



## **BUNGOMA COUNTY**

---

### **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

# **MEDIUM TERM EXPENDITURE FRAMEWORK AND COUNTY FISCAL STRATEGY PAPER 2023/2024 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REPORT**

---

‘The Bottom up Economic Transformation Agenda for Inclusive Growth’

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... 2

FOREWORD ..... 3

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... 4

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... 5

PART 1: INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY ..... 7

**Overview** ..... 7

**Approach and methodology** ..... 7

PART 2: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION FINDINGS ..... 2

    SECTION 1 – OVERVIEW OF PARTICIPANTS ..... 2

    SECTION 2 - HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS ..... 4

    SECTION 3 – PROGRAM PRIORITIZATION AND SPECIFIC PROJECT PROPOSALS ..... 10

    SECTION 4: FLAGSHIP PROJECTS ..... 13

PART3: ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS ..... 16

    Representation..... 16

    High Intervention Areas..... 16

    Program Prioritization and unresolved Issues..... 16

    Correlation Matrix ..... 18

    Flagship Projects..... 19

PART4: RECOMMENDATIONS AND WAY FORWARD..... 20

ANNEX1: PRIORITY PROJECTS ..... 21

## **FOREWORD**

The Constitution of Kenya 2010 through Article 56 outlines the basic fundamentals, principles, basis and the rationale for public participation.

With a total budget of KShs.13.05 billion for FY 2023/24 and a resource requirement of 30 Billion, this exercise was highly necessary to guide the process of prioritization of projects to move from 100% public expectation to 43% and ensure equity in distribution of the County resource envelope.

This public participation exercise was undertaken in accordance with the structures set out in the County Public Participation Act, 2016 with full consideration of pre- and post-stakeholder engagement, prevailing social and economic condition to ensure that the County Government incorporates all stakeholders contributions presented in our development agenda for the financial year 2023/2024.

I wish to state that the exercise was live to its objective both in addressing equal representation and group resolutions. The exercise adopted group resolution mechanism to reduce the risk of over dominance by individual participants and skewed development proposals associated with open submissions.

As part of the success in this exercise, I would like to note that the exercise reported a 115% turnout of participants' drawn from village units across the County. This is an indication of the county citizenry confidence in the exercise and a positive indicator of social auditing an idea that takes decision making from the hands of the leader to the minds of the people.

This public participation exercise has brought into our planning sphere a total of 947 new priority projects that the public perceives if addressed will move our County into one of the most vibrant Counties in the Country to attract investors and improve the livelihoods of its citizenry. Through group consensus, 80.3% of participants noted that the County's development agenda was in line with their expectations. Participants also noted a number of grey areas that need immediate redress among them transport network, health systems and infrastructure, and education.

I want to affirm that based on this report, the County Government will endeavor to exploit all possible avenues to address all issues brought forth by the participants.

**CHRISPINUS BARASA**  
**CECM – FINANCE AND ECONOMIC PLANNING**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I wish to thank His Excellency the Governor Kenneth Lusaka and Her Excellency the Deputy Governor Jenifer Mbatiany for overall coordination and leadership in the preparation of this plan.

The department of finance and Economic Planning under the leadership of CECM Chrispinus Barasa, my colleague Chief Officer Dina Makkokha, and Treasury Directors who provided direction and tremendous support.

Further I wish acknowledge all Sector CECM(s), COs, Directors, SWGs, technical team and planning vocal persons including sector economists and finance officers who moderated the exercise.

The Budget and economic planning directorates under the leadership of Ag Director Esther Mukhula and Ag.Director James W Wafula and the data management secretariat led by Deputy Director Metrine Chonge and Economist Cyphrene Sabuni Including Calvin Naibei, Teblin Temko, Dickson Chepkurui and by extension the data entry team who picked every ink particle to inform this report are highly appreciated.

Finally I wish to thank most sincerely the various institutions (CBEF, CSOs, COG and other special interest groups), the County Citizenry and any other stakeholders that contributed in one way or the other to the development of this plan.

Thank you and God bless you all

**EDWARD MAKHANDIA**  
**CHIEF OFFICER – ECONOMIC PLANNING**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The County Fiscal Strategy Paper is a document that:

- Broad strategies, priorities and policy goals to be pursued by the County Government (CG) in the medium term;
- County outlook on revenues and expenditure projections.
- an assessment of the current state of the economy including macroeconomic forecasts;
- the financial outlook with respect to Government revenue and expenditures for the next financial year and over the medium term;
- The proposed expenditure ceilings for the Sectors, including those of the County Assembly.
- Statement of Specific Fiscal Risks.

The paper gives a summary of county achievements for the last 2 Financial years, while giving a forecast of what the county will prioritise in the next 3 years.

This public participation report is an extract of the views presented by the participants of the public participation exercise undertaken by the department of finance and economic planning of the County Government of Bungoma to inform finalization of the County Fiscal Strategy Paper, 2023/2024.

Part one of this report introduces the MTEF public participation exercise citing the legal anchorage and methodology adopted in preparation and execution of the exercise.

