

# DEVELOPMENT OR POLITICS OF PATRONAGE?

*A study report of the Constituency Parliamentary Debates on the  
Constituency Development Fund and the Parliamentary Score  
Card as piloted in Nyabushozi, Makindye, Aruu and Bukedea  
Constituencies in Uganda*

*May 2007*

A Publication of the Africa Leadership Institute (AFLI), Kampala

**Disclaimer**

With all intentions and purposes, this report has sought to be accurate, factual and simple. Any unintended errors and misrepresentation of data are regrettable.

DEVELOPMENT OR POLITICS OF PATRONAGE?

*A study report of the Constituency Parliamentary Debates on the Constituency Development Fund and the Parliamentary Score Card as piloted in Nyabusbozi, Makindye, Aruu and Bukedea Constituencies in Uganda, May 2007.*

A publication of Africa Leadership Institute funded by the Government of the United States of America and the Royal Netherlands Embassy in Uganda.

All rights reserved. Published 2007

Design and Printing by Some Graphics Ltd  
Tel.: +256 752 648 576

AFRICA LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE  
For Excellence in Governance, Security and Development  
P.O. Box 23277 Kampala, Uganda  
Tel.: +256 41 578739, +256 312 277124  
Naguru Summit View Road  
E-mail:info@aflia.org

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE .....</b>	<b>8</b>
1.0 Introduction .....	8
1.1 Background.....	8
1.2 Establishment of the Constituent Development Fund in Uganda .....	9
1.3 The Parliamentary Scorecard Project.....	11
1.5 Objectives of the project.....	11
<b>CHAPTER TWO .....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.0 Methodology .....	13
2.1 Introduction.....	13
2.2 Sampling procedure .....	13
2.3 Data collection .....	15
<b>CHAPTER THREE .....</b>	<b>16</b>
3.0 FINDINGS .....	16
3.1 Introduction.....	16
3.2 Assessment of the Constituency Development Fund in the Sampled Constituencies. ....	16
3.2.4 Is CDF a good approach to fight poverty?.....	19
3.2.5 Suggest mechanisms for effective implementation of CDF. ....	21
3.2.6 What threats do you anticipate in CDF implementation?.....	22
3.3 Dissemination of Parliamentary Score Card findings: .....	23
3.3.1 Participants' Comments on the performance of their MPs in the 7th parliament. ....	24
3.3.2 Discuss what you think should be the role of an MP. ....	27
3.3.4 Shortcomings of their MPs .....	28
3.3.5. Analysis of the Results .....	29
<b>CHAPTER FOUR .....</b>	<b>30</b>
4.0 CONCLUSIONS .....	30
4.1 RECOMMENDATIONS .....	30
<b>ANNEXTURES .....</b>	<b>33</b>

## **ACRONYMS USED IN THE TEXT**

AIDS	:	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
AFLI	:	Africa Leadership Institute
CDF	:	Constituency Dedevelopment Fund
DPC	:	District Projects Committee
CAO	:	Chief Administrative Officer
CDC	:	Constituency Development Committee
CP	:	Conservative Party
FDC	:	Forum for Democratic Change
GISO	:	Gombolola Internal Security Officer
HIV	:	Human Immuno-Deficiency Virus
AIDS	:	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ICC	:	International Criminal Court Of Justice
IDPs	:	Internally Displaced Persons
IGAs	:	Income Generating Activities
JEEMA	:	Justice Forum
KANU	:	Kenya African National Union
LC	:	Local Council
LPO	:	Local Purchase Order
LGDP	:	Local Government Development Program
MoFPED:		Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
M & E	:	Monitoring and Evaluation
MP	:	Member of Parliament
NARC	:	National Rainbow Coalition
NGOs	:	Non Government Organizations
NRM	:	National Resistance Movement
NUSAF	:	Northern Uganda Social Action Fund
PWDs	:	People With Disabilities
SACCOS	:	Savings Credit Cooperative Societies.
UBOS	:	Uganda Bureau of Statistics
UPPAP	:	Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Process
UNDP	:	United Nations Development Program

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Africa Leadership Institute (AFLI) greatly appreciates the efforts of all those who contributed towards the success of this research process.

The secretariat of Africa Leadership Institute comprising the Executive Director, Oscar Okech Kanyangareng, deserves credit as research team leader for guiding the processes up to the completion of the final report. The two program Assistants Edotu Paul, and Muhumuza Patrick, for tirelessly doing background literature reviews , conducting the community parliaments and compiling drafts of the report.

Dr. Dan Lumonya of Makerere University deserves accolades for editing this report.

Equally, the AFLI Board members deserve credit for their oversight role of guiding the Secretariat. These are, The Executive Chairman David Pulkol, The Executive Vice-Chairman Elly Karuhanga, The Treasurer Tobias Onweng, Levi Ochieng, Juma Okuku, David Mukholi, Sylvestor Kugonza and Jessica Eriyo .

At the field all key informants interviewed and participants from various constituencies whose names are appended on this report are highly appreciated for sacrificing their time to attend the debates. The role of the speakers who presided over these parliaments can not be underestimated.

At the resource level AFLI is indebted to the government of the United States of America for supporting this pioneering research with a grant from the Department of State, Human Rights and Democracy Fund. This was built on the previous projects successfully accomplished by AFLI. The Royal Netherlands Embassy in Uganda is especially credited

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report presents findings from a pilot study of people's views on operationalization of the Constituency Development Fund (CDF) and views resulting from dissemination of the performance score card of the 7th Parliament of Uganda. The study was executed in four constituencies of Bukedea County, Aruu County, Nyabushozi County, and Makindye West constituency. Key informants were also interviewed at the district and national levels.

The study objectives are :

1. To assess the utilization of the Constituent Development Fund
2. To identify beneficiary perceptions and recommendations about the utilization of CDF
3. To suggest policy recommendations about the effective utilization of the CDF.
4. To disseminate the findings of the Parliamentary Score Card project
5. To pilot the Parliamentary Score Card and to assess its effectiveness.

This study was conducted a year after the disbursal of the CDF to the respective MPs. A rapid appraisal of the CDF was made in four constituencies, selected from each of the four regions of Uganda. Constituency Parliaments (meetings of ordinary citizens in each of the constituencies ), were conducted to examine the utilization of the CDF in their respective constituencies and to assess the utility of the Parliamentary Score Card. This is another project undertaken by AFLI to assess MPs performance.

Findings of the study were twofold. On Constituency Development Fund, it was found out that CDF is useful but most constituents were not aware of it and the process, even were it was used was not transparent. On the MPs performance scorecard, constituents found it usefull in helping them understand what their MP does. But they also attributed roles to MPs other than their constitutional obligations, like expecting them to directly mobilize local people and contribute directly to development projects in the constituency

As far as the CDF is concerned the study revealed that the constituency development fund had been mismanaged especially in the two constituencies that is Aruu county and in Bukedea county Although many factors were cited as being the cause of this phenomenon AFLI found out the absence of relevant law and policy as being the main cause of mismanagement . Other factors included the MPs unfettered powers and lack of independent signatories to the account other than the MP. The proper use of the funds was therefore at the personal discretaion of an MP.

The results of piloting the Parliamentary Performance Score Card revealed that members of the constituency parliaments were basing their assessment of the performance of their MPs on his or her contributions to community projects and to material things that the Member of Parliament was able to bring to the constituency. Community members were also appreciative of an MP who traveled frequently to the constituency to commiserate

with his or her people in times of grief. Clearly the legislative role of the MP was not well recognized, or given the prominence it deserved. To some participants, the number of times that an MP attended the house did not matter, let alone their contributions to the debates.

The proposed recommendations are below;

### **a) Recommendations for Improving the Effectiveness of the CDF**

To ensure that CDF works for the people as well as the MP who is but a conduit through whom supplementary funding is now possible, participants in the community parliaments and key informants to this study recommended the following:

- There should be a five year and annual CDF plan and budget.. This should be backed up by a comprehensive policy and law to guide the use of CDF in the country.
- A CDF committee be established at the constituency , sub-county, district and national levels.
- CDF funds should go to an account controlled by the CDF Committee at constituency level and not the personal account of an MP.
- There should be civic education to all stakeholders about CDF.
- CDF should be increased from 10 million to 50 million annually to cause more impact. Bigger constituencies should receive more funding.
- All projects and funds should be displayed for community to review and build consensus on the beneficiaries of projects.

### **b) For the score card it was recommended as follows:-**

The methodology of the Parliamentary Score Card be amended to include the contributions of MPs to their constituencies and the constituents be sensitized on the actual constitutional functions of Parliament and those of their members of Parliament.

