira | 20 | 12 | 08 |
| 8 | Electrification of TA’s office | Mwankhunikira | 15 | 12 | 03 |
| 9 | Chivwaradi Primary school | Mwankhunikira | 30 | 20 | 10 |
| | Totals | | 251 | 155 | 96 |

- **Sampling** – The sampled CDF projects were sampled out of 23 projects in Rumphi West Constituency, 20 projects in Rumphi Central Constituency and 11 projects in Rumphi East Constituency. These projects were from within TAs Mwankhunikira, Mwamlowe and Katumbi, where ActionAid and CISANET are implementing the social accountability project funded by the EU. The sample wanted to get community perceptions on some aspects of CDF projects that include: their knowledge of CDF, identification, implementation and monitoring processes and the impact of CDF projects. The sampled projects were:

- ✓ In Katumbi, the sampled projects were:
 1. Kaduku Primary school Block Maintenance (Dec 2015).
 2. Electrification of the CDA’s house (2016).
 3. The maintenance of a house for a police officer, (Nov 2016).
- ✓ In TA Mwankhunikira, the sampled projects were:
 1. Chivwaladi Primary School block,
 2. Electrification of TA Mwankhunikira’s Office (2015).
 3. Construction of Mzokoto ADMARC (2014) that was allocated
- ✓ While in TA Mwamlowe, the sampled projects were:
 1. Maintenance of Teacher’s house at Zowo, allocated
 2. REDF (2016) and
 3. The TA’s office, (July 2016),

- The information gathered from community groups was validated through key informants, the information that was collected from the district council records and own observations by the enumerators.

3.0 LIMITATIONS OF THE CDF TRACKING EXERCISE

- It is indisputable that being able to identify changes by respondents requires a degree of comparison between points in time. It is for this reason that some respondents could not recollect vividly the situation and processes followed in some CDF projects, as

some were barely involved in the identification, planning and implementation stages of such projects. This might have been due to purely loss of or poor recollection of events, processes and situations.

- The bias that is inherent in a narrative review is that our interactions with some respondents might not have uncovered all possible arguments for or against an issue that we really wanted to understand deeply because of bias. The tracking exercise created comfortable environments for people to provide frank and objective perspectives by ensuring they were aware that the purpose of the tracking exercise was not judgmental but rather a learning and improvement seeking exercise. In addition, information was well and clearly triangulated to ensure its validity.
- Some of the information that was sought from the council in terms of CDF budgets and expenditures was found from various files. Some information might have been missed or bypassed therefore creating information gaps that might have affected the true scope of some of the issues in the tracking report. This was, however, compensated by the processes of triangulation that were employed in the process of seeking information.

4.0 A SUMMARY OF ASSESSED AREAS IN THE TRACKING EXERCISE AND A SET OF QUESTIONS THAT WERE USED.

The tracking exercise in 3 constituencies – Rumphi Central, East and West – specifically in TAs Mwankhunikira, Mwamlowe and Katumbi, used a set of topical areas to gauge community members’ perceptions on CDF under a broad topical area of Transparency and Accountability. Under this broad topical area, the following are some sub topical areas of interest:

- Knowledge and Understanding of CDF by respondents
- Identification of CDF projects – how projects are identified
- CDF Projects Budget Allocations
- Management of CDF Funds – a look into how CDF funds are managed and how the system ensures accountability
- Procurement of CDF Project Goods and Services
- Community Participation
- Community access to information on public funds
- Monitoring
- Sustainability
- Impact of CDF Projects

NOTE: For a detailed look into the topical areas that the tracking exercise used, a detailed look into the topical areas and questions thereof, can be seen in **Appendix 1**

5.0 GENERAL ACHIEVEMENTS NOTED IN THE TRACKING EXERCISE

The general achievements, as pertains to CDF for community members, as unearthed by the tracking exercise in the three constituencies include the following:

- (1) One of the big achievements of CDF is that there is immense knowledge of CDF among respondents, as a window that councils and MPs use to finance social economic projects in the 3 constituencies – Rumphi West, East and Central. *‘tikumanya kweni kuti ni ndalama za chigawa izo MP wakulamulira kwendeskelavitukuko’*, said one of the respondents at Zowo, in Rumphi East constituency. Out of the 9 sampled sites, it was only respondents from TA Mwanikhunikira, at the electrification project of the TA’s office that said they had no knowledge of what CDF was all about.
- (2) The impact of some funded CDF projects was applauded in some project areas. For instance, the Mzokoto ADMARD project was hailed a lot as community members, access maize from within the area. *‘Money that we could have used for transport, had it been we were buying food from Rumphi, was used to beef up our maize purchases’*, said one of the women.