Part two presents the findings from the public participation exercise. The part examines participants' representation by gender, geographical locations and administrative functions and further in section two and three, the part brings forth priority projects identified by participants under each function of the government. From the registers, the exercise attracted 2,722 participants drawn from all sub Counties and were distributed in all nine discussion focus groups. 870 of the participants were female while 1,852 of the participants were male. The part concludes with a presentation on the public perception about proposed flagship projects.

Part three of this report presents analysis of the exercise finding, comparative observation and intervening factors that may possibly influence the observations. From the analysis 80.3% of the participants were in agreement with the County Government Proposals, 10.9 had contrary opinions while 8.8% remained undecided. An analysis of the findings showed that transport sector despite having many un addressed issued was the most headed in the right direction going

by program prioritization. Finance and County assembly were flagged as departments with NO critical challenges across the County.

Part four of the report presents recommendations and proposed action points arising from the analysis of the report.

## **PART 1: INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY**

Stakeholders essentially are individuals or groups of people that would be directly be affected by a proposed policy, law or development plan. This section introduces the MTEF public participation report citing the legal anchorage and methodology adopted in preparation and undertaking the exercise.

### **Overview**

This public participation exercise was conducted at the Ward level with participants sourced from each Village Unit level, based on the units created under the County Decentralized Units Act, 2014.

The process was conducted through focused group discussions composed of 10 persons per Village Unit selected from the following stakeholder groups.

- Youth reps
- Disability Reps
- Women Reps
- Faith Based Organizations
- Community Based Organizations
- Non-Governmental Organizations
- National Government Reps
- Civil Society Networks
- Private Sector Reps
- Professional body reps
- Special Interest Groups e.g.farmers, educationists, traders, water userassociations, environmentalists etc.

### **Approach and methodology**

The exercise adopted a multi-stakeholder participatory approach that provided the team flexible discretion to mount simultaneous activities at the same time in all the 45 wards of Bungoma County. The output was threefold:

- i. To develop the capacity of the relevant Ward planning committees for coordination of the Public Participation processes in their areas of jurisdiction;
- ii. to develop the capacity of the community members to understand and make decisions about development priorities in their wards;
- iii. To formulate the County Medium Term Development Plan – 2023/2024 – 2025/2026 that is owned by the county stakeholders.

In this regard, the Public Participation Coordination team scheduled different capacity development forums for the county executive, technical officers involved in planning, members of the civil society, CBEF members, Finance and Budget committee members of the county assembly and the public to capture their input as well as ensure they understand the contribution of the planning process to the county medium-term plans. The following general methodologies were utilized;

- ✓ Working sessions
- ✓ Working retreats
- ✓ Stakeholder Consultation meetings
- ✓ County public consultations

To ensure maximum participation from our stakeholders, the County Treasury provided all the relevant documents on the county website to enable participants across the county to access budget estimates and give their input as appropriate on the budget proposals. I wish to appreciate our stakeholders who are physically with us for having responded positively to our invitation to participate in this process.

The findings of this exercise are contained in this report.



## PART 2: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION FINDINGS

This part presents the findings from the public participation exercise. The part examines participants' representation by gender, geographical locations and administrative functions and further in section two and three, the part brings forth priority projects identified by participants under each function of the government. The part concludes with a presentation on the public perception about proposed flagship projects.

### SECTION 1 – OVERVIEW OF PARTICIPANTS

The public participation exercise involved selection of participants at ward level with a focus on representation in line with villages, gender, PWD, Youth, elderly and other special interest groups. The invitees were then randomly grouped into various sectors where they were subjected to a group questionnaire. The group members were expected to internalize the matters raised in the questionnaire relating to prioritization of projects and proposed allocation of resources for the financial year 2023/2024 budget. From the exercise, it was observed that a total of 2,722 invitees participated in the exercise a turn out that was higher than the targeted 2,360. The participants were distributed as shown in table 1 below.

SUB COUNTY	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL	%
BUMULA	96	219	315	11.6
KABUCHAI	59	172	231	8.5
KANDUYI	162	360	522	19.2
KIMILILI	87	180	267	9.8
MT. ELGON	124	318	442	16.2
SIRISIA	43	109	152	5.6
TONGAREN	117	224	341	12.5
WEBUYE EAST	62	111	173	6.4
WEBUYE WEST	120	159	279	10.2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>870</b>	<b>1,852</b>	<b>2,722</b>	<b>100</b>

*Table 1: Distribution of Participants by Gender and sub County*

The table represents a fair distribution of participants across all sub counties with subcounties constituted by few wards having least percentages while those with most wards commanding high percentages. This is because most participants were invited based on their geographical location at village unit levels.

Gender representation was a major consideration in distribution of participants. From the table above, it can be observed that 32% (870No) of participants who turned up for discussions were female while 68% (1,852) were male. Representing a slight deviation of 1% short of a third rule for gender mix in decision making.

