



EAST AFRICAN COMMUNITY

IN THE EAST AFRICAN LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY (EALA)

The Official Report of the Proceedings of the East African Legislative Assembly

96th SITTING - THIRD ASSEMBLY: SIXTH MEETING - THIRD SESSION

Wednesday, 13 May 2015

The East African Legislative Assembly met at 2:30 p.m. in the EALA Chambers, EAC Headquarters in Arusha, Tanzania.

PRAYERS

(The Speaker, Mr. Daniel .F. Kidega, in the Chair.)

(The Assembly was called to order)

PAPERS

The Chairperson, Committee on Agriculture, Tourism and Natural Resources (Mr Christophe Bazivamo): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I beg to lay the report of the Committee on Agriculture, Tourism and Natural Resources on the on-spot assessment of the Lake Victoria Water Supply and Sanitation Program II. I beg to lay.

MOTION FOR THE CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON GENERAL PURPOSE ON THE EAC ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE PERIOD 2012/2013

(Debate interrupted on Tuesday, 12 May 2015, resumed)

The Speaker: Thank you so much, honourable members. You remember last evening we adjourned before concluding this debate specifically to allow further consultations and to allow members to prepare themselves for more debate. Debate is still open.

Ms Dora Byamukama (Uganda): Mr Speaker, I want to thank you for giving me this opportunity and to note that the Committee on General Purpose has done a very good job and I salute the work that it has done.

Mr Speaker, I have had time to read the report and I have looked in particular page 3 on findings and observations. When you look at the findings and observations for example when you look

at page 4, it says the committee considers the omissions, errors and misrepresentations still emerging in the report to be unjustifiable.

It goes on to say that, the report lacks basic information, details and statistics. It talks about the fact that the omission and inconsistencies lead to errors within the report and these are cited in the report under the Office of the Counsel to the Community where the Assembly has passed a list of Bills.

It also points out the issue of pictures and photographs, which was highlighted yesterday as well as wrong captioning of photographs and wrong page numberings.

It goes on to make other fundamental observations. However, when you look at the recommendations, these recommendations in a way contradict the findings and observations. Therefore, I thought it would have been prudent for the committee to be able to explain this contradiction because if in the report under findings and observations there is mention of the fact that the report lacks basic information, details and statistics, how then can we go ahead and put in the recommendations that the committee commends the evident improvements? Can you have evident improvements without basic information, details and statistics?

I think this issue needs to be addressed squarely. Therefore, I have a challenge whereby the committee recommends that we adopt this report because if it lacks this basic content, if we actually support the report and therefore give an okay to the annual report, we shall actually be confirming what is defective and what does not contain what we expect it to contain.

Mr Speaker, I would like to provide some brief history on these issues. The Second Assembly in 2008 rejected an annual report and we went ahead to propose that there should be a format, which should be followed when annual reports are written. I have made consultations, I have looked at the format, and I can say without fear or favour that this format has not been complied with. Therefore, what this House recommended - because the Second Assembly still carries on to this Third Assembly - was not adopted.

I am therefore constrained as to whether we should go ahead and actually support what the committee on this issue has recommended.

Mr Speaker, the essence of an annual report is that it emanates from the Treaty and then from the Treaty we have the plan for the EAC. From the plan, we have an annual report, from the annual report we have activities for financial years. So, as an Assembly vested with powers, which are provided for under Article 132 of the Treaty, I find it very difficult to be able to carry on work of the Assembly where you have a report which is so defective to the extent that it does not even provide us with enough information to be able to concretely propose activities for the financial year.

Let me say very clearly and note that this particular report is of 2012/2013 so in effect we are doing post mortem. Where is the report for 2013/2014? I think this would have been an appropriate time as we enter into the next financial year.

Therefore, Mr Speaker, I have a challenge. Just like the Hon. Patricia Hajabakiga said yesterday, I really feel that we should not merely rubberstamp just because we have been passing annual reports and supporting reports of the committee on this matter.

The findings and observations clearly point to the fact that we need to request humbly that the Council of Ministers and the Secretariat take back this report and address the issues, which

have been raised, and that the persons who are responsible are tasked to give a comprehensive answer to the issues, which have been raised.

The issue of lack of basic information, details and statistics cannot be ignored and, therefore, this august House should not rubberstamp a report that lacks this very important and critical component. If we do, posterity will judge us harshly. This is my humble proposal and I beg to move. Thank you.

Ms Nancy Abisai (Kenya): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I wish to move an amendment to the committee report. The amendment is as follows: Considering all the errors and inconsistencies, lack of timeliness and material errors found in the annual report, the committee recommends that EALA reject this annual report.

The Speaker: Thank you so much, hon. Nancy. Honourable members, you know how we treat reports of committees and the amendments. What transpires is that the amendment comes as part of the debate and then the chairperson of the committee, at the point of his or her response, will concede to the amendment and then thereafter, the House will pronounce itself on the report as amended. Therefore, debate is still open before I invite the chairperson to comment.

Ms Sarah Bonaya (Kenya): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would like to add my voice to this very important issue. I say this because I was in this General Purpose Committee for five years and I think I am one of the people who pushed for rejection of the report of the EAC annual report in the first instance. The main reason then was it was a very glossy paper, which looked like an advert for the Community but it did not take into consideration the key issues of the status of the EAC, the implementation status, and the general report on challenges and the situation as it were.

It was under the department of Corporate Affairs in the EAC so we rejected and I can see now that the backlog is flowing through. In general, I see this mirroring the state of affairs of EAC in general because I sat on the Accounts Committee and we saw the audit report. The monitoring and evaluation report seemed not to be coming through which could have also been of substance in generating this report.

We have a very good strategic plan and this report is supposed to show where we are heading, where we are and what the gaps are. Actually, my colleague hon. Nancy has put it right. I just want to voice my own concerns and say that we reject this report and it should be treated very seriously because we seem to have major gaps in very important areas like our risk management, our human resource issues. We have so many gaps in EAC so this report is just a reflection of how we are doing generally and if we cannot put our issues straight, then we have a big problem as a Community and this report should be a basis for us to mirror ourselves on how we are performing. Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Ms Judith Pareno (Kenya): Mr Speaker, thank you. I rise to support the submissions that have been given in terms of rejecting this report. This is because we have all had a chance to look at the report as it is. Also, considering the committee's report, you will definitely see that the report is in itself erroneous and it would reflect badly on us if we said the report is erroneous and we go ahead to confirm something that has misrepresented even the members of this Assembly.

I do not need to repeat the aspects that were highlighted yesterday as erroneous but I took time to look at the conclusion that had been given by the committee and they admit that this is an accountability tool. The purpose of this report is for accountability. If it is wrong, then how can

we say that we are being accountable by considering something that is wrong as a tool for accountability? It definitely shows that there is just no way that we can accept this report as it is.

In fact, if you look at the conclusion of the committee report, it seems to allude that there are omissions in terms of the challenges facing this Community, and there are omissions when it comes to policies and procedures that have been used. Therefore, clearly this report is just a deliberate tool to misguide us as to what we are doing in the Commission.

