

CASE STUDY & STORIES: “Public Expenditure Trucking (Survey PETS): Focusing on URRAP Rural Roads Projects Budget and Community Participations in Lode Hetosa Woreda”

Background Information

- ❖ **Project Period:** Implementing Social Accountability Approach in five Selected Woredas of Oromia National Government Regional State (January 01/2013 to December 30/2015).
- ❖ **Methodology:** PETS was used to monitor the budget flow, leakage and utilization of Rural Road in Lode Hetosa Woreda. Semi-structured questionnaire; Key Informant Interview with government officials and local community representatives were developed and conducted.
- ❖ **Implementing Partner:** Mekdem Ethiopia National Association (MENA)
- ❖ **Overall Objective:** To track the flow of URRAP Rural Roads and Community Contribution Budget Flow and Utilization from Source to Destination.

Major Issues Identified from PETS Assessment

The survey indicated that the existence of coordination gaps among Zone OFED, Woreda OFED and Rural Road Office. It also entails the lack of greater level of transparency and disorganization of data on budget allocation, transfer and expenditure. URAP project budget flow and recruitment of contractors and consultants is managed by Zone and Regional level, as a result the Woreda OFED and Rural Roads Office and citizen have minor information. Local government and citizen are involved on Woreda and citizen contribution for rural road.

The survey result indicated that earth work, water crossing structures, on and off drainages, run-off water speed braking structure and surfacing work are not completed yet and there was hence a big concern on the quality of the roads being constructed or already constructed. The roads constructed from Ligaba to Sibub Abadir (6.98 km) and Gonde Korchasa to Jimata (7.86km) have started to serving the community, but those structures were not completed.



Gurahricho Kebele (Ligaba to Sibub Abadir road) which point out a selected material for surfacing of road collected from the farm land and kept for a long period of time without purpose. This bridge at Gurahricho Kebele (Ligaba to Sibub Abadir road) indicates water crossing structure constructed inappropriately.

Significant Improvement

To make the PETS process participatory and well organized, MENA together with SAC members and Woreda Officials came up with the need to establish Advocacy Team. PETS Advocacy Team consisting of seven members established at Woreda level representing service providers and local communities. The

objective of this Advocacy Team was to take the role of coordination of PETS implementation activities and collecting data in relation to budget allocation, transfer and expenditure and its analysis. The effort of this team has practically strengthened the joint efforts of partners to make the PET survey process successful.

From the field observation it is also confirmed that community/citizen awareness specifically towards PETS and SA in general improved through training given on different meetings and workshops. Road construction at Guraharicho Kebele was not satisfactory from the view point of community, which is too narrow, so that communities force the contractor to stop construction unless he keeps the minimum standard of rural road. Because community learnt that it is their right to monitor and follow up development activities implemented in their Kebele, whatever the source of fund from the government or non government organizations.

Case Stories

As narrated by Mr. Ayle Tumsa, from woreda road office official

Road construction under URRAP carried out through the budget allocated from MDG (zone), Woreda capital budget and community contribution. Budget allocated from zone (MDG) in a grand total for all the sites constructed under the Woreda which is difficult to know or identify a single site budget. Budget from Woreda capital decided by the council based on the availability of resources for the given budget year. The contribution of community also decided by the Woreda Council considering the availability of community income of a given Kebele.