Another recommendation from MP's is that most of the debates in Parliament takes place in committees of Parliament and therefore the Score Card should cover this as well.

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **1.0 Introduction**

This report presents findings from a pilot study of people's views on the first year of the operationalization of the Constituency Development Fund (CDF) and views resulting from dissemination of the Parliamentary Performance Score Card of the 7th Parliament of Uganda. The study was executed in four constituencies of Bukedea County in Bukedea district, Aruu County in Pader district, Nyabushozi County in Kiuruhura district, and Makindye West constituency in Kampala district. These constituencies respectively represented the four Regions of Uganda namely East, North, West and Central Uganda. The study was commissioned and executed by the Africa Leadership Institute (AFLI) during the period of July-August 2006. The report is divided into the following sections: Background of CDF and MPs' scorecard, Guidelines for CDF, Study objectives, the Methodology, Findings, Conclusion, Recommendations, Participatant evaluation of the Constituency Parliaments and annexes.

### **1.1 Background**

Development programs and projects in Uganda are implemented mainly by government, NGOs and international agencies. Government projects are implemented by the central government through the respective Ministries or by local governments at the district and sub-county levels. NGOs and international agencies also often provide services themselves or indirectly through local intermediaries. In 2005, during the State of the Nation Address, President Yoweri Museveni pledged that government would give MPs funds to help with development in their constituencies in order to avoid constituents overburdening MPs with demands for development projects, making MPs delve into their private pockets, get poorer and corrupt in order to make ends meet. (Parliamentary Hansard 2005)

While the reasons for establishing the CDF remain not concrete, within the circles of the policy makers it is argued that CDF provides another avenue to fight poverty. In addition MPs, being elected leaders, will have the people at heart and will be sensitive to poverty alleviation projects that directly benefit their people. Members of parliament are also expected to be people of integrity and as such are more likely to be transparent and accountable if resources are channeled through them. The President has also argued that it is not in order for MPs to support development activities in their constituency from their personal incomes as this renders them incapable of living a life that is expected of people at their level.

The fund came at a time when the parliamentary term of the 7th Parliament was coming to a close, and about the same time when elections were due in early 2006. Because Parliament also had much business to conduct; to debate the Political Parties and Organizations Act and amendments to the constitution, the establishment of the CDF did not receive

adequate attention. Money was paid to MPs with scanty Interim guidelines , an enabling law or accountability protocols.

## **1.2 Establishment of the Constituency Development Fund in Uganda**

The history of giving MPs funds for development in constituencies started in the 1960s. During the Obote I government, there was a programme in the Parliament of Uganda where every Member of Parliament received Ushs 150,000 for the purpose of assisting him or her in the constituency with projects, which were not within the development plan of the country. Discussion to re-introduce a similar fund started during the National Resistance Council (NRC). It was discussed in the 6th Parliament (1996-2001) and never concluded, until at the beginning of the 7th Parliament in 2001, when President Museveni made a promise to Members of Parliament concerning the establishment and maintenance of a Constituency Development Fund.

In July 2004, government sent the then Minister for Parliamentary Affairs, Hon. Hope Mwesigye and Hon. Charles Bakkabulindi to Kenya to study how the CDF works. In Kenya, the Constituency Development Fund (CDF) was established in 2003, and operationalised in January 2004 following the enactment of the CDF Act. Following their visit, a cabinet paper was prepared and approved. On 11 October 2005, the Parliamentary Commission appointed a committee of seven Members of Parliament to formulate interim guidelines and procedure for the establishment of the CDF for the financial year 2005/2006. The committee prepared Interim Guidelines for the implementation of the CDF. Thereafter, Ushs 2.9 Billion ( US 1,657,000 ) was transferred from Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MFPED) to the Parliamentary Commission, and each constituency was given Ushs 10m ( USD 5,714 ) in November 2005. The money was transferred to the personal accounts of respective MPs. The same amount of funds have been budgeted for by Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development. But the funds have not yet been released because it is inadequate as the number of MPs have increased in the 8th Parliament by 27 MPs from 305 to 332 MPs

The committee formulated the following interim guidelines in 2005, for approval by the parliamentary commission:

- a) The fund to be operated by the Parliamentary Commission.
- b) The fund shall be an item in the annual development budget of parliament.
- c) The purpose of the fund is to support the constituency development programs or projects of the Member of Parliament.
- d) The Member of Parliament shall establish a committee of 5 (five) members of which he or she shall be the chairperson, and designate whom shall be secretary and treasurer.
- e) The fund shall be disbursed to each MP as advance and accounted for as such to the accounting officer of parliament.
- f) The accounting officer shall disburse the fund within one month of its release.
- g) The fund shall be disbursed as a lump sum to each MP for the financial year 2005/2006, the fund shall be accounted for within 6 (six) months. Subsequent

### *Development or politics of patronage?*

- disbursements shall be accounted for by the end of each financial year.
- h) It is the responsibility of the MP to provide accountability supported by credible documentary evidence of each expenditure (e.g. receipts given by payees, signatures by payee acknowledging receipt of payment, receipts against procurement of goods and services supplied for the constituency development activities and contracts)
  - i) The accounting officer of the parliamentary commission shall inform the members of parliament of these guidelines /procedures before disbursement of the funds; and where necessary may verify the accountability provided by the members of parliament.

### **The structure of managing the fund was proposed to include the following:**

**i) Constituency Development Committee** to be established in every constituency to be convened by the elected MP. The chairman of this committee and the appointing authority would be the respective MP. Other members of the CDC would be elected. This committee would design projects e.g. projects that would increase agricultural productivity, improve market access and promote agro processing, for submission to the District Project Committee for their consideration.

**ii) The District Project Committee (DPC)**

Above the CDC there would be established in every district a District Project Committee (DPC) whose main function is to receive and consider project that are submitted by the CDC and to coordinate their implementation. The DPC was also expected to monitor all the projects funded by the CDF. The District Community Development Officer would be the secretary to the district project committee and would perform the following functions:

- Receive and administer the CDF.
- Issue Local Purchase Orders (LPO) to suppliers and contractors selected to offer services and goods.
- Communicate to the national committee and cabinet indicating lists of projects generated by different constituencies' development committees.
- Monitor the implementation of projects through the DPC
- Receive and submit the progress reports to the national committee.

**iii) The National Committee on Rural Development.**

This should be headed by the permanent secretary to the treasury in the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development. This should be charged with approving projects submitted from constituencies. The Minister of Finance should appoint 8 persons who are knowledgeable in matters of rural development issues such as commerce, eco-

nomics, agriculture etc to constitute this committee.

While the Parliamentary Committee on CDF discussed and adopted the above guidelines and procedures, the parliament plenary as a whole did not. To date there is no enabling law to regulate the CDF.

### **1.3 The Parliamentary Scorecard Project**

Article 41 of the 1995 constitution of Uganda, provides citizens with the right to access information in custody of government and its agencies. Similarly, citizens have the right to inquire about and monitor the performance of their MPs. The main channel for this information is the Parliamentary Hansard. However, access to the Parliamentary Hansard is affected by the high illiteracy rates, constraining bureaucracy and lack of resources; distance to parliament and the psychological fear of the place of Parliament by most people. In addition the Parliamentary Hansard is not readily accessible, user-friendly and digestible by most people. The development and use of a more user friendly audit report about the MPs performance would help the electorate to know about the performance of their MP, and enable them to make more objective decisions about their MP.

In an effort to improve this information access gap by the electorates, AFLI embarked on developing the Parliamentary Performance Score Card, a tool that would be used to monitor and assess the performance of MPs in Parliament.

Eventually, the Score Card of the 7th Parliament that was developed assesses the following:

1. Frequency of attendance by MPs of Parliamentary proceedings.
2. Contribution of the MP in the house in terms of bringing new bills, debates, ministers questions comments on state of nation address, etc.

Africa Leadership Institute published the Parliamentary Score Card Project report of the 7th Parliament of Uganda; “Holding Members of Parliament Accountable” This report was disseminated as a pilot study in four constituencies, as part of the constituency Parliament discussions that also included debates about the CDF.

### **1.5 Objectives of the project**

This project was conceptualized as part of the broader aim by AFLI to contribute towards good governance in Uganda. The overarching aim of the project was to examine the effectiveness of the Constituency Development Fund and the appropriateness of the Parlia-

mentary Score Card that has been designed by AFLI.