6.0 FINDINGS: findings depict both positive and negative practices that were identified from the CDF budget tracking exercise in 3 constituencies of Rumphi east, west and Central specifically in TAs – Katumbi, Mwanikhunikira and Mwamlowe. These practices were further analyzed in conformity with related Local Government policy documents. Recommendations too constitute part of the findings.

6.1 CDF Allocations in 2016/17 and Disbursements to Various Projects versus Management of CDF Funds

6.1.1 Rumphi West Constituency

| No | Name of Project | Nature of Expenditure | Amount | No | Name of Project | Nature of Expenditure | Amount |
|----|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|----|----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| 1 | | Materials | 3,158,510.00 | 15 | Bawa School Block Rehabilitation | building materials | 68,000.00 |
| 2 | Thazima School | | 141,000.00 | 16 | Lundu Admarc | building materials | 315,800.00 |
| 3 | Kamphenda AEDO | | 46,000.00 | 17 | Bolero Teachers house | building materials | 64,600.00 |
| 4 | Katowo chief Office | | 141,000.00 | 18 | Chanyoli Administrat | building materials | 207,000.00 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|----|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | ion block | | |
| 5 | Katowo Police House | | 46,000.00 | 19 | Bululji School block | building materials | 136,000.00 |
| 6 | Zolokere Chiefs office | Transportation /Materials | 102,390.00 | 20 | Masato FP School | building materials | 54,400.00 |
| 7 | Bolero Police Unit | Transportation | 105,000.00 | 21 | Lumphawa Clinic | building materials | 132,000.00 |
| 8 | Bolero Police Unit | labour | 152,000.00 | 22 | Zolokere School block | building materials | 43,500.00 |
| 9 | Kankhoka School block | building materials | 1,114,500.00 | 23 | Jandalavu School | building materials | 82,500.00 |
| 10 | Kasonkhwe staff houses | building materials | 281,700.00 | 24 | No project indicated | building materials | 175,000.00 |
| 11 | Chiyola Teachers house Rehabilitation | building materials | 153,800.00 | 25 | Bolero School | | 95,000.00 |
| 12 | Bolero Rural Hospital | building materials | 145,800.00 | 26 | Kamphenda School | | 95,000.00 |
| 13 | Bolero RTC Bolehole | building materials | 161,000.00 | | Unidentified Projects | | 2,646,600 |
| 14 | Mphopwe Teachers house | building materials | 166,600.00 | | Total Amount for Rumphi West Constituency | | 10,030,700 |

For Rumphi West Constituency, the following observations were made:

- **According to the findings in Rumphi West Constituency, K5,804,750 remains unaccounted for.** This constitutes about 58% of total CDF funds in the said fiscal year. Out of these funds, **K3,158,150.00** had no name or names of projects that benefited from these funds. The nature of ‘‘expenditure’’ simply says materials while **K2,646,600.00** was used on unidentified projects, according to information from the council. This constitutes about 58% of total funds (K10,030,700) that Rumphi west constituency allocated to different CDF projects in the 2016/2017 fiscal year. Questions like what were the funds spent on, are on people’s lips. This is an unanswered question that still begs for answers.
- There are a couple of projects where the nature of expenditure was not mentioned in the financial report from the District Council. The projects include: Thazima School,

Kamphenda AEDO, Katowo Chief's Office, Katowo Police Unit House, Kamphenda School and Bolero school. Going through the financial report, this information is clearly not there in the report. Incomplete information in reports portrays incomplete accountability and transparency.