Therefore, I rise to support that we actually reject this report as it is. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you so much. Can I invite the chairperson to respond?

Dr Odette Nyiramilimo (Rwanda): Thank you, Mr Speaker. First, I want to thank all the members who gave their views to this report and especially all the members who thanked or congratulated the Committee on General Purpose on the work done.

From yesterday, all the members who talked showed their disappointment on the way the report has been written, presented and today hon. Nancy brought this amendment to reject the report.

Members who spoke after hon. Nancy and those are hon. Sarah, hon. Judith Pareno supported the motion, and I think as a committee, we all support the amendment to this report. This is because we discussed it this morning and actually even in the conclusions given by the committee where we say, we support this report.

As we stated, it is very erroneous and therefore, Mr Speaker, we support the amendment and we agree that this report should be rejected. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you so much, chairperson. Honourable members, I am going to put the question to adopt the report of the committee. I call for order in the House. I am going to put the question to adopt the report of the committee on the annual report of the Community 2012/2013 as amended. I put the question.

(Question put and agreed to.)

The Speaker: Honourable members, before we move to the next item, I would like to re-echo what this Assembly has done to the Council of Ministers. Please we would like the Council of Ministers to address itself to the Secretariat that they should take this Assembly seriously and take the recommendations that the Assembly gives seriously. This matter came from the Second Assembly to date. The question of quality and the timeliness of the report and the format- We do not expect to receive the same report for 2013/2014 in the same fashion. I thank you so much.

MOTION FOR THE CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS ON THE ON-SPOT ASSESSMENT OF THE INTERNAL AUDIT SYSTEMS OF THE LAKE VICTORIA BASIN COMMISSION

The Chairperson, Committee on Accounts (Mr Jeremie Ngendakumana)(Burindi): Mr Speaker, I beg to move that the report of the Committee on Accounts on the on-spot assessment of the internal audit systems of the Lake Victoria Basin Commission be adopted. Mr Speaker, I beg to move.

The Speaker: Secunder? Hon. Yves, hon. Bernard, hon. Mumbi, hon. Jeremie and all the members standing. Honourable chair, proceed.

Mr Ngendakumana: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Let me go straight to the report.

Introduction

The East African Legislative Assembly is the Legislative Organ of the East African Community responsible for, among other things, carrying out oversight function on all matters pertaining to the Community. Article 49 (2) (c) of the Treaty Establishing the EAC empowers the Committee on Accounts to discharge oversight functions on behalf of the Assembly on all financial matters of the Community. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure of the Assembly, particularly Annex 5A, the Committee on Accounts is mandated to-

- (i) Carry out a post audit review and scrutiny of the expenditure incurred by the EAC Secretariat, the Organs and Institutions of the Community.
- (ii) Carry out post audit review and scrutiny of the expenditure based on an annual audit report of the Audit Commission, pursuant to provisions of Article 49(2) (c) and 134 of the Treaty for the Establishment of the EAC. This function is post budget and implementation of the budget by organs and institutions of the EAC.
- (iii) Carry out post audit function that encompasses the need to monitor the implementation of the budget in a manner similar to internal audit, pursuant to Rule 72(1) of the Rules of Procedure of the Assembly.
- (iv) Present a report with recommendations to the House for debate and adoption after the on spot assessment.
- (v) During the review and consideration of EAC Audited financial statements for the year ended 30 June 2013, a number of queries were reported on LVBC among other Institutions and Organs of the Community.

The queries were largely on financial management and lack of strong Internal Audit Unit and the inefficiency of management. It is against this background that the Committee on Accounts decided to carry out an oversight assessment of the internal audit unit functions of the LVBC; its programmes and projects from 1st to 6th February 2015 in Kisumu, Kenya.

The on spot assessment mainly looked into the following:-

1. Functioning of the projects and programmes;
2. Functioning of the Internal Audit Unit and much emphasis was put on the following areas:
 - a) Role of Internal Audit Unit;
 - b) Reports of the Internal Audit Unit;
 - c) Reporting and structure of the Internal Audit Unit;
 - d) Systems control;
 - e) Relationship with management;
 - f) Annual Audit plans;
 - g) Challenges faced by the internal Audit Unit; and
 - h) Any other related internal audit matters.

Objectives of the Assessment

- (i) To assess whether the Internal Audit unit discharges its professional duties to the Commission and its projects and programmes.
- (ii) To establish if LVBC uses modern auditing techniques and new applied technologies to assist them in carrying out their duties;
- (iii) To understand any related challenges facing the Internal Audit systems of LVBC;
- (iv) To strengthen the Internal Audit Unit of LVBC through appropriate internal audit policies and procedures in accordance with international standards;
- (v) To recommend on the improvement of the functioning of Commission, Projects and Programmes; and
- (vi) To understand the entire functioning of LVBC Secretariat; projects and programs affiliated thereto.

Methodology

As a method of assessing the Internal Audit Unit Systems in the LVBC, the Committee undertook the following:-

- (i) Made field visits to projects and programmes coordinated by LVBC;
- (ii) Interacted and discussed with Management of LVBC, projects and programmes coordinators, County Government officials overseeing the implementation of projects around the basin;
- (iii) Reviewed the report on the progress made by the internal auditors;
- (iv) Received presentations from the internal audit unit as well as the project and programme Coordinators on their role and challenges faced while executing their duties; and
- (v) Held plenary discussions.

Meeting with LVBC Management

The Committee met the Deputy Executive Secretary (Finance and Administration), the Deputy Executive Secretary of LVBC (Projects and Programmes), the Principal Internal Auditor and other officers of LVBC. The Executive Secretary was attending another meeting at the time of assessment.

The Committee briefed the Management on the purpose of the activity as a review and assessment of the Internal Audit Systems of LVBC and its projects and programmes. The Committee also sought to understand manuals and other issues regarding the Internal Audit Systems.

The Deputy Executive Secretary gave an overview and functions of LVBC; its programmes and projects as well as the functions of the Internal Audit Unit.

The Deputy Executive Secretary noted some improvement in the Internal Audit Unit of LVBC but revealed the need for more strengthening of the unit as well as the monitoring and evaluation unit by recruiting more staff.

The Projects and Programmes visited were initiated and they aim at contributing to the broad-based poverty alleviation and improvement of livelihoods of people, by supporting sustainable management of shared natural resources of the Lake Victoria Basin and supporting secondary urban centres to address environmental degradation and enable people to achieve the water and sanitation.

Structure of Internal Audit Unit at LVBC

The Internal Audit Unit at Lake Victoria Basin Commission (LVBC) is currently staffed with an Internal Auditor and a Principal Internal Auditor. However, there is need for more staff at the Audit Assistant level to help improve Internal Audit coverage especially of the projects whose implementation is coordinated by LVBC.