To this end constituency Parliamentary debates were convened in four selected constituencies to achieve the following objectives:

6. To assess the utilization of the Constituent Development Fund
7. To identify beneficiary perceptions and recommendations about the utilization of CDF
8. To suggest policy recommendations about the effective utilization of the CDF.
9. To disseminate the findings of the Parliamentary Score Card project
10. To pilot the Parliamentary Score Card and assess its effectiveness.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **2.0 Methodology**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

This study was conducted a year after the disbursal of the CDF to the respective MPs. A rapid appraisal of the CDF was made in four constituencies, selected from each of the four regions of Uganda. Constituency Parliaments (meetings of ordinary citizens in each of the constituencies), were conducted to examine the utilization of the CDF in their respective constituencies and to assess the utility of the Parliamentary Performance Score Card. Besides constituency Parliaments, key informants were also interviewed. The methods that were used in data collection are described below.

#### **2.2 Sampling procedure**

The research team used three procedures for sampling the constituencies for the study. These are two stage stratified sampling, random sampling and purposive sampling of constituencies. The study population comprised a total of 305 elected MPs from the 2001 elections and subsequent by-elections. The 7th parliament is composed of 214 directly elected constituency representatives, 56 district women representatives, 10 Uganda People's Defense Force representatives, 5 Youth representatives, 5 representatives of Persons With Disabilities, 5 Workers' representatives and 10 ex-officio MPs appointed by the President. This is a stratified sample group.

In the two stages stratified sampling the 305 constituencies were identified at national level. There after the constituencies were divided according to the four main regions of Eastern, Northern, Southern and Central Uganda. The reason for this was because of the unique regional differences that could be missed out if we just sampled randomly at national level. The constituencies at this level also represent the various strata like at national level. At this stage, the study team picked only constituencies for directly elected MPs because they are comparable. While those for the interest groups were left out because of their wider coverage, scattered electoral colleges and variability across the country, which would make them difficult to measure. There after, purposive sampling was used in order not to miss out on constituencies with important variables that would have been missed out if only random sampling was used. The selected key variables for purposive random sampling are;

- a) Regional representation
- b) Urban Vs. rural.
- c) High poverty index constituencies Vs. fairly rich constituencies
- d) Opposition MPs Vs. movement MPs constituency.
- e) MPs who lost Vs. MPs who were re-elected.
- f) Constituency with a directly elected MP who is a woman.

The constituencies which fitted into some of the above variables were then purposively

selected and grouped according to each region. There after, random sampling was applied to the regional groupings to pick a constituency. However, if a new constituency picked at random is similar to another picked at random earlier and yet some other variables are not yet covered, the team would re-do the random sampling again and again until all the variables are evenly covered by the four sampled constituencies in the four regions.

The rationale for going for the four constituencies only was due to limited funds and the desire for validity arising from choice of a feasible scope and sample. Finally the lot fell on the following constituencies which the researchers believe have a fairly representative element of the entire country and parliamentary constituencies on the broad regional divide;

**1. Bukedea county, Kumi district.**

- a) Has the highest poverty index of 81% in the Eastern region, (UBOS 2002)
- b) NRM MP Hon Peter Esele lost to opposition FDC MP, Hon. Oduman Albert
- c) Regionally, the constituency is in the East
- d) It is located in a rural area
- e) It is headed by an NRM party MP.

**2. Aruu county, Pader district**

- a) The constituency is located in the Northern region.
- b) It has the highest Poverty index of 91.7% in the region, (UBOS 2002).
- c) It's headed by Opposition party- FDC, MP Hon Odonga Otto.
- d) It's located in a rural area
- e) Its MP was re-elected.

**3. Nyabushozi county, Mbarara district**

- a) It's located in the Western region of Uganda.
- b) Its Poverty index 44.27%, the fairest in the region (UBOS 2002)
- c) It's located in a rural area.
- d) It's headed by NRM party MP, Hon. Mary Mugenyi
- e) Its MP was re-elected
- f) The MP is a woman

**4. Makindye West constituency, Kampala district**

- a) The constituency is located in the central region.
- b) Its Poverty index is 14%, the fairest in the region (UBOS 2002)
- c) The constituency is located in an urban area
- d) It was represented by Hon. N.Y Nsambu who supports the Opposition party (Conservative Party) but he lost to the now current MP, Hon. Hussein Kyanjo of opposition party JEEMA.

Besides the above constituency debates, key informants were also purposively interviewed. These are the Chief Administrative Officers in the sampled districts, the Parliamentary staff, Members of Parliament and officials in Ministry of Finance. The MPs whose con-

situencies were sampled were also interviewed either in the constituencies or at a feedback meetings later.

### **2.3 Data collection**

Both primary and secondary data was collected. Primary data was collected by recording participants' views in Constituency Parliaments in the four constituencies presided over by locally nominated Speakers.

In Constituency Parliaments; broad and open ended questions to seek people's views were asked. These included:

**“What is the role of an MP in a constituency? What is the contribution of your MP in the development of your constituency?”**

Questions on the management of CDF included: **“Is CDF a good approach to fight poverty? How was last year's CDF used? What recommendations do you suggest to improve the use of CDF?”**

A verbatim recording of Constituency Parliamentary proceedings were also done. Lists of participants in the debates in all the four constituencies are attached on the report as annex A. Other primary data extraction methods included taking of photographs, Focus Group Discussions, and administering of questionnaires to different respondents including MPs, technical persons like CAOs, Parliamentary staff, Ministry of Finance officials, including the Minister. Two categories of questionnaires were used. The first category was for the technocrats, and the second category was for the MPs. The two categories of questionnaires used during the study are attached on this report as annex B .Secondary data was collected through review of documents about CDF, and development indicators, documents from Uganda's Parliament, and Ministry libraries.

## CHAPTER THREE

### 3.0 FINDINGS

#### 3.1 Introduction

The broad intention of the project was to assess the utilization of the CDF and to disseminate the findings of the Parliamentary Scorecard Project and to pilot its implementation. Discussions were held with selected community members at forums that were called constituency parliaments. Views were also obtained from key informants namely the CAOs, MPs, Parliamentary Commission and Ministry of Finance officials.

The proceedings of these discussions, from the four sampled constituencies, i.e. Nyabushozi, Makindye, Aruu, and Bukedea are presented here. And the findings with interviews from key informants is jointly presented in this report.

#### 3.2 Assessment of the Constituency Development Fund in the Sampled Constituencies.

In order to make an assessment of the use of the CDF, the following questions were discussed by the constituency parliaments in each of the selected constituents.

- |                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| <b>Question one:</b>   | <b>How was the CDF used in your area?</b>                                   |
| <b>Question two:</b>   | <b>Is CDF a good approach to fight poverty?</b>                             |
| <b>Question three.</b> | <b>What mechanisms should be put in place for proper management of CDF?</b> |
| <b>Question four.</b>  | <b>What threats do you anticipate in CDF implementation?</b>                |
| <b>Question five.</b>  | <b>What recommendations do you propose?</b>                                 |

##### 3.2.1 How the 2005-2006 CDF was used

Overall the CDF had neither been handled transparently nor effectively and had been mis-handled in all but two of the constituencies under study. In addition the perception of use or abuse by the constituent parliaments varied among the constituencies.

In Nyabushozi 47% of the participants knew about the CDF and generally felt the fund had been used transparently and effectively as shown by the quote below;

*The CDF was extended to special interest groups like the youth, and women as a micro-credit assistance to boost their earnings through income generating projects. For example, the Youth under Rusbere Credit and Savings Scheme used the funds as a revolving fund to buy 'bodabodas' (motorcycle taxis) and lent to it members on a rotational basis without necessitating collateral securities. The fund was also used to pay tuition fees for two girls from each of the 7 sub-counties in the constituency to attend four months vocational training, at a cost of 200,000 each. It also*

*Development or politics of patronage?*

*bought 2 computers for North Ankole Learning Institute to boost on the self reliance capacity of the students. The fund was also used in infrastructure development and caused good cordial working relationships between politicians in the constituencies with the entire citizens.*



### **RUSHERE CDF TESTIMONY**

Geoffrey Kiwarabi, is a 34 year-old man who has benefited from the boda-boda scheme funded under the Constituency Development Fund (CDF).

He was able to access a motor-cycle from Rushere Credit and Savings scheme after getting recommendation as one of the beneficiaries of the project.

He presented 600,000 to the Credit scheme and completed the balance of Shs 600,000 within a period of six months. He was saving daily collections in order to complete the balance.

Kiwarabi is proud to mention that the CDF project has acted as a turning point in his life. It was the beginning of a new experience of joy and happiness. Access to a comfortable daily life is now made easy with his boda-boda cycle and grappling for survival is no longer a task.

From the time he started operating boda-boda business Kiwarabi has not had any problems related to education of his children. Unlike the years before when his children were among the last to report to school or often returned without sitting examinations due to lack of fees, this time they go to school with new uniforms every year.