6.1.2 Rumphi Central Constituency

| No | Name of Project | Nature of Expenditure | Amount | No | Name of Project | Nature of Expenditure | Amount |
|----|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|----|--|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | | Materials | 2,710,000.00 | 13 | Mphompha clinic | Transport /materials | 595,450.00 |
| 2 | Betha School block | Labour | 150,000.00 | 14 | Ngonga football pitch | Transport /materials | 213,900.00 |
| 3 | Mzokoto Admarc | Labour | 170,000.00 | 15 | Nkhwangu football pitch | Transport /materials | 213,900.00 |
| 4 | Chozoli School block | Materials(Small bricks) | 500,000.00 | 16 | Phalasiu irrigation | Transport /materials | 207,500.00 |
| 5 | Rumphi hosp - Chankhomi Road | Labour | 408,504.92 | 17 | Mphande School | Labour | 50,000.00 |
| 6 | Njolowiro Bridge | Labour | 1,000,000.00 | 18 | No project indicated | Labour | 600,000.00 |
| 7 | Balwe Mjuma Road | materials | 270,000.00 | 19 | No project indicated | building materials | 600,000.00 |
| 8 | Lubagha Bridge | Transport materials | 1,435,000.00 | 20 | Kanyerere Clinic | building materials | 200,000.00 |
| 9 | Chilundanya Church | Transport materials | 25,000.00 | 21 | No project indicated | | 450,000.00 |
| 10 | Chiyola | Transport materials | 25,000.00 | 22 | No project indicated | | 100,000.00 |
| 11 | Doroba St Calvin | Transport /materials | 198,750.00 | 23 | | | 250,000.00 |
| 12 | Lupalamizi | Transport /materials | 25,000.00 | 24 | chozoli bridge | | 750,000.00 |
| | | | | | Total for Rumphi Central Constituency | | 11,148,004.92 |

For Rumphi Central Constituency, the following observations were arrived at after scrutinising the 2016/17 CDF allocations, presented by the district council secretariat:

- **K4,710,000 in Rumphi Central Constituency remains unaccounted for**, as K2, 710,000.00 was used for materials whose projects were not mentioned while a total of K2, 000,000.00 went to 5 projects that were not mentioned in the report. This constitutes about 42% of total funds (K11,148,004.92) that Rumphi Central Constituency allocated to different CDF projects in the 2016/2017 fiscal year. Questions like on which materials and projects were the funds spent on? And were the funds really used for CDF projects, were the funds stolen, are on people's lips. These remain unanswered questions that still beg for answers.
- There are projects where the nature of expenditure was not mentioned in the financial report from the District Council. The projects include 3 unnamed projects, which makes it even harder to check or confirm the expenditures. As pointed out above, incomplete information in reports portrays incomplete accountability and transparency. This impinges the very ideals or pillars of our decentralized frameworks.

6.1.3 Rumphi East Constituency

| No | Name of Project | Nature of Expenditure | Amount | No | Name of Project | Nature of Expenditure | Amount |
|----|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------|----|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | Zowo Brigde | Materials (lampstones) | 250,000.00 | 9 | Tcharo School | | 200,000.00 |
| 2 | No projects indicated | | 858,600.00 | 10 | No projects indicated | | 100,000.00 |
| 3 | Mzuwo FP School | materials planks | 288,750.00 | 11 | Mphalamawe | | 290,096.00 |
| 4 | Chisanga FP School | materials planks | 288,750.00 | 12 | Boto School | | 290,096.00 |
| 5 | Mfulu FP School | materials planks | 738,750.00 | 13 | Mchenga school | | 290,096.00 |
| 6 | Msuku FP School | materials planks | 538,750.00 | 14 | Mlowe school | | 290,096.00 |
| 7 | No projects indicated | Building materials | 5,000,000.00 | 15 | Chombe School | | 290,096.00 |
| 8 | No projects | Building materials | 1,050,250.00 | | | | 10,764,330.00 |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| indicated | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|

For Rumphi East Constituency, the following observations were made at after scrutinising the 2016/17 CDF allocations, presented by the district council secretariat to the CDF tracking team:

- 88.5% (K9,527,930) in Rumphi East Constituency remain unaccounted for. K6,918,850 was allegedly spent on 4 unnamed projects while for K2,609,080 the nature of expenditures were not mentioned. The tracking could not establish what services or goods were bought. The biggest danger here is that 88.5% of the CDF funds were spent on unnamed projects and on projects whose nature of expenditure was not known. Were the funds really used on community projects? This is one of the questions that can be raised.

6.2 Sampled Projects that were funded from the 2014/15 to the 2016/17 fiscal years, their allocations and observations made:

- ✓ In Rumphi West Constituency, specifically in TA Katumbi, the sampled projects and their allocations were:
 4. Kaduku Primary School Block Maintenance (Dec 2015). The projected was allocated K685,000 – allocation was known by the community and confirmed by the district council.
 5. Electrification of the CDA’s house (2016). The amount allocated was K109,405.00 – Given by the MP’s Representative.
 6. The maintenance of a house for a police officer, (Nov 2016). This project was allocated K211,000. The figure was given by the council but not known by the community.
- ✓ **In Rumphi Central Constituency, specifically in TA Mwankhunikira, the sampled projects and their allocations were:**
 4. Chivwaladi Primary School block.
 5. Electrification of TA Mwankhunikira’s Office (2015). The funds allocated to the project were K100,000 according to the representative of the MP on CDF projects, Mr Bowoyeke Munthali. The council was unable to establish this record.
 6. Construction of Mzokoto ADMARC (2014) that was allocated K758,860. Figure given by the council.
- ✓ **In Rumphi East Constituency, specifically in TA Mwamlowe, the sampled projects and their allocations were:**
 4. Maintenance of Teacher’s house at Zowo, allocated K567,400 - (December 2014). The council gave out the figures. In 2016/17 the school was also funded a total of K288,750 was also allocated.

5. REDF (2016) and
6. The TA's office, (July 2016)

6.3 Community Access to Information on Public Funds

In Rumphi West Constituency, in 2 of the 3 sampled projects implemented in TA Katumbi, there was no transparency and openness. Respondents were not told how much funds were allocated and finally disbursed to a maintenance project of a police officer's house at Katowo and to another project on the maintenance of a CDA's house. *'We do not know how much funds were allocated, finally disbursed and spent on this project at Katowo police. We were surely not involved in the identification of this project. We wished the MP, councillor and ADC members had made aware of the allocated funds, disbursed funds and how much had been spent finally. It is our right'*, said one of the community members.

In the Chivwaradi primary school project and Mzokoto ADMARC project, in Rumphi Central Constituency, in TA Mwankhunikira, respondents said they were not told how much was allocated and disbursed to the project and ultimately how much was used in the project. In another project within TA Mwankhunikira in Rumphi central Constituency, respondents said, *'while we knew the project cost on the electrification of TA Mwankhunikira's office, at Chinyolo, we were not aware of how much had been allocated and finally disbursed.'* While fingers pointed towards councillors, MPs and the council officials, on why communities were not aware of how much funds were allocated, disbursed and used on CDF projects, it was also noted that communities were unable to exercise their right to demand information, like budgets, from duty bearers.

In Rumphi East Constituency, in TA Mwamlowe, in all the 3 sampled projects, it was found out that the respondents were not aware of how much had been allocated, finally disbursed and used. The sampled projects in the TA included: the maintenance of a teacher's house, the Rumphi East Development Fund (REDF) project and the maintenance of the TA's office. *'Besides not knowing how much was allocated, disbursed and finally used, we were also not aware of who procured the goods and services for the projects. This constitutes the denial of our right to information and to participate in decision making'*, said one of the respondents.

It is apparent that access to all necessary information on CDF allocations, disbursement and expenditures by concerned communities in the 3 constituencies in the 3 TAs, had been denied. This is an accountability gap on the part of MPs, ADC members, councillors and the technocrats from Rumphi District council. Communities have a constitutional right to all information relating to CDF projects that they are supposed to benefit from.

6.4 Monitoring of CDF Projects

In all the 9 sampled projects in Rumphi East, West and Central constituencies, it was noted that CDF projects are hardly supervised or monitored by professionals from the council on the basis that the 5% earmarked for administration and monitoring is not released for the same. MPs have always put their feet down insisting that they better employ the 5% into funding projects than spare the same for administering and monitoring CDF projects.

We would want to point out that any incompliance to the CDF guidelines, whether for a good cause or not contravenes the same guidelines that are supposed to be followed to the letter. Funds for administration and monitoring are important, as incompetence and deviation from meeting acceptable government standards can be noted and corrected on time.

6.5 Planned CDF projects versus implemented projects

In all the 3 constituencies – Rumphi East, West and Central – the implemented activities were very different from those that were sent for approval in their respective fiscal plans and budgets. The practice has been such that during implementation, it is when other projects are identified and funded for implementation within constituencies. These changes constitute an indication that budgetary consultations on which projects to be included in the plans, for approval, are not done during the planning period. By implementing a myriad last minute community projects, MPs and the council just fulfil the distribution of funds to cover very small projects, most of which might not change the social economic needs of constituents. This might also be misconstrued, as a consolidation of political power by MPs. This statement by some respondents from Chivwaradi, in Rumphi Central Constituency affirms this: *“we think this is part of a political campaign by our MP.”* Respondents at Mzokoto ADMARC in Rumphi Central emphasized on the need not to politicise CDF projects.