The previous recommendation to have the Head of Internal Audit Unit position at a higher administrative level of Deputy Director is yet to be implemented. The EAC Audit and Risk Committee in their 2014 Report that was adopted by Council presented the recommendation to the Council of Ministers. However, the Institutional Review process has held its implementation back.

Field Visits of Programmes and Projects of LVBC

On a two day site visits to the projects and programmes of the Commission in Kenya, the Committee interacted with the regional coordinators, the County Government officials, the locals administration and the contractors.

The Committee made field visits to the following projects and programmes;

LVEMP II

- a) ROJE Community Driven Development (CDD) Group demonstrating good practices in watershed management and tree planting;
- b) a sewage Treatment Plant in Homa Bay (rehabilitation going on);
- c) Andisore Kagola Women in Ahero (a model group geared towards improving the environment and livelihoods of the Community);

LVWATSAN II

- a) water, sanitation, and solid waste in Isebania/Sirari; and
- b) The sewage treatment plant under rehabilitation in Kericho.

In the above mentioned field visits, the Committee paid courtesy calls to the County Governments of Homa Bay, Kericho and Migori and in particular the line County ministries dealing with the projects directly.

Committee Findings and Recommendations

Staffing

The Committee noted that LVBC Internal Audit Unit is staffed with only two Auditors and as such the functional coverage is still limited and the available staff are stretched due to lack of adequate staff.

As the Commission and the number of projects grow, the LVBC internal audit unit should equally be staffed given the fact that this is a specialized Institution.

The Committee recommends to the Assembly to urge the EAC Management to recruit more staff in the Audit Unit of LVBC as a matter of priority especially at the Internal Auditor and Audit Assistants level. This should not wait for the completion of the institutional review process.

Funding

The Committee noted that the funds availed to LVBC by Partner States are not sufficient to enable recruitment of the required staff. It was further revealed that Partner States disburse only 10% to supplement 90% of the LVBC budget funded by development partners. Certainly, this does not provide sufficient funds for particularly project monitoring. This leaves the Internal Audit Unit dependent on donor funds.

The Committee underscores that Internal Audit Unit is a core oversight function whose funding should not be left largely at the mercy of the donors and whose independence should be guarded even in its funding if it is to be efficient and effective in serving its purpose.

The Committee recommends to the Assembly to urge the EAC Council of Ministers to cause the increase of LVBC funding for sustainability and proper execution of the mandate by the Internal Audit Unit.

Lack of Automated Audit software

The Committee noted that the Accounting system of LVBC is not automated (Sun Five Accounting Software). The Internal Audit Unit is trained on the system. An automated Accounting system can be audited by reviewing data in the system, extracting data into Excel or when print outs are made. This can be referred to as auditing around the computer, which is currently being done. However, it is more effective and efficient to audit a computerized system through the computer using Computer Aided Audit Techniques (CAATS).

The EAC Secretariat undertook to provide the same in the interest of standardizing the internal Audit tools across the EAC Organs and Institutions, but it is yet to complete the process.

The Committee recommends to the Assembly to urge the EAC management to provide requisite Internal Audit professional tools and training to LVBC as earlier promised.

Lack of Approved Risk Management Policy

The Committee noted the absence of an approved Risk Management Policy hence absence of a risk register for the Commission making it impossible for the Internal Audit Unit to assess the level of risk management.

The Committee recommends to the Assembly to urge the EAC management to prevail over the Commission to prepare a Risk Management Policy adaptation and implementation road map and start instituting those measures that can be undertaken under the current year available resources.

Privileges Imbalance

The Committee noted that staff members of Kenyan nationality working for the Commission do not enjoy same Status, Privileges and Immunities like the rest of the EAC/LVBC staff due to limitations in the negotiated Headquarters Agreement. The employees working for Institutions of EAC in Partner States do not enjoy similar privileges as those at EAC headquarters.

The Committee recommends to the Assembly to urge the EAC Management to engage the Republic of Kenya to renegotiate the provisions of the EAC/LVBC Headquarters Agreement to allow Kenyan Nationals working for the Commission to enjoy same Status, Privileges and Immunities like the rest of the EAC staff.

The Committee further recommends that staff privileges in the Community be harmonized to ensure conformity with the EAC staff rules and regulations.

Reports of the Internal Audit Unit

The Committee noted that as usual, reports of the Internal Audit Unit are submitted to LVBC Management and the EAC Audit & Risk Committee. Only external audit reports are presented to the EAC Council of Ministers and considered by the EAC Legislative Assembly. This leaves a number of issues raised in the internal audit reports privy to the management. The best practice would be sharing the reports with other stakeholders. This way, issues raised by external auditors would mitigate.

The Committee recommends to the Assembly to urge the EAC management to table quarterly internal audit reports to the Assembly to enable execution of its oversight purposes.

Sustainability of Projects and Programmes

With regard to sustainability of the projects being implemented in the Partner States, the Committee observed the need to build capacity of all beneficiaries in specific areas for easy management and continuation.

The Committee recommends to the Assembly to urge the EAC Council of Ministers to cause provision of a budget line by the local administration to build capacity of beneficiaries and enable management of projects after handover to the Partner States.

LVWATSAN Budget Absorption Capacity

The Committee noted that the LVWATSAN Programme has extremely low budget absorption capacity. After 80% of the programme time, only 25% of the budget had been absorbed. There is a risk of returning disbursed funds back to the donors.

The Committee recommends to the Assembly to urge the EAC management to evaluate LVWATSAN programme and establish challenges affecting its absorption capacity and act accordingly.

General Conclusion

There has been some improvement in the Internal Audit Unit in the last four years. More improvement will be realised if better facilitation by way of staffing and funding is provided to the Commission.

The Committee recommends to the Assembly to urge EAC management to avail requisite resources to enable this Committee to complete the oversight tour in all Partner States where EAC projects and programmes are being implemented.

The Committee further recommends to the Assembly to urge the EAC Council of Ministers to conduct an independent survey of the Community on issues of Water and Sanitation.

Acknowledgements

The Committee on Accounts wishes to thank the office of the Rt. Hon. Speaker for allowing it to carry out its oversight function. The Committee further appreciates valuable time accorded to it by LVBC Management; its projects and programmes staff, the County Governments of Kericho, Home bay and Migori.

The Speaker: Thank you so much, hon. Jeremie, Chairperson of the Committee on Accounts. Honourable members, the motion on the floor is that the report of the Committee on Accounts on the on-spot assessment of the internal audit system of the Lake Victoria Basin Commission be adopted. Debate is open.

Mr Bernard Mulengani (Uganda): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker and I would like to thank my chairperson but also to inform the House and declare that I am a member of the committee. What I am going to do, Mr Speaker is just to add more meat on what the chair has presented because I signed the report.

Mr Speaker, when you look at page 5, the committee is emphasising the issue of monitoring and evaluation unit, which goes in line with internal audit. Whenever the Executive decides to do the monitoring and evaluation as well, there is a likelihood of not getting proper evaluation of the progress of the projects in an organisation.