<b>SECTORS</b>	<b>FEMALE</b>	<b>MALE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>%</b>
AGRICULTURE LIVESTOCK AND FISHERIES	115	203	318	11.7
EDUCATION YOUTH AND SPORTS	110	211	321	11.8
GENDER AND CULTURE	118	196	314	11.5
HEALTH AND SANITATION	108	218	326	12.0
LANDS URBAN AND PHYSICAL PLANNING	94	214	308	11.3
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION & FINANCE	65	187	252	9.3
ROADS AND TRANSPORT	83	227	310	11.4
TOURISM WATER AND NATURAL RESOURCES	89	201	290	10.7
TRADE ENERGY AND INDUSTRIALIZATION	88	195	283	10.4
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>870</b>	<b>1,852</b>	<b>2,722</b>	<b>100</b>

*Table2: Distribution of Participants by Gender and Sector Groups*

There was fair distribution across all sectors of discussion with a less than 1% deviation of participants in each focus group discussion as presented in table2 above. This shows that all sector issues were fairly presented in the exercise.

An analysis of village representation indicated that 191 of the 236 village units were represented in the discussions translating to 81% village representation.

## SECTION 2 - HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS

This section presents high priority areas that need quick intervention by the sectors. All participants through a group consensus were required to identify and rate three key areas that have most unaddressed challenges in their area on a rank of 1, 2 and 3.

The key issues identified by groups are tabulated below per group focus area. Stars indicate priority levels noted by the public.

<b>SN</b>	<b>GROUP FOCUS AREAS</b>	<b>HIGH PRIORITY MATTERS</b>
1	AGRICULTURE AND CO-OPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To empower cooperative</li> <li>- Construct and revive fish bonds</li> <li>- Increase extension officers</li> <li>- Increase supply of coffee seedlings</li> <li>- ***decentralize, increase certified farm inputs</li> <li>- ***Operationalization of cattle dips</li> <li>- Construct processing factories to support value chain</li> <li>- Promote irrigation</li> <li>- Soil sampling for suitable fertilizer</li> <li>- Group financing</li> </ul>
2	EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- **Construct ECDE classrooms and toilets</li> <li>- Upgrade vocational centres</li> <li>- Completion of started projects</li> <li>- **Construct and equip vocational</li> <li>- Employment of more teachers trainers</li> <li>- Increase TVET programs</li> <li>- Establish VTCs and ECDEs</li> <li>- **Increase bursaries and schoolships and enhance transparency</li> <li>- Lack of health programs in schools that could aid reduce teen pregnancy</li> </ul>
3	GENDER, CULTURE, SOCIAL PROTECTION AND RECREATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construct and equip cultural centre</li> <li>- Provision of youth and empowerment fund-ward level</li> <li>- **Completion, equipping and operationalization of resource centre</li> <li>- Build recreational centers</li> <li>- ***Establish sports and talent centre</li> <li>- Improve bitabicha</li> <li>- Capacity build self help groups</li> <li>- Promote development and regulation of sport</li> </ul>
4	HEALTH AND SANITATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide staff housing scheme for facilities</li> <li>- **Upgrade existing facilities and establish level5 hospital</li> <li>- **Renovate delapidated facilities</li> <li>- **Medical supply and equipments and recruitment of medical staff.</li> <li>- Complete stalled and operationalize idle facilities</li> <li>- **Establish new facilities</li> <li>- Enhance refferal services</li> <li>- Employ specialised skills and infrastructure to deal with PWDs</li> </ul>

SN	GROUP FOCUS AREAS	HIGH PRIORITY MATTERS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- *Construct and increase public sanitation utilities</li> <li>- Enhance in-patient services</li> <li>- Improve maternity services</li> <li>- Increase access to specialized services</li> </ul>
5	LANDS PHYSICAL AND URBAN PLANNING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Upgrade eligible market to municipalities or urban centres</li> <li>- Decentralize survey information and maps</li> <li>- Purchase land for future plans, protect existing land and develop idle land</li> <li>- Review of valuation rolls</li> <li>- Improve gabbage collection</li> <li>- Develop spatial plans</li> <li>- Construct market stalls</li> </ul>
6	PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, FINANCE AND COUNTY PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Enhance Government Policies and Resource Mobilization</li> <li>- ***Construction offices of administrator ward</li> <li>- Establish offices for Administrators and MCAs</li> <li>- Transparency in County Gov Services like employment of youths and management of resources</li> <li>- Establish proper financial management and accountability committee</li> <li>- Enhance public participation</li> <li>- To empower women and reduce tax rate i.e reduction of business permits</li> <li>- Establish special programmes fund</li> <li>- Decentralization of revenue collection system in the ward level</li> </ul>
7	TRANSPORT, SAFETY AND PUBLIC WORKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ***Opening, maintenance and upgrading of roads</li> <li>- Completion of stalled projects</li> <li>- **Construct and rehabilitate bridges</li> <li>- Fix drainages and culverts</li> <li>- Erect road safety fixtures and traffic lights</li> <li>- Construct service lanes</li> </ul>
8	ENVIRONMENT WATER NATURAL RESOURCES AND TOURISM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ****Drilling of boreholes</li> <li>- **Protection of water towers and planting trees</li> <li>- Install solar powered pumps</li> <li>- *Proper management of dumpsites</li> <li>- Set up water kiosks, establish water schemes and increase piped water</li> <li>- Improve tourism and encourage eco tourism</li> <li>- Construction of recreation centres</li> <li>- Increase sewerage systems</li> <li>- Revive stalled water projects</li> </ul>
9	TRADE ENERGY AND INDUSTRIALIZATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- **Facilitate trade through construction of Modern Markets, trade loans and affordable trading licenses</li> <li>- ***Modernization and Construction of markets with relevant infrastructure like auction rings, sanitation utilities, Boda boda sheds and market stalls</li> <li>- Build and Renovate existing industries</li> <li>- ***Installation and maintenance of market lights and street lights, and Electrification of market centres</li> <li>- Establishment of a power station</li> </ul>