6.6 Procuring of CDF project goods and services

The tracking and monitoring of CDF activities, also found out that the office of the DC is bypassed in some processes in the procuring of some goods and services. These mostly hinge on the collection of quotations, deliveries of goods and negotiating contracts to a larger extent. This presents a risk of loss of funds, poor quality of workmanship and noncompliance to the Public Procurement Act (PPA).

In all the sampled projects that the tracking team visited, in the 3 constituencies – Rumphi West, East and Central, in the 3 TAs – Katumbi, Mwanikhunikira and Mwamlowe – there were no CDF committees, comprising all relevant stakeholders charged with the administration of CDF projects at constituency level. What is present is a structure that consists of the representatives of the MPs. The representatives of the MPs, in all the 3 constituencies – Rumphi West, East and Central, are wholly at the pinnacle of administering CDF funds in liaison with MPs. To make matters worse, the representatives

of the MPs were from the same political party with their MP. This has created divisive political havens that have excluded other stakeholders from a number of institutions. The result is that CDF is being politicized.

It was found out that in the following projects: Kaduku School block maintenance, in Rumphi West Constituency; Mzokoto ADMARC, in Rumphi Central Constituency; REDF, Zowo Primary School teacher's house and the maintenance of the TA's office in Rumphi East Constituency had well constituted project implementation committees (PICs). The members comprised ADC, VDC, chiefs and the MP's representative. However, there were no PICs in the following CDF projects: Katowo Police House maintenance, maintenance of a CDA's house in Rumphi West Constituency; electrification of TA's office and Chivwaradi primary school maintenance project in Rumphi Central Constituency. According to CDF guidelines, this committee should comprise 5 members – with only 1 member appointed by the MP and the others by ADCs and Councilors.

Some CDF projects, like the Rumphi East Development Fund (REDF) project, remain incomplete to date. *“Even if the REDF project remains incomplete, we appreciate that it has been roofed with funding from CDF. As a community, we are now able to hold several community meetings in the structure. We pray for its ultimate completion. This is a project that started in 1994,”* said one of the respondents from Rumphi East Constituency. Though the ZOWO teacher's house maintenance project has not been fully completed, it is habitable and a teacher now occupies the house. The funds that were given to the project facilitated some important maintenance works that allowed one of the teachers to occupy it. *“In this project, we are satisfied with the workmanship of the contractor,”* said one of the respondents.

In the electrification project of TA Mwankhunikira's office, in Rumphi Central Constituency, all the planned works pertaining to the electrification of the office were concluded. Satisfaction was also expressed by respondents at Chivwaradi primary school and Mzokoto ADMARC projects, as all the planned works were completed.

While all works pertaining to most of the projects were complemented based on the funds allocated to each of the projects, it is necessary to point out that the allocated funds were insufficient to fully complete the projects. Piece meal funding of projects is contributing to bottlenecks that prevent the full attainment of objectives for such projects.

In a certain project (Chivwaradi School project), the community informed the study that their councilor was in the forefront participating in some processes of procuring project goods and services. *The CDF guidelines are very clear in terms of the roles councilors are supposed to play. Their main role is to provide oversight over all CDF projects in their wards. As such, they are supposed to inform Full Council on progress of projects in their respective wards.*

Chivwaradi, Mzokoto and the electrification project of TA Mwankhunikira's office in Rumphi Central Constituency; REDF, Zowo School Teacher's house and the office of the TA in Rumphi East Constituency Katowo Police House, the electrification of the CDA's

house and Kaduku School block in Rumphi West Constituency, the respondents bemoaned lack of transparency and accountability. Respondents said that they were not aware how much funds were allocated to all but one project, Zowo Teacher's house maintenance. Further they were not aware of actual project expenditures and balances thereof. *"we would very much love to be informed about how much each project was allocated and further how much was spent on each project. We are very thankful that the government introduced this window of funding in constituencies"*, said one of the respondents at Zowo Primary School. *"We appreciate decentralization through which this window of funding, CDF, was created. We are able to easily access funding for small projects here. However, some gaps remain in that we are not involved in many of the CDF processes,"* one of the respondents at the REDF project commented.

6.7 Sustainability of CDF projects

CDF projects implemented in TA Katumbi had a mixed bag of findings on sustainability. In 2 (electrification of a CDA's house and re-roofing of a police officer's house) of the 3 projects, where community members did not participate, the community members did not own the implemented projects. This was so because the community did not participate in the identification of the projects. The ADC and VDC are the ones that identified the projects. The electrification of the CDA's was not even considered a priority project by the community. The re-roofing of a house for a police officer was still considered one of the priority projects in the area.