“This is not the way I used to dress in the past. I now have disposable income and change my shirts often. I do not have problems with disease or managing family life”, says beam-

*Development or politics of patronage?*

ing Kiwarabi.

A father of four, Kiwarabi was born in Kensunga Sub-county in Kiruhura District where he intends to diversify investments.

From the proceeds of the boda-boda he acquired just a year and a half ago, Kiwarabi, has purchased 20 goats and 4 cows in preparation for a huge cattle farm. He sees a lot of prospects in the boda-boda project and advises many of the youth in the same trade to work hard and save the money for further investments.

To the initiators of the CDF project, Kiwarabi is grateful that it has achieved the purpose of poverty alleviation. His motor-cycle has changed not only his family's life but for the entire clan who look up to him for financial support.

The project should be furthered to support women groups, says Kiwarabi, for women are pillars in enhancing household incomes and are key producers in the rural setting.

The area MP for Nyabushozi, Mary Mugenyi said when she received the CDF money, she called all the LC 3 Chairpersons in the constituency and tabled the money before them. They are the ones who decided on the priorities. She said the CDF money is good but only if its increased. She said a committee for CDF would be good but if the funds are little one can't facilitate them. So, its better to use existing local government structures.

While in Makindye 28% knew about the CDF money. They agreed that CDF had been effectively used and knew of some beneficiaries ( One was in the meeting) but the process of allocation of funds and identification of beneficiaries was not transparent to the public; According to the personal assistant of the former area MP, Nsubuga Nsambu;

*The money was received by the area MP. A committee to manage the fund was immediately set up, and applications for the funds were invited from the community in respect of using the funds. 400 applications were received of which 162 were eligible beneficiaries to receive the money. 52 women groups, 30 youth groups, as well as 26 elderly and persons with disabilities and 54 individuals were selected from the 12 parishes in the constituency and were given the money (Key*

*Informant, Makindye)*



Participants in Aruu and Bukedea did not think the fund had been well utilized. 7% of participants in Aruu had heard about the CDF while 14 % in Bukedea had heard of the CDF. But no one in both constituencies knew how the money was used , neither could they point out any beneficiary. In fact neither the responsible MPs nor their assistants were available to give credible explanation of how the money was utilized. Although for Bukedea, the former MP later explained that he had accounted for CDF funds and he had used it well. Participants commented that the release of the money was poorly timed. The money was released at a time when the MPs were campaigning for re-election into parliament and subjected the funds to the risk of being diverted from the intended development work to being used to canvass for votes for the respective MPs.

However, the former MP for Bukedea Hon. Dr. Peter Esole was interviewed later and separately in Kampala. He said the CDF funds are little and should be limited to agriculture only..The CDF during his tenure was utilized for the following activities and projects.

- Provide street lights to light Kachumbala trading centre as away to promote trade in the constituency.
- Goats were provided to two women groups.
- Cement was given to some churches within the constituency.
- Provided special balls to the youth, they were special because the MPs name was

*Development or politics of patronage?*

written on them.

A committee independent of government should manage the CDF and should be elected. He said. The MP shouldn't be a signatory to the CDF funds account but committee members only. This money should be given as seed money to groups and not as loans. Its only fair that this money is given only to geographically definable constituencies, women inclusive. Not other interest groups.

Hon. Odonga Otto MP for Aruu county when contacted for his comments on the report of the field findings, said **“I have read your report I have no reservations”** (Sender Odonga Otto 24th March 2007, 12:39:42.. What this means is that the MP upholds the findings and recommendations raised by the members of the constituency Parliament in Aruu County including the fact that the MP had no transparent utilization of the CDF in his constituency. Not even a committee was put in place for dispensation of the CDF fund. In total the fund was most likely mismanaged.

### **3.2.4 Is CDF a good approach to fight poverty?**

Almost all participants in the four constituencies and key informants interviewed said that CDF can be a good approach for poverty alleviation. Many opinions were expressed on what the CDF could be used for ; Improving market access by opening community roads, improving the capacity of Savings Credit Cooperative Society (SACCOS). In addition, cultural activities such as dance, drama and art could be supported. The fund could also be used to identify and support talented sports people. Capacity building program, e.g. training of TBAs could also be done.

In those constituencies where CDF had been mismanaged, participants still agree that there was need for the fund, in order to enhance poverty eradication efforts. CDF could be used to provide relief to vulnerable groups such as orphans and to support children who are unable to pay for higher education. The money could be used in implementing Income Generating Activities (IGA) for certain vulnerable groups like the unemployed persons, the widows, as well as help in mitigating the effects of natural disasters. CDF could help in enhancing a positive relationship between the MP and the citizens through regular consultations and interactions.

The flexible nature of the CDF was also mentioned. Community members would have the flexibility to propose projects that suited their needs. The following quotes illustrates:

*“the CDF development initiative is different from other development initiatives because, it helps the entire community allocate the funds according to their priority needs” (Key Informant, Nyabushozi)*

*“CDF goes directly to groups which are carrying out income generating activities e.g. women*

*groups, youth groups and disadvantaged groups” (participant, Bukedea)*

The CDF was also seen as having the potential to redress imbalances in between and among different areas and groups of people. CDF can be used for positively discrimination and affirmative action for disadvantaged groups such as women, PWDs, and youths

*“CDF can be given to youths, women doing “Awara wara” and small traders” (This was said by one of the participants in Aruu county Constituency Parliament)*

In addition some participants argued the CDF could provide the opportunity to prove the MPs ability to initiate and implement development programs.

*“It tests the ability of an MP in projects implementation and initiation of new projects”*

The key informants interviewed included CAOs, MPs, Parliamentary staff and officials in the Ministry of Finance. 12 MPs out of 14 said CDF was useful and appropriate. An official from Ministry of Finance, on the other hand said CDF would make MPs lose track and moral authority of their oversight role i.e. watch dog of the executives’ functions in policy implementation. However he also said that CDF is good as it contributes to the economy; it has potential to add value.

*“Very appropriate because it allows MPs to work with their constituencies as partners in development rather than as charity providers”*

Appropriate since it targets the entire country. CDF is coming to bridge the gap left behind by government unattended. CDF also fills the gap left by the removal of graduated tax since the grant promised by government to replace graduated tax has not been adequate. Nevertheless some key informants thought CDF had limitation and these needed to be addressed in order for the benefits to trickle to the intended beneficiaries for example there should be a law to govern its utilization and management and the amount was too little to cause cognizable change in the lives of the people or even to trigger growths and household incomes.

*“CDF is not very meaningful the amount is too little causes problems for MP instead, atleast 50 Million a year could make a difference”.*

An MP disagreed with the method used.

*‘I am one of those who didn’t account for that money. I think that money was just a thank you by the President to MPs. How can you put public money in my account? How do you expect me to lose an election when there is money lying in my account? This time if they put the money (CDF) in our personal accounts again, I’ll return it. Unless there are regulations. The money*

*Development or politics of patronage?*

*should be put in a separate account and there should be one other signatory other than myself.*

The Chief Administrative Officers interviewed didn't know of any structures in place linking CDF with local governments and expressed ignorance about how CDF Works.

*"it's a new thing and it's difficult to tell how it works, I cannot comment on it". Said one.CAO.*

So far 113 MPs out of 315 had not accounted for the funds by the time of conducting our research. Even out of the sample of 50 accountabilities done, only one is correct and properly done. Hon. Alice Alaso was cited as one good example. Although officials from Parliament said the funds in 2005 came from Ministry of Finance and was not budgeted for in 2005 neither in 2006/07 under Parliament, an official in Ministry of Finance said the contrary. That CDF was budgeted for under Parliament in both financial years. The only problem this time is that the number of MPs has increased by 17 and yet they have budgeted for the same amount as the previous year, hence the delay to release the CDF. Besides, the funds were borrowed to pay for MPs car scheme. So the Budgetary allocation for CDF has been used up. There is also no policy in place or an ongoing process to develop one.

*'No one is even talking about it' An official of Parliament said.*

However, the office of the Clerk to Parliament suggested there is need to strengthen the interim guidelines developed the previous year before the new CDF funds could be released. The Parliamentary officials also thought that there is no mechanism for the Clerk to Parliament to monitor MPs. Therefore unless such a system is in place, the funds shouldn't be released.

### **3.2.5 Suggest mechanisms for effective implementation of CDF.**

Disbursal of the CDF to MPs and by MPs to their constituents was done without an enabling law. Moreover the Interim Guidelines that were made by the parliamentary committee for regulating and implementing the fund were neither approved by Parliament nor operationalized. It was therefore necessary to inquire into the necessary implementing mechanisms for the CDF in its nascent stages. Participants were asked to discuss and suggest effective mechanisms for implementing the CDF.