<b>SN</b>	<b>GROUP FOCUS AREAS</b>	<b>HIGH PRIORITY MATTERS</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Complete stalled projects</li> <li>- Set up cottage industries and develop private sector</li> </ul>

*Table 3: Key Intervention Issues*

The data collected was subjected to a statistical analysis that involved evaluation of contributive abundance on a weighted scale of 100% to extract outstanding challenges in each sector and sub county. The sectors in each subcounty were flagged based on the following criteria.

<b>Flag</b>	<b>Weight Range</b>	<b>Action</b>
White	<10.5%	Ignore the projects
Yellow	>=10.5	Extract the projects for action
Red	>=20.5	Extract the projects for action

Sub County results of the analysis for this sector are presented below

<b>SN</b>	<b>SUB COUNTY</b>	<b>AGRI</b>	<b>EDU</b>	<b>GEND</b>	<b>HEAL</b>	<b>LAND</b>	<b>PA</b>	<b>ROAD</b>	<b>WATR</b>	<b>TRAD</b>	<b>TOT</b>
1	BUMULA	10.0	21.0	0.7	16.8	3.8	2.7	24.4	10.7	10.0	100.0
2	KABUCHAI	8.0	16.1	5.2	12.1	5.2	4.0	25.9	11.5	12.1	100.0
3	KANDUYI	5.0	21.8	1.7	15.6	3.7	3.0	29.0	11.2	8.9	100.0
4	KIMILILI	8.9	22.9	6.1	10.1	5.0	0.0	29.6	8.9	8.4	100.0
5	MT. ELGON	8.9	18.6	1.9	16.3	4.3	3.1	30.6	7.8	8.5	100.0
6	SIRISIA	8.8	22.1	2.7	21.2	5.3	4.4	19.5	8.8	7.1	100.0
7	TONGAREN	10.1	21.3	6.4	14.2	5.2	2.2	27.0	5.2	8.2	100.0
8	WEBUYE EAST	5.2	21.6	3.7	17.9	2.2	2.2	24.6	11.9	10.4	100.0
9	WEBUYE WEST	5.6	22.4	3.1	18.9	2.6	0.5	34.2	6.6	6.1	100.0
	<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>20.9</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>15.7</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>27.7</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>100</b>

*Table4: Weighted Needs Assessment*

From the table, education, roads and health stood out as sectors that have most challenges in the County. Water and trade departments also posted challenges in some sub counties. A list of priority proposals is presented on departmental reports but the preceding section presents a summarized analysis of each group observations.

### **AGRICULTURE**

There were NO significant critical challenges experienced by the public across the County in this sector with all sub Counties posting white flags. Overall, the department pooled a weight of 7.8% which is a white flag. The sector is a key contributor to the County GCP therefore this observation indicates that the strategies and initiatives adopted by the department have greatly reduced the public expectation gaps and in fact have solved most of their challenges.

Despite the white flag, all sub counties highlighted a number of challenges which though not significant as per the ranking criteria, need to be addressed by the implementing departments. The table3 above

highlights key interventions proposed by the public with a list of all projects proposed for quick action annexed here. The stated proposals were raised more repeatedly indicating level of priority.

### ***EDUCATION***

All sub Counties noted that there are substantial critical matters affecting the sector and there is need for the County to address them with seven sub counties marking it a red flag issue that needs immediate intervention. Overall, the department pooled a weight of 20.9% which is a Red Flag and a call to the implementing department to re-strategize and address the identified issues. This further indicates that there is a huge expectation gap between the services offered by the department and the needs of the public.

### ***GENDER, YOUTH, CULTURE AND SOCIAL PROTECTION***

The sector had NO significant critical challenges across the County with an overall rating of 3.2% which is a white flag. From the observations, participants identified a number of critical challenges in relation to the services of the department in all the sub counties though they were mild and could not meet the threshold to be flagged out for action. This therefore calls on the department implementing these functions to re-look into the matters raised under this section and initiate necessary action to the satisfaction of the public.

### ***HEALTH AND SANITATION***

Except for Kimilili Sub County, all the other eight sub Counties noted the need for the County to address health and sanitation matters with critical issues reported in Sirisia sub County. Overall, the department pooled a weight of 15.7% which is a yellow flag. These resolutions indicate that the department needs to improve on its established strategies to move from Yellow to White Flag and further review its service delivery in Sirisia sub County to limit the expectation gap to the public through addressing specific issues raised by the public in this section.