Even in TA Mwankhunikira, for Chivwaradi school project, there was no community participation save for their contributions for the purchase of wire nails, binding wire and ridges. The community was not happy because it was side-lined from participating in the project. At Chivwaradi School, some community members thought that the school block maintenance project is part of a political campaign by the incumbent MP. For the Mzokoto ADMARC project, community members confirmed that there was some community participation and that the project had indeed been one of their priorities. The community, own the project. For the project on the electrification of the TA's office, there was minimal community participation. The community expected that they could have been involved in the purchase of project materials and services.

The projects in TA Mwamlowe have had a measure of community participation through the mobilisation of locally available materials. They also acknowledged that they took part in the identification of the projects and these were some of their priorities. From this and other comments from them, they gladly own the projects.

6.8 Impact of CDF Projects

At Chivwaradi, the community and specifically the learners have a school block that is roofed with iron sheets though some part of the block is not roofed. The block has protected learners from adverse weather conditions. As a result, they are able to achieve their learning outcomes. The ADMARC Mzokoto project has had a big impact in the lives

of the people around Mzokoto area in TA Mwanikhunikira, as community members, have been accessing maize from within the area. ‘*Money that we could have used for fuel, had it been we were buying food from Rumphu, was used to beef up our maize purchases*’’, said one of the women.

The maintenance of a teacher’s house has helped to give confidence to teachers that the community, MP and local council are committed to give them better accommodation. Some teachers that had wanted to leave the school because of poor housing have changed their minds to do so. Therefore, the teachers continue to provide their teaching services with commitment and dedication. For the REDF project, because it has been roofed, the community started using the structure for meetings though the facility has not been completed. Previously, chiefs used to meet under a mango tree but now they are using the REDF structure. Besides this, the community is happy, as the structure has improved the beauty of the place. For the TA’s office, an early childhood centre has been introduced, where children are learning through play.

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) Since community members have a right to all pieces of information on any projects taking place in their localities, MPs, councilors, ADC members and technocrats from Rumphu District council, need to exercise their constitutional obligations to inform community members on how much funds were allocated, disbursed and used on any CDF project. Further, authorities need to ensure that all channels of identifying projects are always open, for transparency and accountability to take centre stage. Transparency and accountability can be promoted through the use of transparency and accountability boards, where information relating to budgets, disbursed and used funds can be displayed for each project within constituencies and the district level. Further to this, it is recommended that the council could use the print media to display all pieces of information relating to either allocation to projects or expenditures of projects. It is also important that while the onus of ensuring that such information is given to communities’ rests on duty bearers, communities too need to start demanding for such information, as it is their rights to do so.
- (2) It is strongly recommended that the 5 % meant for CDF projects’ administration is always released for its intended purposes. Lack of compliance contravenes CDF guidelines. Lack of monitoring is a health breeding ground for incompetence and bad workmanship. Monitoring promotes the realisation of acceptable government standards. Any deviation can be noted on time and corrected on timely.
- (3) It is recommended that there should always be strict adherence to planned activities in the implementation of CDF.

Further, consultations on which projects could be included in the district budget to be approved by parliament need to be done on time so that projects, based on communities' priorities are included in the district budget for approval by parliament. The CDF guidelines clearly stipulate that MPs, at least once a year, need to organize a meeting with chiefs, councilors and ADCs within their constituencies to identify and prioritize projects that meet the immediate social and economic needs of the people that can be funded through CDF. These include on-going projects. Further, the CDF guidelines point out that selected projects should be in line with priorities in the District Development Plans (DDP). Further, the guidelines say that MPs, Councilors and ADC members need to familiarize themselves with key priorities in the DDP.

To this effect, it is also recommended that Rumphi District Council need to ensure that its DDP is always up to date and relevant.