Participants recommended the formation of committees at various levels, i.e. at the district, constituency and sub-county levels. Each committee would have five members. The constituency development committee would be the major committee, with the MP serving there as a member. The CDF committees at the various levels should be independent, without the direction or influence of any individual or authority.

A CDF bank account would be established and be run by the sub-county CDF monitoring

and evaluation committees that would be formed.

Since the resource envelop of the CDF is small participants suggested that the respective MP should also subsidize the costs of running the committees by taking care of the welfare of the members.

An MP said if the CDF funds are as small as currently, then there is no need for a committee because the administrative costs of running such a committee will unnecessarily encroach on the small funds. The option would be to use the local government structures. Either the LCV Council or the LC3s as a CDF committee.

### **3.2.6 What threats do you anticipate in CDF implementation?**

Although participants were able to suggest implementation mechanisms it considered important to anticipate possible vices that would threaten the proper implementation of CDF. This was necessary for efforts in making policy recommendations for proper management of the fund.

At the Constituency Parliamentary forum the participants identified the following as challenges and threats on the way of CDF Implementation in their constituencies and nationwide.

**Diversion of the money for MP's personal interests:** As MPs would inevitably have much control over the fund, they could divert the money to their own personal interests, contrary to what the money is meant for. Participants were concerned about the potential by the MP to misuse the fund.

**Manipulation of the Composition of the committee:** As noted above, the MP could manipulate the composition of the committee, especially if the criteria for electing or appointing membership to the committee were not clear. This could breed sectarianism and nepotism. Therefore the issue of independence of the committee needed to be emphasized.

**Lack of awareness by the citizens about the CDF:** A lack of awareness by the citizens about the CDF could lead to corruption. People's involvement in management of the CDF requires some sensitization but it was envisaged that this is not feasible in the short run.

**The effect of multi-party politics:** This was a major concern among the participants. Multi-party politics could make the implementation of CDF difficult. Selection of membership to the committee would be problematic as party affiliations would be difficult to deal with. There is a likelihood that an MP would be unwilling to work with members belonging to parties other than his own.

**Insecurity:** Insecurity in some regions could undermine the achievements of the fund. Insecurity could cause damage to people's property.

**Poor project identification and management of projects:** The projects identified by the beneficiaries might not be necessarily the best kind of projects. In addition many people still lack proper project management skills.

**Inadequate funding:** Money may be very little to benefit the whole constituency especially large constituencies like for women, youth and disabled. The fund may be "a drop in the ocean". In addition much money would be required to support the activities of the

respective committees, offices and other logistical requirements.

**Inability for the fund to benefit different groups equally:** The fund may benefit only one part of the constituency. Sectarianism in allocation of the fund could occur. Prioritization of areas or groups to fund could prove to be a difficult undertaking.

**Poor timing of release funds:** Funds could be released at a time that was inconvenient for the implementation of certain types of projects, e.g. agricultural projects.

**Conflicting role of MPs.** MPs are mandated under the constitution to make laws and to monitor and evaluate government programs and not to co own implementation. Oversight role is compromised by CDF. This was comment from most key informant officials.

**Presidential Initiative.** CDF was not initiated by parliament. It was initiated by the President, so its being treated politically, by many MPs.

*“These must have been political payments because it was rushed and it was towards elections.” One Parliamentary staff said..*

**Unclear guidelines/policy or law.** There is now law, policy and or guidelines which makes CDF open to abuse

*“Even us we do not know what the whole thing is. Even the guidelines are not sufficient, it raises more questions than answers.” Said an official from Parliament.*

**Poor accountability.** Over 113 MPs of the 7th parliament never accounted for the constituency development fund (CDF). Accountability is still poor out of the 50 MPs sampled only one appeared to be near a good accountability. That for Hon. Alice Alaso.

The above concerns of the community and key informants need to be addressed by the new law and/or policy on CDF if the benefits from CDF are to be harnessed. A Quick look at the recommendation that follow may be very helpful in drawing the key aspects for policy and legislation.

### **3.3 Dissemination of Parliamentary Score Card findings:**

African Leadership Institute implemented the Parliamentary Score Card Project. The goal of the project was to develop objective criteria for judging the performance of MPs in parliament, in order to inform the electorate about the performance of their representatives. The study of the parliamentary score card project was started in October 2005, and completed in January 2006. The performance of all MPs of the 7th parliament was assessed and the findings published as: Holding Members of Parliament Accountable: MPs Performance

The next phase of the project was the dissemination of the score card report to constituencies. As with the CDF study, this was done in Nyabushozi, Makindye, Aruu and Bukedea constituencies. The proceedings of those dissemination meetings are shown below.

### **3.3.1 Participants' comments on the performance of their MPs in the 7th parliament.**

#### **Makindye: Hon Nsubuga Nsambu**

Participants were pleased with the performance of Hon Nsubuga Nsambu. They noted happy that he had attended 35 of the 67 sampled sittings, and was the 3rd, among MPs who attended most times in parliament. The MP had made three positive contributions and was rated "D" by the score card project.

In the constituency, the MP had convened many meetings and contributed favorably on federal and land issues, debates both in and outside Parliament.

The participants commended the Parliamentary Score Card approach and agree with its rating of their MP. The Score Card they noted could be a good tool for assessing MP's performance and for informing the electorate.

#### **Nyabushozi: Hon Mary Rutamwebwa**

Hon Mary Rutamwebwa had contributed to one bill, brought one motion to the House, contributed to one motion, and to one ministerial statement, and raised one point of order. She was rated "D" by the Parliamentary Score Card.

However the participants argued that the Parliamentary Score Card did not adequately capture the performance of their MP. They pointed out the following contributions that she had made:

- Collaboration with local leaders
- Led formation of Nyabushozi Women's Development Association.
- Encouraged the development of the diary business by introducing milk tanks to transport milk from the villages
- Sensitized people on development issues
- Brought tractors to the constituency
- Influenced the establishment of NGOs in the constituency, e.g. Heifer Project International
- Building bridges on roads
- Construction of schools and churches through fundraising
- The MP also lobbied the ministers of health, sports and culture, finance and eco-

conomic planning to visit the constituency

- Led to improvement of health and micro-finance facilities in the constituency.
- In the social perspective, the MP reconciled local leaders from LC I to LC IV
- Showed exemplary leadership towards women emancipation
- Her appointment to the position of Minister of State for Animal Industry and Fisheries showed a good example to young girls aspiring for leadership.

Clearly the MP had made enormous impact on the social-economic and governance issues of her constituents. Her performance in the house did not match her contributions to development projects. To her constituents, it was not her legislative function that mattered most; it was her impact on their immediate daily lives.

### **Bukedea County: Honorable Eselle Peter**

Participants in Bukedea County expressed mixed reactions, with apparent differences of opinion between those who supported a multi-party system and those who supported the movement system of government. The areas of disagreement included the criteria for assessment of the MP's performance, the possibility for bias, the role of an MP in lobbying with colleagues and other contributions to development projects in the constituency.

*"It's difficult to say yes or no. There are parameters to consider before saying yes or no. The role of an MP is broader than house business in parliament. The score card does not indicate the lobbying role of an MP for support of his area. The score card does not capture the role of our MP in mobilization of the electorate for example during referendum. It's against that background that it becomes very difficult to say yes or no"*

And another noted:

*"The score card is vague and biased because it refers only to parliament business. Score card does not include consultation of voters by the MP."*

And another participant alluded to the role that the MP had played in the elevation of Bukedea into a status of a district:

*"I commend AFLI for the wonderful work done to highlight the CDF and performance of MPs in Parliament. The Score Card should have reflected the contribution of the MP in bringing for us Bukedea District."*

Another participant argued that the Parliamentary Score Card could not capture the MP's contribution as he was an intelligent professional who must have contributed in various ways in Parliament. Secondly, this very participant could not understand why the MP's role in bringing the new district was not given prominence in score card.

However many participants also concurred that the Parliamentary Score Card was a good eye opener and a good lesson to MPs to improve and to become accountable, transparent,

*Development or politics of patronage?*

effective, efficient and responsive.

Some participants linked leadership to development. The poor development indicators showed that the district was under developed, the population size is high, mortality levels of both infants and maternal, water coverage low, school enrolment and literacy levels low and basic social services lacking in many areas. Some participants felt that the MP should have done more on these issues.

*“I assent to the score card because given our development profile our MP should have done something in regards to our underdevelopment.”*

*“Comparing the score card and our development profile for Bukedea our MP did not do much”*

Participants also appreciated the role of the Score Card in capturing the attendance of their representative in Parliament.