### ***LANDS PHYSICAL AND URBAN PLANNING***

The sector issues have NO significant critical challenges across the County with an overall rating of 4.1% which is a white flag. From the observations, participants identified a number of critical challenges in relation to the services of the department in all the sub counties though they were mild and could not meet the threshold to be flagged out for action. This therefore calls on the department implementing these

functions to re-look into the matters raised under this section and initiate necessary action to the satisfaction of the public.

### ***PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION***

The sector had NO significant critical challenges across the County with an overall rating of 2.5% which is a white flag. From the observations, participants identified a number of critical challenges in relation to the services of the implementing department in all the sub counties except Kimilili. Results show that though they were mild and could not meet the threshold to be flagged out for action, there is need for the department implementing these functions to re-look into the matters raised under this section and initiate necessary action to the satisfaction of the public.

### ***ROADS INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORT AND PUBLIC WORKS***

Participants noted that there is critical need for the County to address matters relating to roads infrastructure and public works with eight subcounties marking it a red flag issue that needs immediate intervention. Mt. Elgon and Webuye West sub Counties reported an extremely severe need for the issue with ratings above 30%. Overall, the department pooled a weight of 27.7% which is a High Red Flag and a call to the implementing department to restructure its approach towards project identification and implementation. Despite the massive investment in the sector the expectation gap between the implementing departments and the public still remains huge thus the need to restructure priorities.

### ***WATER ENVIRONMENT NATURAL RESOURCES AND TOURISM***

Four sub Counties noted that there is need for the County to address matters relating to the sector with yellow flags in Bumula, Kabuchai, Kanduyi and Webuye East illustrating issues that need immediate intervention. Overall, the department pooled a weight of 9.2% which is a White Flag. The implementing departments should therefore initiate necessary action to address matters raised in these subcounties through improvement of existing strategies to move them from yellow flags to white flags. Alongside this, the departments should also address the mild critical issues raised by participants in the other five subcounties but could not attain threshold for flagging in order to reduce the expectation gap from the public.

### ***TRADE ENERGY AND INDUSTRIALIZATION***

Kabuchai sub County noted that there is need for the County to address matters relating to trade energy and industrialization. Overall, the department pooled a weight of 8.9% which is a white flag. The implementing departments should therefore initiate necessary action to address matters raised by participants in Kabuchai sub county to transform it from yellow to white flag by enhancing existing

strategies. Alongside this, the departments should also address the partially significant critical issues raised by participants in other subcounties but could not attain threshold for flagging in order to the satisfaction of the public.

#### ***FINANCE AND ECONOMIC PLANNING***

There were NO issues that were raised by participants as critical challenges in this sector resulting to 0.0% weight that is a white flag. This could be because the department plays a facilitative role in provision of services to the public hence No direct responsibility to their needs.

#### ***COUNTY ASSEMBLY***

There were NO issues that were raised by participants as critical challenges in this sector resulting to 0.0% weight that is a white flag. This could be because the department plays a facilitative role in provision of services to the public hence No direct responsibility to their needs.



## SECTION 3 – PROGRAM PRIORITIZATION AND SPECIFIC PROJECT PROPOSALS

This section presents the participants view on resource allocation criteria proposed by the County Government. Participants were required through a group consensus to state their agreement or disagreement with the presented proposals and where No consensus was reached or participants had NO idea of the program, they were required to state unresolved. A review of the responses indicated that the public through group consensus agreed with the program allocations as prioritized by the County Government with an agreement index of 80.3% while participants remained undecided or did not draw conclusion on 8.8% of the matters raised in different programs. List of proposed projects under each program is attached on sector reports for circulation to implementing departments.

<b>GROUP RESOLUTION/ SECTOR/PROGRAMS</b>	<b>AGREE INDEX</b>	<b>DISAGREE INDEX</b>	<b>UNRESOLVED INDEX</b>	<b>TOTAL INDEX</b>
<b>BUNGOMA COUNTY</b>	<b>80.3%</b>	<b>10.9%</b>	<b>8.8%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>1. AGRICULTURE</b>	<b>77.4%</b>	<b>16.9%</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<i>Agricultural institutions Development Management</i>	81%	10%	9%	100%
<i>Corporative development and Management</i>	81%	14%	5%	100%
<i>Crop development and Management</i>	78%	18%	4%	100%
<i>Fisheries Development and Management</i>	72%	23%	5%	100%
<i>General Administration Planning and Support Services</i>	84%	11%	5%	100%
<i>Irrigation and Drainage development and Management</i>	80%	15%	5%	100%
<i>Livestock Development and Management</i>	73%	20%	7%	100%
<b>2. COUNTY ASSEMBLY</b>	<b>76.5%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>20.7%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<i>P1:General Administration and Planning and Support Services</i>	70%	2%	28%	100%
<i>P2:General infrastructural development</i>	100%	0%	0%	100%
<i>P3:Legislation</i>	83%	0%	17%	100%
<i>P4:Oversight</i>	79%	0%	21%	100%
<i>P5:Representation and other outreach services</i>	72%	11%	17%	100%
<b>3. EDUCATION</b>	<b>88.4%</b>	<b>7.0%</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<i>P1:Early childhood development</i>	80%	16%	4%	100%
<i>P2:Education improvement and support services</i>	83%	14%	3%	100%
<i>P3:General administration planning and support services</i>	90%	3%	7%	100%
<i>P4:Vtc_general administration planning and support services</i>	95%	2%	3%	100%