This does not only lie to the Lake Victoria Basin Commission. Rather, it seems to cut across all the Organs and institutions of the Community where the monitoring and evaluation has been, either unknowingly or intentionally, suffocated.

Mr Speaker, I want to agree with the committee but also to say that the Lake Victoria Basin Commission is second to the East African Community Secretariat in the area of housing projects and therefore the budgets being big. This one needs an immediate address on the area of internal audit. Internal audit, in its own formation right now at the Lake Victoria Basin Commission is unable to handle their routine work exhaustively because of the level of the projects, and because of where they are being handled.

This is because the projects are not necessarily in Kisumu where the Lake Victoria Basin Commission is housed. They are even being implemented from the Partner States.

The committee is raising issues to do with the staffing of the internal audit. Mr Speaker, some time back here in the Community we tried to raise as a committee and as an Assembly on the separation of the reporting by the internal audit to administratively report to the Executive but functionally to report to the Audit and Risk Committee.

The way the Audit and Risk Committee was formulated is in such a manner that it does not have enough meeting time with these other institutions because as we read in our earlier reports, the Audit and Risk Committee is only appearing four times a year. Given the number of institutions and Organs of the Community, this is not sufficient for the Audit and Risk Committee to ably monitor and handle the internal audit function.

I would request the Council of Ministers to revisit the terms of reference of the Audit and Risk Committee and maybe consider widening the composition of the Audit and Risk Committee. This is because if internal systems fail in any Organ and institution, definitely there is a danger of occurrences of such issues like mismanagement of public funds.

In the area of funding, we are emphasising that the Partner States disburse 10 per cent and this is supplemented by 90 per cent. Mr Speaker, when we look at the supplemented budget by development partners to Lake Victoria Basin Commission, we also ask ourselves how much of that money is being put in tangible results. This the committee answers on some page where we said that the LV ... is operating at 25 per cent. These are some of the tangible programs in the Community because it involves putting piped water in the ground.

However, here is a ... project performing at 25 per cent. I think this is very appalling and as an Assembly, we should condemn this because these are the only things that we can show our people. Just like His Excellency Jakaya Mrisho Kikwete said, we are representatives of the people and the only thing we can tell people about are tangible results.

Now if we are saying that we are operating at 25 per cent for programs that can be seen then we need to condemn travels of the Executive because these are the causes of non-implementation of tangible programs. As they travel and are absent at the station, they eventually fail to implement what can be seen.

Mr Speaker, on page 8 the committee raises the issue of privileges and imbalances. If we fail to harmonise our own headquarters agreements within the region as East African Community, how can we claim to be in position to harmonise the Partner State legislations and policies? I think this is a total indication of failure. If we cannot negotiate harmonised headquarter agreements at the regional level, can we claim that we are in position to harmonise country policies and legislation and other issues or concerns that take place in the Member States? I do not think so; it is far-fetched.

I think we actually need to wake up the Council so that whenever we are negotiating headquarter agreements, they are harmonised. There is no way an institution or Commission that is being put up in Burundi, Rwanda, Uganda or Kenya will be treating its staff differently from the headquarters. I think this is a serious anomaly and omission.

Mr Speaker, lastly the report of the Internal Audit Unit. I would like to seek clarification from Council. At what point in time do they get to interact or get to follow up in the internal audit systems of the organs and institutions of the Community? This is because the committee observed that internal audit reports are not presented to Council but they are presented to management, which is okay, but how does Council use its own presence to be able to know?

If I am on the Executive and I report to a Council, I am a human being just like the executives are and they would not want to bring forth to Council areas where they are not performing but Council in its wisdom- How do you eventually go round to get to know the internal operations of Organs that you manage and oversee?

I would like to support the report of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. Mulengani.

Dr. Kessy Nderakindo (Tanzania): Thank you, Mr Speaker. Yes, I know that the Assembly is at home in the headquarters but coming from Tanzania, I am pushed to say *karibuni nyumbani*.

There is a point that hon. Mulengani raised about the program of LV Watson project. This is to support or to add on what hon. Mulengani had just said, in particular point 4.18 about LV Watson budget absorption capacity. This is about water and sanitation and I would like to say that this is the last year of the millennium development goals and starting with the new ones SDGs.

In the seventh millennium development goals, our target 4 is talking about water and sanitation. It is in the report specifically from the UN development report 2012, which says that, "lack of safe water, sanitation and hygiene causes sub Saharan African countries annual losses which is more than what the entire continent receives in development aid." Not being able to provide safe water, sanitation, hygiene, and we are a sub group of the sub Saharan countries means that we are losing more than the whole aid we get for the whole of Africa. Here we have a program that is not being able to sue what is given.

I will substantiate this UN report. For example in east Africa and simultaneously with a report from the Joint Monitoring Program of WHO, World Bank and UNICEF under water and sanitation program 2012, it says that Tanzania loses about 301 billion Shillings annually which is equivalent to US\$ 206 million per year because of having unsafe or poor sanitation. On that, Tanzania 26 million people out of 48 million people use unsanitary or shared latrines and 5.4 million Tanzanians out of the 48 million have no latrines.

In Kenya on the same note, Kenya loses 27 billion shillings annually for poor sanitation, which is equivalent to US\$ 324 million per year. In Kenya, 21 million people use unsanitary or shared latrines and 5.6 million Kenyans have no latrines at all and defecate in the open.

Defecation in the open cost Kenya almost US\$ 88 million per year yet eliminating the practice will require less than 1.2 latrines to be built and used.

For Uganda, in the same report of March 2012 on poor sanitation, Uganda loses 387 billion shillings, which is equivalent to US\$ 177 million per year because of poor sanitation. 13.8 million Ugandans use unsanitary or shared latrines. 3.2 million Ugandans have no latrine and defecate in the open. Open defecation cost Uganda US\$ 41 million yet eliminating the practice will require just less than 650,000 latrines to be built and used.

How does this relate to integration? Mr Speaker, the major objective as stated in Article 5 of the Treaty is to develop programs and policies that will lead to improvement of the living standards of our people while ensuring achievement of sustainable environment.

Mr Speaker, EAC is a sub set of sub Saharan countries. If we look at the reports, it says that every day, 2000 children die from diarrhoea due to poor sanitation and here we have a program that fails to use the money that it has for sanitation.

Four out of ten people in East Africa have no access to water. That is not too bad. Seven out of ten have no appropriate sanitation. Think about this. What happens when we have a storm? What is happening in the city of Dar-es-Salaam when it is flooding?

I know the program is part of the millennium development goals and it was the effort of the African sanitation that they pushed the target for the seventh goal in the millennium development goals. In addition, the African ministers council on water that they pushed that goal. The report is not that bad in east Africa for we have examples. The African ministers' council on water awarded one of our presidents, His Excellency President Kagame for his outstanding personal contribution of improving sanitation in Rwanda. We do have an example in East Africa and therefore, having this example as a member of the Accounts Committee, we seriously urge the Council of Ministers to take this very seriously as an urgent matter. Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. Kessy for your well researched debate.