*“Attendance is another area I assent to the score card of my MP. We expect him to attend parliament regularly. If he is absent, it means we have no representation. That probably explains why the score card of our MP is full of spaces”*

### **Aruu County: Hon Odonga Otto**

As with the case in Nyabushozi, the participants did not think that the Score Card adequately captured the performance of their MP who scored a C equivalent to 9 points. However in this case the participant reactions were more mixed and demonstrated variations in judgment.

The participants pointed out some of the following as the contributions that were not captured by the Score Card:

- Consultation of voters by the MP
- Contribution 15 bags of cement to church of Uganda Pajule.
- Sponsorship of some poor children in public institutions in liaison with state house,
- Organization of peace building initiatives through sports,
- MP advocated for civil rights of the people
- Fenced the palace of the paramount chief
- Donation of three bulls and implements to development projects

Others also passionately alluded to the vocal nature of their MP.

*“The role of an MP is broader than house business in parliament we have not seen the score card capturing our MP advocating for IDPs”*

On the other hand other participants thought the score card was representative of the MP's

performance, as it was indeed based on his actual performance in parliament.

The debate in Aruu was a long one. There was little consensus as to whether or not the score card represented the MP. The arguments advanced by the participants serve to indicate the direction of the opinion of the people about the role of an MP and what constitutes score milestones for performance. The next phase of the debate was directed to the role of an MP as understood by the people themselves.

### **3.3.2 Discuss what you think should be the role of an MP.**

This question was asked as a follow up question so as to first of all test what people expect from their MPs but also derive a checklist for scoring MPs for activities outside parliament. They said their MP's roles should be to;

- Legislate properly for their people in parliament.
- Enlighten the electorate on government programs.
- Microfinance including;
- Lobby NGOs to support the constituency in development.
- Should attend council sessions e.g. budget processes as they are ex-officio members of local councils.
- Attend community development events
- Monitor community facilities such as roads, schools, health centers and hospitals,
- Be knowledgeable about the standard of social service provision of his people
- Fulfill the promises stated in their manifesto.
- Work for reconciliation and unity of the people.
- Have good working relationship with his people.
- Be open and dialogue between the MP and the electorate.
- Organize fund raising activities.
- Be knowledgeable about the local government programs and give technical input.
- Attend burials, visit labor wards to monitor birth and mortality.
- Have an office in the constituency.
- Lobby for bursaries /scholarships for the poor and yet bright children.
- Take inventory of graduate students in his /her constituency and lobby for jobs.
- MP should sensitize the constituents on civic rights, political pluralism among other things.
- Bridge between people and government.

Participants pointed out that, MPs should perform a legislative role in parliament, as well as practice the laws they make throughout their lives until the laws are amended. While performing the legislative role, the MPs should endeavor to protect the electorates against bad laws likely to be enacted by government. The MPs should also gather knowledge necessary for development, as well as guide government on development issues, consult on problems affecting the people and present the people's views to parliament. Participants largely

### *Development or politics of patronage?*

considered the MPs' roles as largely coined to serving as a bridge between the people they represent and government. MPs should have a strong obligation to candidly participate in parliamentary debates to effectively perform the legislative role to benefit the public.

Fora participants in Makindye considered the roles of an MP in local development as; to search and present development ideas to parliament, lobby for the implementation of development projects in the constituency, participate in civil education, research on development plans, work together with the local leaders, supervise development projects and represent all people in his/her constituency irrespective of any social affiliations including the MPs' campaign agents (kakuyege).

In executing his/her legislative role, the MP should candidly participate in parliamentary debates to advocate and influence proper policy guidelines for good governance and ensure that, the electorates are protected from bad laws. The electorates in Makindye West constituency also considered MPs as a bridge between the people and government. To this effect, MPs should be physically available in constituency offices, Local Council meetings or on telephone to gather people's views for presenting to parliament, as well as communicate what transpires in parliament to the grassroots. The MP should also participate in prioritization and implementation of comprehensive programs in the country for the development. However, Councilors in Makindye division pointed out that;

*“Although we discuss on the roles of our MPs, the MPs are not easily available to gather community view for discussion in parliament. For example, we are in this forum, but where is our MP? We have heard that the MP will just come to close. We are wasting our time”*

Another councilor in MakindyeWest constituency pointed out that,

*“Performance of MPs depends on how a person was brought up. Most MPs don't equitably gather views from all the electorates in the constituencies. The MPs mainly hold discussions with their campaign agents, and the developments they initiate mainly benefit persons in the MPs' nearby areas”*

### **3.3.4 Shortcomings of their MPs**

The participants however, also pointed out shortcomings about the MP's role. In the development of Nyabushozi constituency, in the education sector; the MP contributed nothing to elevate the education standard in the constituency. The MP had promised to help in establishing a girls' secondary school, but she did not contribute to establish the school. In house business, out of the 67 sittings sampled in parliament, the MP only attended 26 times, less than half of the sampled sittings in parliament. The MP also had little participation in parliament; she scored only five positive contributions, and attained grade D, yet the most active participant in house business Hon. Aggrey Awori scored 43 positive contributions to house business.

For Hon. Odonga Otto Participants recommended that the MP should start to use the local leaders other than the campaign agents. The MP needs to work with all social groups and not with only the youth, perhaps for reason that he is a youth. The MP also had paid

little or no attention on the fact that the district has no hospital. He needs to lobby for a hospital and medical staff. The MP should return to the constituency to thank the electorate after election to office. In future, failure by an MP to thank his people for electing him or her may be a ground for none performance and being voted out of office. The MP also needs to put in place development committees for Aruu County without regard to party affiliations /lines. The MP needs to bridge the leadership gap from top to bottom. He should be accountable in areas of CDF; this is because he had failed to account to the electorate the previous CDF.

### **3.3.5. Analysis of the Results**

It is apparent that members of the constituency parliaments were basing their assessment of the performance of their MP on his or her contributions to community projects. Material things that the member was able to bring to the constituency. Community members were also appreciative of an MP who traveled frequently to the constituency to commiserate with his or her people in times of grief or joy. Clearly the legislative role of the MP was not well recognized, or given the prominence it deserved. To some participants the number of times that an MP attended the house did not matter, let alone their contributions to the debates.

A big discrepancy between the functions of an MP and the expectations of the electorate is clearly apparent. What implications this has on the democratization process, on the functioning of the legislature, on re-election of MPs, on the watch dog function of the parliament, etc, remains an issue for further discussion and analysis.

Secondly, should the methodology of the parliamentary score card be amended to include the contributions of MPs to their constituencies or should the constituents be sensitized on the actual functions of parliament and those of their individual legislators? Does the CDF contribute to the perception by community members that the MP should be an agent of development? Does this perception contribute to the politics of patronage? Does it enhance or undermine democracy? An in-depth analysis of these and related issues is crucial in informing the debate about the future directions for democracy in Uganda.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **4.0 CONCLUSIONS**

The conclusion to this study is based on the objective that the study sought to assess the utilization of the CDF and to disseminate the findings of the Parliamentary Scorecard Project and to pilot its implementation. As far as the CDF is concerned the study revealed that the Constituency Development Fund had been mismanaged in all but two constituencies; i.e. Aruu county and in Bukedea county (although the MP later when contact told the researchers how the fund was utilized, his account of the story is at variance with what the people on the ground gave during the community parliament in Bukedea )

Although many factors were cited as being the cause of this phenomenon AFLI found out the absence of relevant law and policy as being the main cause of mismanagement .Other factors included the MPs unfettered powers and lack of independent signatories to the account .Indeed these and other factors have already been discussed in the findings as well as the recommended action(s).

The results of piloting the score card revealed that members of the constituency parliaments were basing their assessment of the performance of their MPs on his or her contributions to community projects and to material things that the Member of Parliament was able to bring to the constituency. Community members were also appreciative of an MP who traveled frequently to the constituency to commiserate with his or her people in times of grief. Clearly the legislative role of the MP was not well recognized, or given the prominence it deserved. To some participants the number of times that an MP attended the house did not matter, let alone their contributions to the debates.

A big discrepancy between the functions of an MP and the expectations of the electorate is clearly apparent. What implications this has on the democratization process, on the functioning of the legislature, on re-election of MPs, on the watch dog function of the parliament, etc, should be a matter that the next score card should address.