<b>GROUP RESOLUTION/ SECTOR/PROGRAMS</b>	<b>AGREE INDEX</b>	<b>DISAGREE INDEX</b>	<b>UNRESOLVED INDEX</b>	<b>TOTAL INDEX</b>
<i>P5:Vtc_training and skill development</i>	86%	10%	4%	100%
<b>4. FINANCE</b>	87.2%	8.0%	4.8%	100%
<i>P1:General Administration Planning and Support Services</i>	88%	7%	5%	100%
<i>P2:Public Participation and Formulation of Policies</i>	85%	10%	5%	100%
<i>P3:Service delivery and organizational transformation</i>	89%	6%	5%	100%
<b>5. GENDER YOUTH AND SPORTS</b>	64.2%	13.1%	22.8%	100%
<i>P1:Cultural Development Management</i>	70%	13%	17%	100%
<i>P2:Gender Equality Empowerment of Communities</i>	59%	20%	21%	100%
<i>P3:General Administration Planning and support services</i>	52%	5%	43%	100%
<i>P4:Sports and talent Development management</i>	64%	20%	16%	100%
<i>P5:Sports Facility Development Management</i>	81%	5%	14%	100%
<i>P6:Youth Development Management</i>	59%	15%	26%	100%
<b>6. HEALTH AND SANITATION</b>	75.1%	22.1%	2.8%	100%
<i>P1:Communicable and non communicable diseases</i>	65%	34%	1%	100%
<i>P2:General administration and planning program</i>	78%	14%	8%	100%
<i>P3:Health infrastructure development and managment</i>	84%	16%	0%	100%
<i>P4:Primary health care services</i>	78%	21%	1%	100%
<i>P5:Sanitation managment</i>	75%	23%	2%	100%
<i>P6:Specialized medical services</i>	76%	18%	6%	100%
<b>7. LANDS</b>	72.6%	11.3%	16.1%	100%
<i>P1:Bungoma Municipality</i>	74%	7%	19%	100%
<i>P2:General programmes</i>	63%	21%	16%	100%
<i>P3:Housing</i>	78%	13%	9%	100%
<i>P4:Kimilili Municipality</i>	56%	6%	38%	100%
<i>P5:Land Development and Management</i>	79%	13%	8%	100%
<b>8. PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION</b>	85.1%	7.5%	7.5%	100%
<i>P1:County public service board</i>	87%	5%	8%	100%
<i>P2:General administration planning and supportive services</i>	89%	6%	5%	100%
<i>P3:Office of CS and ICT</i>	83%	4%	13%	100%
<i>Office of H.E The Governor</i>	82%	7%	11%	100%
<i>P4:Public participation civil education</i>	85%	13%	2%	100%

<b>GROUP RESOLUTION/ SECTOR/PROGRAMS</b>	<b>AGREE INDEX</b>	<b>DISAGREE INDEX</b>	<b>UNRESOLVED INDEX</b>	<b>TOTAL INDEX</b>
<i>national holidays and hospitality services</i>				
<i>P5:Service delivery and organizational transformation</i>	86%	12%	2%	100%
<b>9. ROADS AND PUBLIC WORKS</b>	91.9%	6.4%	1.7%	100%
<i>P1:General administration Planning and support services</i>	91%	4%	5%	100%
<i>P2:Public and Transport Safety</i>	88%	8%	4%	100%
<i>P3:Transport infrastructure development and management</i>	92%	6%	2%	100%
<b>10. TRADE ENERGY AND INDUSTRIALIZATION</b>	82.7%	10.6%	6.7%	100%
<i>P1:Energy</i>	84%	9%	7%	100%
<i>P2:Industrialization</i>	81%	13%	6%	100%
<b>11. WATER AND NATURAL RESOURCES</b>	77.3%	9.2%	13.5%	100%
<i>P1:Environment and Tourism</i>	78%	11%	11%	100%
<i>P2:Water and Natural Resources</i>	77%	6%	17%	100%

## SECTION 4: FLAGSHIP PROJECTS

In this section, participants were provided with a list of proposed flagship projects that various departments were considering to initiate. They were expected through a group consensus to state as to whether they Agree or Disagree with the County's proposal to fund the project. Where participants were unable to reach a consensus as a group or had NO idea about the project, they were required to state Unresolved. Finding of the section are presented below.