Mr Pierre Celestin Rwigema (Rwanda): Mr Speaker, thank you very much for giving me the floor. I want to let you know that I am a member of the Accounts Committee and I would like to congratulate my chairperson, Ambassador Jeremie on how he presented the report. I support the report.

Mr Speaker, I was very interested to be part of the team that visited LVBC. In fact, when you are at the place and you listen to how different teams are explaining what they are doing, you feel that things are improving and it is true. The only problem is that they miss what is necessary to make the management as a managerial management that can produce benefits and outcomes for the organisation.

In every management, you have to plan. That means you have, first, to plan the budget. You have to see what kind of budget you need to be able to achieve your goals. The budget itself cannot work. You need to get the staff and the staff must be trained. You must get good staff and the staff must be sufficient because you do not have to get one staff in the place of four or five people because you cannot really get the outcome that you need.

To get better results, you have to coordinate. Who coordinates? It is the staff. The management is from the top to the bottom. Then you expect to get good results and you have to evaluate the performance. This is done at the level of control. What we have seen for the unit of internal control is that it is understaffed. They need people and they can do more. You cannot get good performance if you do not have good staff.

Mr Speaker, in this report we have seen that 80 per cent of the program at the time, only 25 per cent of the budget had been utilised. You cannot expect to get good results and not to expect to get a good outcome. It is not possible. This is the reason why when we were there, we were very pleased to say, is it possible that we can really schedule meetings in different areas in form of Partner States and then try to push and stimulate our different Organs and organisations and discuss with them openly, do it quarterly and get reports. Then we can expect an improvement of the management because management is to get results at the right moment and communicate the results at the different levels of leadership.

Mr Speaker, again I support this report and I thank the Chair.

Mr. Celestin Kabahizi (Rwanda): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I need to add my voice to those who preceded me by supporting the report and declare that I am a member of the committee. I need to point out one of the recommendations made.

We have seen that many ... of the financial statements from the year 2013 were due to lack of internal audit unit activities and also there is another point which we need to emphasise which is the risk management policy which we have found lack in almost all EAC organisations,

programs and projects. This implies that the sustainability of projects is questionable. If we do not have a risk policy management, we do not know exactly how the project will be sustainable and sometimes we do not plan for recurrent charges for the project and there is adapting of sustainability of this sewerage plan t system, which we have found in Kericho and constructed in other countries.

Therefore, we urge the Council of Ministers to think about this policy being in place to help and ensure the sustainability of the project. With those few words, I support the report. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you so much, hon. Celestine.

Mr Emmanuel Nengo (Burundi): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker for giving me the floor to contribute to this report. Let me declare that I am a member of the committee. Others have expressed their views on technical issues but for me it is only to emphasise my appreciation on the findings in the field.

Mr Speaker, I fund that the LVBC has improved their work. This is because two years ago in the Accounts Committee, we saw that the LVBC had an unclean opinion form the Audit Commission but in these two years, with the new management, we found that LVBC has unqualified opinion from the Audit Commission. That is why I am congratulating the management of LVBC meaning that the Internal Audit Unit contributes much to this improvement.

Secondly, Mr Speaker, I found on the ground that the project and programs, which were well done in the field- Many associations supported by those projects- Most of the members, are women. I thought that those families and beneficiaries improve so much, they get many benefits from those projects, and they improved their socio-economic development.

Mr Speaker, the coordinators of the project told us some challenges like funding, which are not certain. Some contributions from the development partners are decreasing and they had dependence on donors, which put doubt on the sustainability of those activities in future.

However, I am very happy that our committee put some clear recommendations about the capacity building of those beneficiaries.

Finally, Mr Speaker, the LVBC rents the office from the Partner State contribution. When we were there, we had our meetings in a hotel instead of having it in their office. I know that other institutions are now trying to construct their buildings. I also heard from the management that they have many partners. Instead of continuing to pay rent, Partner States can contribute money to be used to finalise the findings and then the LVBC shall start constructing its own building.

With those few remarks, I thank you so much, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. Nengo.

Ms Judith Pareno (Kenya): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I rise to support this report. However when I looked at the observations of this committee and remembered some time back, I think they did a similar over sight activity over this institution and to me, there is not much difference-

The Speaker: Sorry hon. Pareno for the interference on your debate. Sergeant, please can you go and ring the bell and tell members who are outside that the plenary is on? Proceed.

Ms Pareno: Thank you, Mr Speaker for your directive lest we would be talking to ourselves. I remember contributing to a similar report sometime last year by this same committee or the committee that was there but by this Assembly. This is one institution that the grievances have become too much. Every time an oversight activity is undertaken, same things come up: lack of funding, no proper auditor controls, members or employees not being given the same treatment as the rest of EAC employees in institutions.

When I look at this report, in fact the committee refers to promises by Council that the Council promised to do this that the Council has now said they have not done it because of institutional review. I was even wondering. When it comes to the funding, do we need institutional review to give funding. Because they are saying that they cannot be able to add more staff because of institutional review but to even allocate or increase their funding, do they need institutional review?

I think we need to hear from Council on this particular institution because we cannot be in a circus. Last year the same complaints and issues we made. We carry oversight and the same things come up. I am happy to support this report and to support the committee's recommendation but I would like to hear from Council. What have they done from the recommendations that we gave last time? What have they done of their promises? Would they have to await for this institutional review? If it is never forthcoming, do we let this institution die because this institution is seriously ailing, looking at the report we had last year and the report we have right now - (*Interruption*).

Ms Byamukama: Thank you very much, my sister hon. Pareno. I am rising on a point of elucidation. I would like to add on the point she has made on the issue of institutional review. We have been told that this institutional review has been on since 2008 and that it has consumed slightly over US\$ 2 million. I think we need some clarification on the cost of this institutional review and more clarification as to how much money it has consumed and when exactly it will be concluded. It is a very important piece of information that we should be vested with so that we do not carry information that may be erroneous. I thank you my sister hon. Pareno and Mr Speaker for giving me space.

Ms Pareno: Of course that is very relevant information because if we are hiding behind the institutional review not to do what we are supposed to do, we need to know what this monster called institutional review is. I think it has now become derailing to the activities of the institution and to the activities of this Assembly.

Every time year in, year out- If it has been going on from 2008, if we have used all this money, is it really worth it if our institutions are ailing because we do not have funding, our institutions are ailing because we cannot even put in proper audit controls because we are waiting or institutional review. I think it is time we either discarded this institutional review thing, or we get a commitment and deadline as to when this institutional review should be done because this is one of the reasons that has been given as to why we do not have proper systems in this LVBC because we are waiting for this monster called institutional review to be completed.

Looking at the funding, if you look at the report that we have before us, it talks about a 10 per cent increase and I am wondering, there was a promise by Council from the records that we have that they were going to work on ensuring that this institution gets more funding. I want to hear from Council. What have you done to ensure that we have enough funding for this institution?