- (4) The report recommends that all procurement processes need not bypass the office of the District Commissioner. This presents a risk of loss of funds, poor quality of workmanship and noncompliance to the Public Procurement Act (PPA). CDF being part of government approved expenditures, in the national budget, is subject to public funds management laws, hence the need for compliance to ensure complete accountability. Some of the procurement process that bypassed the office of the DC included: the collection of quotations, deliveries of goods and negotiating contracts.
- (5) In all the sampled projects that the tracking team visited, in the 3 constituencies – Rumphi West, East and Central, in the 3 TAs – Katumbi, Mwankhunikira and Mwamlowe – there were no committees comprising all relevant stakeholders charged with administering and spearheading CDF projects at constituency level, except for the availability of the representatives of MPs. The representatives of the MPs, in all the 3 constituencies – Rumphi West, East and Central, are wholly at the pinnacle of administering CDF funds in liaison with MPs. To make matters worse, the representatives of the MPs were from the same political party with their MP. *This has created divisive political havens that have excluded other stakeholders from a variety of avenues. The result is that CDF is being politicized.*
- (6) It is recommended that Project Implementation Committees, for each CDF project, should be instituted as per CDF guidelines. The guidelines stipulate that, this committee should comprise 5 members – with only 1 member appointed by the MP and the others by ADCs and Councilors.
- (7) It was found out that Piece meal funding of projects is contributing to bottlenecks that prevent the full attainment of objectives for such projects. While there was also satisfaction that some of these projects are already contributing to the community members' social economic aspirations, there is need for MPs and the council to initiate new big projects that can receive more funds from the CDF facility that can enhance the social economic status of community members.

- (8) This report would advise councilors to refrain from participating in the procurement of CDF project goods and services. The CDF guidelines are very clear in terms of the roles councilors are supposed to play. Their main role is to provide oversight over all CDF projects in their wards. They are also supposed to inform Full Council on progress of projects in their respective wards.
- (9) MPs, the council and councilors are advised that they ensure that community participation in the entire CDF project circle is given priority. To begin with, these are their projects that they are supposed to sustain. Secondly, the projects are therefore supposed to benefit them and they can only derive maximum benefit if they own the projects.
- (10) It is a mandate that each constituency should have an all stakeholders' committee charged with the running of CDF processes within each constituency, as long as the CDF fund is being administered. The MP should desist from instituting a committee that comprises only people from a party that he comes from. This kind of arrangement cannot create divisive political havens and politicization of CDF projects. This will ably enhance inclusions of all stakeholders, hence ownership of projects by all.
- (11) The report further recommends that unaccounted for Funds – 42% for Rumphi Central; 88% for Rumphi East and 58% for Rumphi central Constituencies be accounted for immediately.

8.0 REFERENCES

Some of the reference documents that were referred to in the process of tracking CDF activities included:

Government of Malawi, 'The Public Finance Management Act (PFMA) 2003', Lilongwe, Malawi

Government of Malawi, 'The Public Procurement Act (PPA) 2003', Lilongwe, Malawi

Government of Malawi, 'The Corrupt Practices Act (CPA) 1995', Lilongwe Malawi

Government of Malawi, 'Local Government Act (LGA) 1998' Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, Lilongwe, Malawi

Government of Malawi, 'The Malawi Republican Constitution, 1994', Malawi

The Government of Malawi, 'The Constituency Development Fund (CDF) Guidelines, revised 1994, June, Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development;

Rumphi District Council, Approved Plans and Budgets, 2014/2015 to 2016/2017, Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, Rumphi

9.0 Appendices

(1) Appendix 1

Rumphi Civil Society Network (RUCSN)

Introduction

Following interactions RAC members have had on social accountability in their respective TAs (Katumbi, Mwamlowe and Mwankhunikira) where ActionAid is implementing an EU social accountability project, the issue of tracking the Constituency Development Fund (CDF) featured very highly in all the 6 RACs, so far in place. The communities had agreed to gather evidence on the CDF public service, as a way of enhancing transparency and accountability in the provision of public services. One of the sought for outcomes was to increase people's access to information on how public resources are spent. With more information and knowledge among community members, it was assumed that people would better be equipped to participate meaningfully in decision making about public resources.

The tracking was to dwell on finding out how much CDF funds were actually allocated in line with approved funds. It was also to determine where and how the allocated sums were spent. The tracking also sought to compare budgets allocated to CDF over a three-year time frame vis-à-vis actual transfers.

Why CDF

CDF was put in place to ensure an even spread of rural development throughout the country by ensuring that MPs and their constituents take part in the development processes taking place in their communities.