### HEALTH AND SANITATION

#### 1. PROJECT NAME: ESTABLISHMENT OF A LEVEL 5 HOSPITAL FACILITY

SUB COUNTY	AGREE	DISAGREE	GROUP REMARKS
BUMULA	3	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The county should upgrade one facility</li> <li>- Agreed to have one health centre well equipped .</li> <li>- To have a modern hospital in the sub county with all requirements</li> <li>- Easily accessed by many occupants. Availability of enough land and water electricity</li> </ul>
KABUCHAI	1	0	
KANDUYI	2	0	
KIMILILI	2	0	- Technical officers
MT. ELGON	3	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It should be established at a central place</li> <li>- Our sub county hospital still has not reached the level. We request Kopsiro hospital be upgraded</li> </ul>
SIRISIA	1	0	- To provide specialized treatment from within the county
TONGAREN	1	0	- To be prioritized accordingly
WEBUYE EAST	1	0	- Webuye health center to be established to be level 5 and field expanded
WEBUYE WEST	2	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Good</li> <li>- Implimentation of the projects will be highly appreciated by Matulo ward residents</li> </ul>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	

### ROADS INFRASTRUCTURE AND PUBLIC WORKS

#### 1. Expansion of ZeroZero – Kibabii – Mayanja Mkt Road on Kanduyi - Chwele Road to dual carriageway

SUB COUNTY	AGREE	DISAGREE	UN RESOLVED	GROUP REMARKS
KABUCHAI	3			- Reduced congestion

SUB COUNTY	AGREE	DISAGREE	UN RESOLVED	GROUP REMARKS
KANDUYI	3			- <i>Decongest roads</i>
KIMILILI	3			- <i>Reduced traffic jam</i> - <i>Expand trading radius</i>
MT. ELGON	1			
SIRISIA	1	1		
TONGAREN	3		1	
WEBUYE WEST	2			
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	

2. Upgrading of Matisi – Bokoli – Teremi Road to bitumen standards

SUB COUNTY	AGREE	UNRESOLVED	GROUP REMARKS
KABUCHAI	3		- <i>Fast track transport to market</i>
KANDUYI	3		- <i>Facilitated growth and access to facilities</i>
KIMILILI	3		- <i>Easy accessibility to market</i> - <i>Open up county</i> - <i>Upgrade</i>
MT. ELGON	1		-
SIRISIA		2	-
TONGAREN	2	1	-
WEBUYE EAST	1		- <i>Accepted the project</i>
WEBUYE WEST	2		-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	

**ENVIRONMENT WATER TOURISM AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

1. Construction of one dam in Mt. Elgon

SUB COUNTY	AGREE	GROUP REMARKS
KANDUYI	2	
SIRISIA	1	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3</b>	

2. Solarization of Matisi treatment works

SUB COUNTY	AGREE	GROUP REMARKS
KANDUYI	2	
KIMILILI	1	- <i>Will help in capping down the cost which may end up providing affordable clean water bills</i>
SIRISIA	1	
Grand Total	4	



## **PART3: ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

This section presents analysis of the exercise finding, comparative observation and intervening factors that may possibly influence the observations.

### **Representation**

Findings in section one of part two of this report indicate that there was fair representation of participants across the county drawn from various administrative wards, sub County tabulations, gender mix and devolved functional development focus areas. Although the design of data collection templates did not directly extract information on representation of other marginalized groups and special interest groups, the exercise co-coordinating teams factored all special and marginalized interest groups in invitations and a review of the detailed submissions indicates all parties were represented.

### **High Intervention Areas**

Section two of part two targeted to identify key challenges facing citizens of Bungoma County. In its results, road transport network, education and health were identified as sectors that need quick intervention in order to achieve an all inclusive growth as cited by the theme of the fiscal strategy paper 2023/2024 which this document seeks to address. In their submissions, the public cited specific areas that if addressed could better their livelihoods. Other sectors that called for quick interventions in some parts of the County included Water and Trade.

### **Program Prioritization and unresolved Issues**

The FY 2023/24 was divided into Development Allocation of Kshs 4,198,545,821 and Recurrent allocation of Kshs. 8,944,612,120 representing 32% and 68% of the total budget Kshs. 13,143,157,931 respectively.

Economic classification takes the form of ;

- 1) Non-discretionary expenditures (Personnel Emoluments); this takes first charge and includes payment of statutory obligations such as salaries, pension and others. These expenditures are projected to account for about 46.7% of the Budget.
- 2) Operations – make up 19.9% of the FY 2023/24 budget
- 3) Maintenance - Departments are allocated funds for basic maintenance. This accounts for 1.5% of the budget

- 4) Development expenditure; as already indicated, it is 31.9% of the total budget and is shared out based on the sector plans and priorities and other strategic county considerations.