On the automated audit software, the committee is recommending to the Assembly that they provide requisite internal audit professional tools and training to the Lake Victoria Basin Commission as earlier promised. When was this promise made and why has it not been realised? I would like to hear that from Council otherwise then I think we are going in circles year in, year out. I do not think we need to now move in and do another oversight activity when what we recommended last year and what we are recommending this year is not going to be implemented.

Mr Speaker, since I came to this Assembly I think I have contributed at least two times to this particular issue of how the Lake Victoria Basin Commission is ailing. We need to hear from Council as to why it is ailing. I support the report of the committee.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. Pareno.

Ms Nancy Abisai (Kenya): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I stand to support the report of the committee and I would like to raise two important issues briefly. One, I know hon. Mulengani had raised it but I think it is important that I speak to it just to raise the issue of the lack of uniformity especially in relation and in regards to the staff remuneration, privileges and packages.

The Lake Victoria Basin Commission is housed in the lakeside city of Kisumu. Staff working there from the capital – Imagine being treated like second rated staff compared to the rest. You get demoralised, they cannot work, they will not perform and yet we know they have capacity. These issues need to be addressed. In fact, we do not even need to continue re-emphasising it and bringing it back to the floor because I think it needs to be done. Just thought I should mention it because even when we went there as a whole House, it was still raised.

Because I come from near the lakeside city, every time they see an EALA member, those are the issues they will raise again and again so it is actually looking very ridiculous even on us because we look like we just listen and it is business as usual. I think something needs to be done.

The Speaker: Hon. Nancy, sorry for the interruption. Just before you proceed on another point, honourable members, this is matter that I think we give to give a timeline to Council on because if we allow the debate to continue until the end, they will just gloss through and pass the report without giving specific attention to this matter.

I think Council should take it that this House does give a timeline to this matter to be addressed not only for Lake Victoria Basin Commission but all institutions of the Community that are hosted by Partner States must be treated how other staff of the EAC are treated. In the next financial year, the Council should report on how best they have harmonised the matter. I do not think this matter should be treated lightly. Thank you, honourable.

Ms Abisai: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker for that guidance and I hope the Council of Ministers will do just that.

Secondly, Mr Speaker, we have been talking about underfunding in some areas of the EAC budgets yet now we have a program that is heavily funded or at least is well funded. When you see that, the absorption capacity of a whole program is 25 per cent that raises serious issues of concern. Why would you only absorb 25 per cent? Is it that there is lack of capacity to implement the programs? Is it that there is something that is fundamentally not addressed and that is why the programs are not being implemented?

You cannot have 80 per cent of funds being taken back to donors. Why? People have sat down, they have thought through a process, they have come up with a project proposal, work plans and operational plans, they have pegged budgets to them and then now when you are given all the money to implement, you still take it back to donors and say, we were not able to implement 80 per cent. Really?

That is why I think one of the honourable members raised the idea of travels as well. This is not to say that travelling is bad but I think it needs to be planned because if half the time – Let me tell you, Mr Speaker. The institution that had its highest budget on travel was the Lake Victoria Basin Commission. I belong to the Committee on General Purpose and we have those figures and facts. At least 27 per cent of the total budget of that institution goes to travel.

Now if that total budget is going to travel and yet 80 per cent of the program is not implemented that the absorption capacity is lacking, there is something fundamentally wrong and we cannot just treat this and leave it as if it is business as usual. We need to ensure that this issue is addressed, especially because within the General Purpose Committee, we have raised issues on some sectors within the productive and social sectors being underfunded, and here you are, you have an institution that is being funded and implementation- In fact if you were rating this from the background I came from, there is no donor who would give you money after you come up with such a report that you were not able to absorb 80 per cent. You cannot justify why you seek for more funds. It is a very serious issue and we do not have to treat it lightly.

Thirdly and finally, I would like to thank one of our colleagues who came up with some very good statistics on issues of water and sanitation. I think that we do not have to look at it lightly. These statistics, facts and figures that have been given to us- Yes they are good because they come from a very reliable source the UN but Africa as a whole, you know that sometimes we do not know what kind of measurement criteria was used, the tool used against us. We do not want to be condemned to poverty, violence.

I would wish to make a recommendation, given the facts and figures from an authentic source that was given by one of us and I think that it is important that we urge the Council of Ministers to conduct an independent survey around the Lake Victoria Basin Commission especially on those issues of water and sanitation and other challenges that one of our members raised because we cannot also just whisk it away. We must do that and that is an amendment that I will write down and give to the chairperson but because of the figures that will now go to the *Hansard*, it is important that we also come up with statistical figures that are a result of a survey that has been carried out by the Council of Ministers.

Lastly, Mr Speaker is the issue of sustainability in terms of projects and programs. I think the committee has talked about capacity especially to the communities and institutions living around the lakeside. I think it is important that as we talk about integration, sensitisation and inclusivity, I think it is important that we ensure communities and institutions around the lake have enough capacity to be able to carry on and take up some of those programs even when the Lake Victoria Basin Commission may not be able to be funded adequately on some of those programs.

I think they have capacity and they gave examples like some of the county governments from the regions and even some of those lakeside communities and institutions.

Thank you, Mr Speaker and I support the report.

Mr. Martin Ngoga (Rwanda): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I just want to emphasise largely what hon. Nancy has just said. First, I support the report but there are some intriguing issues here. That we can have both low absorption capacity and lack of funding in the same report is a big puzzle. This is because before you fix issues behind low absorption capacity, you do not have justification to advocate for increased funding. If you cannot spend what you already have then what is the justification for more funding?

What this means is that projects are not timely implemented and if they are not timely implemented, they are not properly implemented. Therefore, I do not know to what extent the audits direct themselves to value for money. I do not know to what extent that is addressed. Do we just audit to see if we have papers in place, or do we just look at value for money?

Therefore, I think this House must direct that if this has not been done in these projects that we think are meant to improve the lives of people and which should be treated as a matter of urgency, we do value for money – (*Interruption*)

Dr. Nderakindo: Thank you, Mr Speaker and hon. Ngoga. Hon. Ngoga asked about a contradiction in our report because I am a member of the Accounts Committee that why can we ask for more funds at the same time that we have low absorption. This was particular for that one project about the absorption but at the same time, we know that many of the funds come from donors and they have strings on it.

For example with the program with water, it is so sad to see that we go on the spot, they show us the tank, they show us the laying down of the pipes but the nearby school does not get water. This is because of the constraints of the aid that was given and we know that without water, some of these children have their cognitive abilities going down and that is one of the reasons we find that it is so important to listen to *TWAVEZA* about the cognitive ability of our children due to lack of water.

At the same time, the funds of water have constraints on it. Therefore, in this report, we do have other parts that need more funds and we do have other parts where the absorption was so low. Therefore, there is no contradiction from the report. Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Ngoga: Thank you, hon. Kessy for the information. The larger point I am trying to put across is that we should actually spend the little resources we have wisely in our planning, budgeting and spending. We must have in mind that we must spend the resources we have where they should be because I also have noted that hon. Mulengani spoke about a lot of money being spent in travels. So is it a priority? Can't we look into it in much more detail to make sure that money spent on travels- yes they have to travel but it should not strain the main business of the project they should be implementing?