Depending on the weather condition and productivity level of the farmland, some community gain more income and other may not, so that their contributions to road construction vary accordingly. The Woreda has 25 rural Kebeles which need rural road construction and maintenance. To address all the Kebeles with the service, Woreda have to set priority in each budget year based on the availability of fund/budget. Sometimes road constructions get delay for a long period of time as the result of budget deficiency. Regarding budget allocated, transferred and expenditure from zone, most of the administration and management process is centralized,+ i.e. selection process of contractors and agreement of contract with Consultancy Company and payments are made at zone level which is difficult to the Woreda to monitor and evaluate the progress. Consultancy company was not regularly available at the construction site to monitor and report the progress to the zone to effect payment for the contractors on time. Construction Company stop their construction until they received the payment which results delay in construction. Monitoring and follow up of the program implementation mainly carried out by the rural road office in a regular basis. In addition to this, team organized from Woreda administration office, Woreda FED office and rural road office also conduct joint monitoring and evaluation to insure quality and on time completion of the road. There are Kebele Road Committee who takes the role and responsibility to monitor and follow up of the whole process, but they are not functional and active to do so. In general, road constructed under URRAP has good quality and accessible to the local community to provide transportation services.

As narrated by Mr. Gobe Kumbi, SAC member Aleko kebele

Communities contribute cash every year per household based on the total amount of cash required from the Kebele which is decided by Woreda council. The contribution varies from year to year and an average 200 ETB per household per year. In addition to cash contribution, during the earth work of road construction community participate in labor in clearing the land and preparing run-off water diversion structure. But community didn't participate on monitoring and evaluation of the process. We are not notified with the amount of budget allocated, transferred and expenditure for the construction of the road. Only we have awareness on the amount of cash we contributed and deposited at the bank with the

bank account opened for road construction. With regard to resource mobilization we are not clear and no guide line that shows the share of government and community. The constructed road has quality problem. Somewhere the road too narrow and somewhere it is wide enough. On rivers or shallows where bridge required, the contractor put small tube which is not fit with the high pressure of run-off water during the rainy season. Our area is black soil type which is difficult to insure construction sustainability unless otherwise in depth excavation of soil applied. But from our layman observation the earth work of our road carried out by Small and Middle Enterprises (SME) who have no extensive machinery and skill, so that the construction compromises the quality issue. Lack of continuity of construction, after the completion of earth work, contractor disappear for a long period of time and to finish the surfacing work it takes long time which results delay of construction. Contractors who will involve on the road construction should be selected based on their experience and capacity to carry out the work or need to build their capacity. Woreda and Kebele have to monitor and evaluate road construction jointly to insure the quality of road and to avoid delay of construction.



Consultative Interface Meeting in Huruta town and some of the Advocacy team members (Aug, 2015)

Joint Consensus Plans of Stakeholders on PETS Assessment Results

S.N	Consultative Interface Meeting Agendas	Joint Agreement and Consensus	Responsible	Supervised by
1	Lack of decentralized management system at URAP Project: Woreda is not involved on the contractor and consultant selections as a result no clear data, there is dalliance.	Zone rural road representatives said URAP project systems do not allow participation of Woreda and Community in all process, but we will appeal for future improvement.	Zone and Woreda Rural Road Authority (WRRRA) and WSAC	Kebele and Woreda SACs, with the Woreda Administration
2	Difficult to monitor the budget flow of each site: ☞ No separate contract agreement of contractors and consultants for each rural road site. ☞ No separate budget allocation, transfer and expenditure for a given site	The Zone and the Woreda Rural Road representatives agreed to improve	Zone and WRRRA and WSAC	Woreda Administration
3	Lack of transparency: ☞ No chance for local community to know the budget of URAP. ☞ Lack of community participation on management process of URAP project	Agreed to request for the improve URAP community participation system	WRRRA and WSAC	Woreda Administration
4	Visibility and awareness of URAP guideline at Woreda level.	All stakeholders agreed on the presence of the guideline.	The WRRRA has to distribute and create awareness with SAC	Woreda Administration
5	Checking and correcting thickness of sand (quarry) to the standard of 15cm at all places.		WRRRA	Kebele and Woreda SACs,
6	Checking and correcting ditch width and appropriateness as to the set standard.		WRRRA	Kebele and Woreda SACs,
7	Leakage of money mobilized from the community	The Zone and Woreda RR as well as the Woreda Administrators agreed to investigate & take the case to court.	Woreda Administrator	KSAC & WSAC