### **4.1 RECOMMENDATIONS**

This study would be incomplete if pertinent lessons and recommendations were not articulated as a basis for formulation of concrete policies and policy actions. The nature and manner of recommendations follow the report prime objective namely; assessment of CDF and piloting of the score card in constituencies. For the CDF it was recommended

as follows:-

#### **4.2 Recommendations for Improving the Effectiveness of the CDF**

To ensure that CDF works for the people as well as the MP who is but a conduit through whom supplementary funding is now possible participants in the community parliaments and key informants to this study recommended the following:

1. There should be a concrete development plan to guide the use of CDF. This should be backed up by a comprehensive policy and law to guide on the use of CDF in the country. The policy should consider establishment of separate constituency accounts for CDF other than the MPs' personal accounts. Proper law must be put in place to avoid misappropriation of the CDF money.
2. CDF committees, which should involve key stakeholders including the leaders from LC I to LC IV, the business community, the civil servants, the women, the youth, and the farmers should be established.
3. There should be CDF committees both at constituency and sub-county levels to manage the fund. The CDF committee at constituency level should be comprised of representatives from each of the sub-counties in the constituency. The CDF committee at sub-county level should be comprised of representatives from each of the villages in the constituency. The CDF committee at constituency level should select projects to be funded by CDF and headed by the area MP.
4. Establishment of a research committee at zonal levels constituting of councilors to decide on projects for use of CDF and have a separate account for each of the project and CDF should be increased and released annually.
5. There should be civic education to all stakeholders about CDF, and the fund should come as a grant of government to constituencies. A technical committee should also be established to monitor and evaluate the way CDF works and ensure proper accountability for the fund. Accountability should be published in public places. Local leaders should verify the accountability of CDF.
6. Participants also recommended that, since the fund covers the entire constituency, it should be increased from 10 million to 50 million annually to cause more impact. Bigger constituencies should receive more funding.
7. All projects and funds should be displayed for community to review and build consensus on the beneficiaries of projects. To ensure proper accountability, there should be an account for the CDF at constituency level, where the area MP and the treasurer are signatories, an annual auditing exercise for the CDF, and clear guidelines by parlia-

### *Development or politics of patronage?*

ment indicating the origin and modalities for use of CDF.

8. A constituency should have a committee in charge of the account, constituted by each of the members coming from each sub county of the district. The MP should not be signatories to this account for the reasons of preserving their sanctity and also as watchdog of the executive in its implementing roles.
9. CDF funds should be put into public account like all other money e.g. LGDP and the MP only monitors.
10. Constituency development committee should be constituted by chairpersons from sub counties and opinion leaders as committee members.
11. Independent sub counties must have their own development committees of ten (10).
12. LCIV should be chairperson because they have time. MP should only monitor.
13. Let parliament pass a law on the use of CDF. Key informants pointed out that, the implementation of CDF was illegal because, it was implemented without the mandate of parliament and without any policy guidelines. It was charged on the consolidated fund without an enabling law or policy to back it up.

### **4.3 For the score card it was recommended as follows;-**

1. The methodology of the parliamentary score card be amended to include the contributions of MPs to their constituencies or should the constituents be sensitized on the actual functions of parliament and those of their individual legislators?
2. People should be sensitized about the roles of their MPs in legislation so that they don't expect MPs to work in the constituencies only.
3. The dissemination of the Parliamentary Scorecard project should be simplified, broadened and cover all constituencies if possible in order to conscientise and mobilize constituents and deepen democracy in Uganda.

*'The work AFLi is doing is good. How could we have known about the CDF and the work of our MP?. I think if possible all constituencies should just contribute money and invite AFLi to their constituencies because they are missing a lot of valuable information.'* A participant in Bukedea.

4. The key informants recommended that the Scorecard should also cover MPs work in the Parliamentary Committees because that is where most of the business of the House takes place.
5. The scorecard is good and a positive contributor to entrenching a democratic culture and good governance at parliamentary and national level. It should be improved to grade the value of MPs contributions in the house.
6. Another recommendation from MP's is that most of the debates in Parliament takes

place in committees of Parliament and therefore the Score Card should cover this as well.

## ANNEXTURES

### ANNEXTURE: A. List Participants in the constituency parliaments

#### A Nyabushozi constituency

No.	Name	Title	Address/Telephone
1	Rubanyohora John Mark	Chair person LC IV	Nyabushozi Constituency
2	Ntamuhirwa	Chair person LC III	Kikaati
3	Matsiko Eric	Chair person LC III	Kenshunga
4	Mbaho Buhamba	Chair person LC III	
5	Byaruhanga Kosiya	Chair person	
6	Kamukunda C	Councilor for people with disabilities	
7	Tibamwenda J	Councilor for people with disabilities	
8	Ndeebwa Parry	Chair person	
9	Kitakureka David	Secretary for production and works	Kenshunga sub-County
10	Nsemereirwe Jovanice	Secretary for education	Kenshunga sub-County
11	Kato G Willium	Chair person	Rushere
12	Rwamubende Elly	Councilor LC III	Kenshunga
13	Byaruhanga Salvatore	Sub-accountant	
14	Tuhiriirwe Grace	O C Police,	Kenshunga
15	Twongerwe Joseph	Retired civil servant and Chair person	0772-307747
16	Ndingiri Everest	Chairperson for the movement caucus	0772-971344
17	Mushabe Roger	Chair person	0782-342285
18	Katisimbura N	Opinion Leader	
19	Kaberegye Y	Opinion Leader	0772-383445
20	Mamuuna G	Councilor	0772-962474
21	Kitakureka David	Councilor	Kenshunga
22	Kamukuuzi S	Speaker Kenshunga Sub-county	0772-901034
23	Bugingo H	Speaker	

24	Mulinda Sam	Chair person-Veterans	
25	Mugume G.H	Chair person	
26	Nuwagaba Frank	Secretary for youth	Kenshunga sub-county
27	Kaberegye Peace	Councilor	

## **B Makindye Division**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address/Telephone</b>
1	Mukasa Abdul Nasaar	Councilor	nassarman@yahoo.com
2	Kachope G	Councilor	0772-416688
3	Wagutu Wankihoma	Chairman LC II	0772-864930
4	Lukumbira P	Chairman LC II	0782-688689
5	kalema t	Councilor	0752-641849
6	Sebuguzi	Councilor	0712-858331
7	Meddie Musisi	Chairman LC II	0772-442377
8	Muwonge M	Secretary for Defense	0752-540408
9	Ssemuuj Rose	Councilor LC III	0712-939924
10	Birungi B. Nalongo	Councilor LC III	0712-615680
11	Nakayima Margaret	Councilor LC III	0782-539407
12	Danie Kamya	Councilor	0772521073
13	Mwanje S	Councilor	0752-624967
14	Kayanja David T	Councilor	0772-500472
15	Lubwama Afukia	Councilor	0772-455291
16	Kizito Vincent	Youth Chairman	0772-390723
17	Katibe Rosemary	Secretary LCIII	0782-390723
18	Bukeya Latifah	Councilor	0772-925922
19	Matiovu Robert	Driver	0772-455291
20	Kabong Frank	General Secretary LC I	0712-730120
21	Nanyonga G	Woman Councilor	0772-314251
22	Wasswa Hassan	Chairperson	0772-6961401
23	Kibila Richard	Youth Representative	0782-608183
24	Kawumgezi Jamada	Security person	0782-889483
25	Akankwasa Saul	Youth Representative	0782-679015
26	Nalongo Ndagire	Secretary	0712-411670
27	Namukasa Rosemary	Councilor	0712-446513

*Development or politics of patronage?*

28	Prince Nakibinge Joel	Councilor	0772-325437
29	Naluyima Maddiina	LCII Councilor	0772-946513
30	Ssendiisa M Patrick	LCIII Councilor	0772-436644
31	Katende Charles	Civil Servant	0772-641997
32	Matovu R	Youth Representative	0782-354927
33	Anne Mugerwa	Woman Councilor	0772-575460
34	Lubega Thermos	Councilor	
35	Siraje Lubwama	Vice Chairman LCIII	0772-455291
36	Naggai Lucia	Councilor	0772-626470
37	Bukenya P.	Civil Servant	0772-499287
38	Katerega V	Chairman	0772-696149
39	Mukasa Matthias	Councilor	0772-427282
40	Kabuje Siraje	Councilor	0712-480022
41	Nakandi S	Civil Servant	0772-880097
42	Katumba B	Civil Servant	0772-552705
43	Prince Simbwa	Representative for former MP hon. Y N Nsambu	0772-839175
44	Okitui George		
45	Luboyera B.	Civil Servant	
46	Kimera Henry	Civil Servant	henrykimera@yahoo.co.uk
47	Kaasa Pius	Chairperson	0782-084779
48	Dorothy Ssekibaala	Councilor	0712-573760
49	Gidaya Julius		0782-194102
50	Ato Willie	Technician	0772-426748
51	Ofumbi Florence	Councilor	0772-485717
52	Hussein Kyanjo	MP. Makindye West	hkyanjo@yahoo.co.uk