Because Rwanda was referred to and I thank you very much, hon. Kessy. Some of the projects that we have been implementing and that have caused positive impact in the lives of people do not require large funding. It is just mobilisation of the population and getting them to participate in what they need to do with proper leadership and supervision.

We have been fighting malnutrition by encouraging families to have small gardens. This does not require any funding from anybody. We have been fighting malaria by training a few villagers to provide basic care and training to their neighbours. These people do not need to be medical professionals so I think we must identify the think tank that can provide to us some of these initiatives for us to advise policy makers.

So many options and projects out there can be implemented using minimum resources that can bring immediate positive impact to the lives of people. We should also stop thinking in terms of having huge amounts of money to change the lives of our population. We must be creative and think about options that are less costly and which are participatory in nature; getting the population to be involved. What our people need is leadership and guidance and they are ready to play their part. Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you very much, hon. Ngoga. Honourable members, you heard the statistics rate by hon. Kessy. I think some of these statistics are a vote of no confidence to us the leadership of the people. Do we need donor funds to construct pit latrines in our countries? We are losing millions and billions of money because we lack pit latrines. I think we need to readdress ourselves to our leadership call holistically. It should not be the Council of Ministers only but everybody who is in leadership. We do not need donor monies to construct pit latrines. It is a sad situation.

Ms Patricia Hjabakiga (Rwanda): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would like to support the report and the committee on the work which they have been doing on oversight particularly in this institution which I consider a very important institution which covers all the five countries and which, if you look at the amount of money that others have said that we receive from donors, this shows how important the Lake Victoria Basin Commission is.

However, Mr Speaker, if you may recall, we have had hurdles. Look at all the audit reports. We have been wondering why things do not change in this organisation. Is it the distance between the centre, which is Arusha and Kisumu or is the structural nature of the Lake Victoria Basin Commission? Unlike all EAC institutions, it is the only institution, which does not have a legal framework.

At one time, it was introduced in this House by the Council of Ministers but they took it away with a promise that they were going to address certain issues, which were raised, and it has never seen the light of day back to this House.

Mr Speaker, I think we need to again ask the Council of Ministers to reconsider bringing back the Bill for the Lake Victoria Basin Commission, taking into account the sizeable amount of money and funds managed by this institution and yet its management has to be through telephones and other things where they are managed by the Secretariat because they do not have their own stand. They do not have a legal- Anything happening to the Lake Victoria Basin Commission is addressed to the Secretariat. Look at the distance; everybody is busy so we need that institution to have its own structure, which is recognised by the law. Mr Speaker that is one thing, which I wanted to raise.

The second issue, which I wish to raise and probably it is a clarification, is that I would like to hear from the committee, is on this project of the water and sanitation project. Probably I will be pre-empting my chair's report, which is coming soon, and which did an oversight on the same project different from what the Accounts Committee did, is this 25 per cent, which they are talking about. Is it the funds for the administration of the project or it is the entire project?

This is because the administrative part is what is at the level of the Lake Victoria Basin Commission. The rest of the total project cost is within the Partner States and it is managed by the Partner States themselves under the different agencies, which are appointed by those Partner States. Therefore, I wanted to know if this 25 per cent is only for that administrative part.

Even if it is so, they cannot spend it if there is a hiccup on the other side. So we need to look at it in a more holistic manner and I hope probably we will be getting the answers since the report on the Committee on Agriculture, Tourism and Natural Resources, which also did the same, will be presented. Thank you, Mr Speaker. I stand to be corrected.

The Speaker: Thank you so much, hon. Patricia. Actually, the problem is serious because even some of our colleagues in the national parliaments do not know that these projects are in their constituencies. Therefore, there is need for serious interrogation.

I now take the opportunity to invite the chairperson to respond before I invite the chair of the committee and then put the question.

Assistant Minister for East African Cooperation, Tanzania (Dr. Abdallah Saadalla Abdallah) (Ex-Officio): Thank you so much, Mr Speaker. I did not want to be biased with Lake Victoria Basin Commission and being specific with the LVWATSAN project but one thing, which really hinders the progress of the programs of this project, is delayed disbursement of funds and this has been seen. This goes along all through the pattern of disbursement of funds. That is one.

Secondly, I was very happy with what hon. Patricia said that she worries about this 25 per cent of absorption and whether it is administrative or with the project implementation on the ground. This is because I was very worried- In fact, it reflects here inside. I went all along Tanzania across the border to Gaita, Sengerema, Simiyu and I saw the projects there. They were there and I think the one in Gaita- I wonder what they were talking about. I went to the tank, I went to the cleaning machine there, and I went to the fixing of the pipes. I know there were two big trucks, which collect refuse. They are there.

There are containers being fixed all over the place and Sengerema is almost the same. Those who have gone there have seen it. That is why I say that it is easy- I know I can always assure the credibility and compliance of money but on the ground, things are there and that is why hon. Ngoga asked whether you are giving 25 per cent- Are you using it perfectly or not within a fixed time? That is one.

Again, I have to tell this august House that there is a lot of money being sent as counterpart funds from the Partner States and they are the ones who are implementing these programs. That is what I can say.

Hon. Nancy talked about inclusion of the people on the ground. At least on the side of Tanzania, I know all these programs- In fact that was my concern. When Watson is off, what will happen? When LVEMPII is off, what will happen?

The Speaker: Chairperson, you must also remember that you are the Chairperson, Council of Ministers so you should also be able to let us know what is happening in other Partner States.

Dr. Saadalla: I have been in Kisumu and they simulate the same programs as what is happening in Tanzania. I am sorry I have never been in Uganda and Rwanda but I have been in Kisumu and Tanzania.

About harmonisation of headquarters agreement, it is true we are facing a very big hurdle in front of us because of domesticating- In fact, this is not domesticating but picking up the internal laws into the EAC laws because headquarter agreements is harmonisation of the EAC memorandum of understanding between the headquarters.

However, we are in the process of trying to have a common template as a draft for the harmonisation of all institutes and I hope this is going to be – (*Interruption*) -

The Speaker: Hon. Dora has some clarification.

Ms Byamukama: Mr Speaker, I am just concerned about one particular word I keep on hearing from the honourable Chair, Council of Ministers and this is the word ‘domestication’. I have a challenge with it because when you look at Article 8(4) of the Treaty, it provides that Community laws shall take precedence over similar matters on the issue of implementation of the Treaty.

Therefore, when I hear the word ‘domestication’ I am afraid that we may confuse this to mean that whatever we pass or whatever the principle is, I must first be domesticated. I would like to implore that maybe the issue of harmonisation or what he is talking about as model laws or approximation, especially as long as they are in line with the principle may capture better what the principle of the Treaty says.

It is just something I heard yesterday and I thank the honourable minister for giving way. I think it is something we need to clear so that we do not have this confusion here. Thank you.