Below is the checklist to be used for community consultations and individual interviews, where necessary

| | | | |
|------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|
| Interviewer code | | Date of interview / consultation | |
| Name of project | | | |

A. Identification of Respondent (individual / group)

| | | |
|----------------------------|------|--------|
| Name of Individual / group | | |
| Village / VDC / ADC | | |
| T/A | | |
| District | | |
| # of participants | Male | Female |

B. Respondent information (for individuals in cases where, they respond to questions alone)

| 1. 2. | 3. QUESTION | 4. CODING CATEGORIES |
|----------|--|---|
| 5. 1 | 6. Age of respondent (<i>In years</i>) 7. | 8. <input type="text"/> 9. <input type="text"/> 10. |
| 11. 2 | 12. Sex of respondent | 1. Female 2. Male |
| 3 | 13. Position of respondent in community | 1. Community leader (ADC / VDC / village head) 2. Project Committee member 3. Community member 4. Other, specify_____ |
| 6 | 14. Are you able to read and write a short, simple statement with understanding in any language? | 1. Yes 2. No |
| 7 | 15. What is your highest level of education? | 1. Pre-school 2. Primary (Standard 1-5) 3. Primary (Standard 6-8) 4. Secondary (Form 1-2) 5. Secondary (Form 3-4) 6. College/University or higher 7. Literacy classes 8. Never attended school |
| 9 | 16. Are you a permanent resident of this community? | 1. Yes 2. No |

C. Knowledge of CDF

1. Have you ever heard of the Constituency Development Fund (CDF)

.....

a) If yes, from where and what do you know about CDF

.....
.....

2. Name some of the projects, which were or are being implemented with CDF funding in your community

.....
.....

D. CDF Project

This publication has been produced with the assistance of the European Union. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of Actionaid Malawi and CISANET and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union."

1. Zeroing on one of the projects above, how was the project identified?

.....
.....

a. Did the project address the community's priority needs?

.....

b. If yes above,

Explain.....

.....

2. Given space for you to exercise your right, what project would you have chosen?

.....
.....

3. How much funds were approved and eventually disbursed to the project?

.....

4. How much funds were spent on the project?

.....

5. If you do not know the answer to question 4, would you have loved to know the total project cost for the project? Why?

.....

6. Who do you think was supposed (mandated) to inform you about the project cost?

.....
.....

7. Given space and time to exercise your right to comment on how the project was implemented, what can you say?

.....
.....

E. Participation in the project

1. In what specific CDF project activities were you involved?

.....
.....

2. What is / has been your role in the mentioned CDF project activities.

.....
.....

F. Project implementation

1. a. When did the project commence?

.....

b. What was the planned time frame for the project?

.....

2. Who were the overseers of the project? (composition of project implementation committee)

.....

.....if it were
a new project, was there a design/ plan for the project?

.....

a. Was the project implemented according to the plan? (design)

.....

b. Was there a BOQ (bill of quantities)?

.....

3. What processes (procedures) were followed when procuring project goods and services?

.....

4. Who was responsible for the procurement of project goods and services? i.e. contractors and artisans

.....

.....

5. Who was responsible for storage of project materials?

.....

6. Was there a contractor?

.....

7. How was he / she identified?

.....

8. Given space to exercise your right, would you have chosen the same contractor?

.....
.....

9. Were you satisfied with the project outputs and outcomes?

.....
.....

10. What changes has the project brought to?

a. Community

.....
.....

b. Individual

.....
.....

G. General observations

17. What do you think went well in the implementation of the project?

.....
.....

18. What did not go well in the implementation of the project?

.....
.....

19. How best do you think CDF projects could be implemented?

.....
.....

Any comment (s) and Recommendations for improvement

.....

End of questions, thank you very much for your time

CHECKLIST FOR CDF INFORMATION FROM THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

1. CDF approved plans and budgets for periods 2014/2015 to 2016/2017 for TAs Katumbi, Mwankhunikira and Mwamlowe
2. CDF disbursed amounts for periods 2014/2015 to 2016/2017 for TAs Katumbi, Mwankhunikira and Mwamlowe

3. CDF actual expenditures for period 2014/2015 to 2016.2017 for TAs Katumbi, Mwankhunikira and Mwamlowe
4. Names of projects funded through the CDF financial window for TAs Mwankhunikira, Mwamlowe and Katumbi

10.0 Photo Gallery



A picture showing Mzokoto ADMARC partly funded with CDF funds in Rumphi Central Constituency



One of the school blocks at Kaduku Primary School that had been blown off and later received CDF funding to re-roof the structure in Rumphi west Constituency



A house for a Police Officer at Katowo in Rumph West Constituency, though incomplete benefited from CDF funds in 2016/2017



A CDA's house at Katowo, in Rumph West Constituency that benefited from CDF Funds in 2016/17 fiscal year. Wiring for electricity was done.



Some respondents during the CDF tracking exercise at Chivwaradi Primary School in Rumphi Central Constituency in TA Mwankhunikira



A school block at Chivwaradi primary School that benefited from CDF funding in Rumphi Central Constituency