**C Aruu constituency**

No.	Name	Title	Address/Telephone
1	Okot Lumumba	Chairman Pader Town council	0772342319
2	Oyella Grace Apiyo	Chairperson Women Pajule	
3	Salim Gogoi	Chairperson LCIII	

4	Ogaba K.Richard	Parish Chief	
5	Oyat M.Geofrey	Parish Chief	0782925468
6	Lato Rose Mwaka	Councilor LCIV Pajule/ Lapul	0782170216
7	Silvia Opira	Chairperson LCIII Lapul	
8	Moroluny	LCII	
9	Oryang Albino	Movement Chairman	
10	Nyeko. E.Lamonlony	Movement Chairman Pajule	
11	Olwoch Tiberio	Parish chief	
12	Opoka P Owiny	Secretary finance	0782801743
13	Odong Simon	Chairperson Finance	
14	Labeja. B.Johnson	Vice Chairperson Pajule	
15	Adiyo Poline Ogiya	Secretary Education/ Health Pajule Sub- County	
16	Opio Maurice	Sub-County Chief Pajule	0772851588
17	Omany Semi	Chairperson LCIII	
18	Admaa Brian.W	Accounts Ass.Pajule Sub- county	
19	Bongomin John Bosco	S/Clerk Lapul	
20	Okoyo Dorine	SE. G.P.C Pajule	
21	Nkomyom Vincent	Chairperson Pedutino	
22	Akello Betty		
23	Otto. P.Komakech	Sub-County Chairperson	
24	Odur Kadi	Chairperson LCIV	
25	Ocan D. L	GISO Pajule	
26	Obote Justin	Chairperson LCII	
27	Ottoba Wellborn Odiya	Chairperson LCIII Laguti Sub-County	0712393050
28	Rev. Okello Jiponi	Priest	0782653148
29	Odong George	Chairman LCII	
30	Oceng Lunjino	Chairman LCII	
31	Edward Elder		
32	Olango Lalako Moriss	Chairman LCII	
33	Abiriga Otim N	D/CCF	0772330292

*Development or politics of patronage?*

34	Odongo Joseph	Chairman LCIII	0774210841
35	Abalo Nancy A	Representative Sub-County chief Kilak	0782498752
36	Komakech Samuel	Obwolo SGT I/C Aruu County	
37	Omena Alfonse Loki-lemoi	Chairman LCIII Pajule	0782303050
38	Okello D. Nicholas	Councillor LCIII Pajule	
39	Okello David	Councilor Representing Youth Sub-County	
40	Chankwo Moreise	Pajule Technical Ag.H/Master	0782697296
41	Kitara Francis	Pajule Sub-County Speaker	
42	Oyugi Hassan David	GISO Lapul S/County	0782509737
43	Oyat Sam	Pajule Sub- County	
44	Oyat Vincent	Pajule Sub-County	
45	Odongo Bosco	Pajule	
46	Apio Grace		
47	Otim Micheal	LCIV Lapul	michealotim@yahoo.co.uk

**D Bukedea constituency**

No.	Name	Title	Address/Telephone
1	Okiria R		
2	Oluka	Y.R.	
3	Odeke Joseph	LCIII Kolir S/ County	
4	Emong Julius	YR Kolir S/County	
5	Akiror Grace	Dep/Speaker Kolir	
6	Ocen C. August	Elder Kolir.	
7	Rev. Okello J.A	Elder BKO	
8	Alwero Sara O	Secretary Women council	
9	Amuria Christine	K'BLA	
10	Malinga Daniel	Y.R..	

11	Malinga	Councilor	
12	Odeke Cyprian	Elder	
13	Omaido Imma	LCIII Councilor	
14	Emokori Elius	Councilor LCIII	0772855194
15	Asano Elizabeth	Student	
16	Okalang Adrew	Secretary	
17	Aumo Florence	Student	
18	Mary Onyait	Chairperson Women LCIII	
19	Omongot A.S.	Elder	0772831834
20	Okia C.P	Elder	
21	Malinga T	Elder	0772672198
22	Osire Jackson	Elder	0772415759
23	Oluka Mahmoud	Opinion Leader	
24	Aolikai James	Youth Representative	
25	Anyapa Julius	Youth Representative	
26	Odea David	LCV Chairperson Bukedea District	0772999488
27	Ojule B	Bukedea	
28	Akol Anna Grace	LC Women Rep.	
29	Oonu S. Bosco	Youth Rep.	
30	Atim Harriet	Youth Rep.	
31	Apio Margret	L.C.P.W	
32	Arafat Oyo	Youth Rep.	
33	Orone L	GISO Kidongole	
34	Obilakol H.	Elder	
35	Idengot. S.	Elder	
36	Outeke Mustafa. O.	Youth	
37	Opio William	Youth	
38	Malinzi Alli	Elder	
39	Eilor. M.	Elder	
40	Hellen Tegu	Women Rep.	
41	Acen Margret	Women Rep.	
42	Tino. H. Grace	Women Rep.	
43	Omuria Lazarus	LCI Chairperson	
44	Opolot William	Elder	

45	Okalebo Simon	Student Rep	
46	Okoche Dan	Elder	
47	Oluka Cooper	Youth Rep	
48	Opio Stephen		
49	Ekitu Juventine	Councilor	
50	Okiring James	Councilor Malera S/ County	
51	Ajilong Bessie	District Councilor	
52	Mugena Agnes	Contact Person (Workshop)	0772975938

### **ANNEX B; List of key informants.**

Hon. Omwony Ojwok Minister of State for Finance, Planning.  
Saul Kaye. Executive Director,  
National Planning Authority  
Desk Officer for Parliament , Ministry of Finance  
Hellen Kaweesa, Public Relations Manager, Parliament of Uganda  
Dyson Okumu, Director of Planning and Development,  
Parliament of Uganda ,  
Administrator, Parliament of Uganda  
CAO Bukedea  
CAO, Kihurura district  
CAO Pader  
Principal Assistant Town Clerk, Makindye, Kampala  
Hon. Peter Esele, former MP Bukedea county, Bukedea district.  
Hon. Odonga Otto, Aruu MP, Pader district  
Hon. Mary Mugenyi, Nyabushozi MP, Kiuruhura district  
Hon. Hussein Kyanjo, Makindye West MP, Kampala  
Hon. Nusubuga Nsambu, former MP, Makindye West.  
14 Members of Parliament who requested not to be mentioned.

### **ANNEX C; tools used for rapid appraisal of CDF**

Constituency parliamentary debate comprising of 50 people selected from among councilors, LC111 Chairpersons, media, head teachers, clergy, NGOs and business men.

- a) Group discussions during preliminary visits and during the parliamentary debates.
- b) Use of key guiding questions in constituency debates.
- c) Interview of MPs and key informants using a checklist of questions. The key

informants are;

- d) Desktop documentary research.
- e) Comparative analysis with the Kenyan experience.
- f) Key informant interviews with the following category of people; parliamentary accounts committee chairman Hon. Okullu Epak, the Minister of finance , Hon. Ezra Suruma , Minister for parliamentary affairs, Hon. Hope Mwesigwa, Clerk to Parliament, Chairman of Parliamentary Commission and Chief Administrative Officers.

### **Check list of questions for CDF for both constituency and MPs.**

To analyze the use of constituency development fund, the following guiding questions were identified by the research team and the same were presented before the members for approval. These included:

- a) Have you ever heard of a fund given to MPs for the development of their constituencies called Constituency Development Fund (CDF)?
- b) What do you know of that CDF is funding?
- c) How effectively have the constituencies utilized the fund?
- d) What types of projects have been selected for funding and what are selection criteria?
- e) What structures are in place fore selection and implementation?
- f) Do you collaborate with local government, NGO or community based organizations? If so, how?
- g) Is the fund adequate?
- h) Is the money used for politicking or genuine development?
- i) Are there penalties attached for mismanagement?
  
- j) Are the current policy and guideline for CDF adequate? If yes, how? If no, what

*Development or politics of patronage?*

should be done?

- k) What is the effect/impact of the fund on targeted beneficiaries?
- l) How has the fund helped MPs avoid being corrupt?
- m) What is the release mechanism of the fund?
- n) What are monitoring and evaluation mechanisms?

**The broad questions to guide debate in the constituency fora**

- a) Do you know CDF?
- b) is it a good policy for poverty reduction and fighting corruption?
- c) Is CDF well utilized?
- d) Does CDF work for the people?
- e) How best can we ensure CDF to work for the people?

**6.0.3 Interview guide for CDF beneficiaries in Uganda**

**Date.....**

**Background variables**

No.	County	
	Sub-county	
	Parish	
	Village	
	Sex	
	Category	

**Study details**

No.	Question	Response
-----	----------	----------