The above amount was distributed between the County Executive and County Assembly as follows;

County Government Arm	Allocation	Projection	
	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26
County Executive (Governor)	532,894,901	559,539,646	587,516,628
County CDAs	11,630,748,335	12,212,285,752	12,822,900,039
County Assembly	979,514,695	1,028,490,430	1,079,914,951
<b>Totals</b>	<b>13,143,157,931</b>	<b>13,800,315,828</b>	<b>14,490,331,618</b>

With a resource requirement of 30 Billion and a resource envelope of 13.1Billion, it is evident that the County Government would only fund an estimated 43% of its priorities in year one of 3<sup>rd</sup> generation County Integrated Development Plan. Therefore, there was need for the technical teams to undertake an in depth analysis to re-prioritize its programs to stay within the resource envelope. Section three of part two of this report focused on perception of the public on the proposed resource allocation criteria. Submissions from participants were subjected to statistical analysis and it was established that 80.3% of the proposals presented to the public were in line with their expectations while 10.9% was out of their expectations. Further, participants were unable to reach consensus on 8.8% of the proposals. County assembly issues, gender youth and culture, lands and physical planning and environment water and natural resources issues stood out with the highest unresolved issues a call for action to establish the underlying reasons.

SECTOR/RESOLUTIONS	AGREE INDEX	DISAGREE INDEX	UNRESOLVED INDEX
<b><i>BUNGOMA COUNTY</i></b>	<b>80.3%</b>	<b>10.9%</b>	<b>8.8%</b>
AGRICULTURE	77.4%	16.9%	5.7%
COUNTY ASSEMBLY	76.5%	2.8%	20.7%
EDUCATION	88.4%	7.0%	4.6%
FINANCE	87.2%	8.0%	4.8%
GENDER YOUTH AND SPORTS	64.2%	13.1%	22.8%
HEALTH AND SANITATION	75.1%	22.1%	2.8%



<b>SECTOR/RESOLUTIONS</b>	<b>AGREE INDEX</b>	<b>DISAGREE INDEX</b>	<b>UNRESOLVED INDEX</b>
LANDS	72.6%	11.3%	16.1%
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	85.1%	7.5%	7.5%
ROADS AND PUBLIC WORKS	91.9%	6.4%	1.7%
TRADE ENERGY AND INDUSTRIALIZATION	82.7%	10.6%	6.7%
WATER AND NATURAL RESOURCES	77.3%	9.2%	13.5%

*Table: Group Prioritization Resolutions*

### **Correlation Matrix**

A correlation analysis between priority intervention areas presented in section two and agreement with priorities presented in section three is tabulated below

<b>SECTOR</b>	<b>PROGRAM PRIORITIZATION</b>	<b>INTERVENTION PRIORITIZATION</b>
AGRICULTURE	77.4%	7.8%
COUNTY ASSEMBLY	76.5%	0.0%
EDUCATION	88.4%	20.9%
FINANCE	87.2%	0.0%
GENDER YOUTH AND SPORTS	64.2%	3.2%
HEALTH AND SANITATION	75.1%	15.7%
LANDS	72.6%	4.1%
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	85.1%	2.5%
ROADS AND PUBLIC WORKS	91.9%	27.7%
TRADE ENERGY AND INDUSTRIALIZATION	82.7%	8.9%
WATER AND NATURAL RESOURCES	77.3%	9.2%

*Table: Prioritization Vs Intervention Correlation*

The green flag indicates that the department's prioritization criteria is in line with the public expectations

From the table, there is need for health and water sectors to re consider re-prioritization of its programs in order to address the public proposed interventions. Education and Roads sectors appear to be prioritizing their programs in line with the expectations of the public but on the flip side have many un addressed issues. This could be due to insufficient funding or poor implementation of funded projects. A subject that calls for further analysis.

## Flagship Projects

Section four of part two of this report was focusing on flagship projects. Despite all the projects recording an agreed consensus from the public. There was limited and worse poor attention to the section that recorded less than 50% of the expected responses and therefore cannot be used to inform any decision. This calls for further action to establish the cause of these results.

<b>SECTOR</b>	<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>RETURN RATE</b>	<b>RESOLUTION</b>
HEALTH	Establishment of a level 5 hospital facility	35% (16 of 45 Wards)	100% Agree
Roads	Expansion of ZeroZero – Kibabii – Mayanja Mkt Road on Kanduyi - Chwele Road to dual carriageway	40% (18 of 45 Wards)	89% Agree
Roads	Upgrading of Matisi – Bokoli – Teremi Road to bitumen standards	40% (18 of 45 Wards)	83% Agree
Water and Natural Resources	Construction of one dam in Mt. Elgon	7% (3 of 45 Wards)	100% Agreed
Water and Natural Resources	Solarization of Matisi treatment works	9% (4 of 45 Wards)	100% Agreed

## **PART4: RECOMMENDATIONS AND WAY FORWARD**

This section presents the recommendations and proposed action points arising from the analysis of the report.

From the analysis, it is clear that except for section four, the exercise met its objectives of informing the County Fiscal Strategy Paper 2023/2024 and the decision remains with implementing departments to adopt the following recommendations.

- i. Prioritize projects based on proposals presented in section three of this report
- ii. Re-align their budgets to address high intervention proposals presented in section two
- iii. Undertake a critical analysis on unresolved issues to establish underlying rationale and take appropriate action
- iv. Undertake an awareness exercise and where possible, a follow up public participation to address gaps in flagship projects
- v. Design appropriate tools to net all ideas fronted by group members including expansion of number of participants, baseline survey, participant screening, participation forms to maximize value of the exercise.

**ANNEX1: PRIORITY PROJECTS**