The Speaker: Honourable Chair, I hope you have the clarification.

Dr. Saadalla: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Maybe I used the wrong word by saying domestication but I usually use another word approximation and harmonisation. The problem we have is how we can approximate or harmonise the laws within the Community so that they can fit in one template of headquarters agreements, including the one, which is here in Arusha.

I agree that there was a problem in the previous audit report on Lake Victoria Basin Commission and I think hon. Mulengani requested for forensic audit or something of that sort. I take this into the Council’s concern and we will, as you said and as we promised in the last Audit Commission’s debate that we would take charge of this and see whether they are going through well or with some other ambiguities.

There was an issue of institutional review. It was a jargon previously but I think it is becoming an angel. Please wait because it was reported in the Council that the consultant has already completed his and her report and the consolidation of the report was sent to the Council of Ministers, which adopted it and noted that Council of Ministers had some sort of improvement to be put on board into the institutional review. By 22 May, they are going to own it and therefore it will be ready for operationalization. This is what we are having now and I want to give this information to this august House.

The Speaker: Honourable Chair, Council of Ministers, you are giving it in the affirmative that the institutional review is ending in May to this Assembly?

Dr. Saadalla: Yes, I can say that. The institutional review, especially for the first phase – I can confirm that by 22 May, it is going to be owned by the Council of Ministers and thereby the decision from there will lead to operationalization.

The Speaker: This Assembly will be very pleased.

Dr. Saadalla: I would like to inform that the institutional review has been there for around 10 years because since 2007, it was in the process and up to now it has not been concluded. May

we be sure that if it is concluded by 22 May, the operationalization will be done in a short time because even if it is concluded, if the operationalization is not there, we will not have anything?

So after that period, is it possible to have a time frame for the operationalization of that institutional review? Thank you.

Dr. Saadalla: I just wonder. Was it information or a question? Clarify please.

The Speaker: The honourable member gave you information that the institutional review is almost coming to a decade and he is very worried that after the conclusion of the review, the operationalization may also run for a decade. Do you agree with him? That is the information he gave to the House and to you. It is incumbent upon you, as the Chair, Council of Ministers, to disagree or agree with him.

Dr. Saadalla: Mr Speaker, I cannot agree with what *mheshimiwa* is worried about because the confirmation from the Council of Ministers is that by 22 May, they are going to own and adopt the institutional review and from there on, it can be the same day, they can pick the day for operationalization.

I cannot predict but I can affirm to you that all the ministers are keen on putting the institutional review into operation. This is what I can say and they are very ready to push it. In fact, they are the ones who are pushing it. Not only the Council of Ministers but also even the Summit members.

The Speaker: Thank you so much.

Dr. Saadalla: The clarification I am seeking is whether the Council of Ministers has budgeted to implement the institutional review. Are we going to have it this week or next week the budget that will handle the institutional review?

The Speaker: The honourable member is very categorical that the operationalization of the review- is it reflected in the Budget proposals coming.

Dr. Saadalla: I am afraid, Mr Speaker that I cannot answer that but I will give the answer later on. Whatever the case, when the Budget arrives, we will see but if this will be looked at with a good eye by the House and by 22 May everything is out then I know that this House can have means of reallocating funds like cutting off from somewhere to the other so that institutional review can be operationalized.

Hon. Hajabakiga talked about the Bill of the Lake Victoria Basin Commission. I felt very sorry about that. I am not well informed about it but I promise to take care of that and we will see how we can move. I want to see where it ended up and how it can be revitalised again into this House. Thank you so much.

The Speaker: Thank you. I invite the chairperson of the committee to respond and we conclude.

Mr Ngendakumana: thank you, Mr Speaker. I would like to come back to the necessity of having an internal audit unit, well equipped with enough staff and enough qualified staff. It is very important because while the internal audit unit is performing its duties, which are a day-to-day activity, it has the responsibility to improve the way things are being done in those projects and institutions.

It allows the management, not only to fulfil its duties to the organisation but also especially to improve the effectiveness of governance, risk management and control processes. This is done by advising the management, coaching the management timely and regularly. This is why the internal audit unit reports directly to the top management of the organisation so whenever the observations and advisers of the internal audit unit are taken into account, the management gets opportunities to take corrective measures timely and this allows the institutions and organisation to succeed.

Secondly Mr Speaker, it has been reported that the Committee of Accounts has undertaken a field visit and we have been visiting LV Watson and LVEMP. We want you to know how those projects perform in their duties to the Community. Those two projects are very important for the Community because they meet, directly, the needs of the ordinary citizen in terms of water and sanitation but also in terms of improving the management of the environment.

Therefore, those two projects are established in the four Partner States. For now, we have just visited the projects in Kenya, Kisumu and there is a need to move to all four Partner States of Burundi, Rwanda, Uganda and Kenya to assess those projects and make sure that they are delivering properly.

Some concerns of the committee have been raised and brought to the attention of the Chair, Council of Ministers especially the institutional review that is a concern of everyday. You have raised the issue of imbalance in terms of privileges and immunities in Kisumu and this brought the questioning if the headquarter agreement but also the funding of the project by Partner States.

I would like to come to the question raised by hon. Ngoga as to whether we said that there is low absorption of budgets yet we request an increase of budget by Partner States. The explanation is that the Partner States contribute 10 per cent and these are addressed especially on administrative fees. The development partners contribute 90 per cent and this is what we see directly on the ground. Therefore, if you want to increase the number of staff especially for the internal audit unit, we will not go and pick from the 90 per cent. It comes from the 10 per cent contributed by the Partner States, and this is not enough to allow the LVBC projects to recruit more staff and pay them with the 10 per cent. I wonder whether now you understand what we mean.

With 10 per cent as contribution of the Partner States, we are not able to recruit more staff for the internal audit unit. That is the issue so – (*Interruption*)

Dr. Saadalla: I would like to give information to *mheshimiwa* that part of 10 per cent from the Partner States goes to administration but also within the project execution, 12 per cent of the project execution is also for part of administration and that is where we are hiring and recruiting project staff. This is just information for him.

The Speaker: So in essence, the Chair, Council of Ministers is giving information to the chair of the committee that apart from the 10 per cent from Partner States to administration, there is 12 per cent from the project money also for administration. Hon. Ngoga would like to follow up on his concern. Honourable chair, you will respond.

Mr Ngoga: Thank you, Mr Speaker. An issue needs to be resolved here for proper records. If we have 25 per cent spent from a 10 per cent contribution, whatever that per cent is. So you have 75 per cent that you can use to do additional recruitment. Still there is no case properly

made for additional funding when you are still spending 25 percent irrespective of where it comes from.

If there is 10 percent that comes from Partner States for administration and that is where they are spending only 25 percent. If they are in need of additional recruitments, why do they need more money when they cannot spend what they have for a smaller number of staff?

The Speaker: Thank you. Chair, I hope that you have heard him clearly.

Mr Bazivamo: Thank you. I have heard him. What I said is that 10 percent from the Partner States is allocated to administrative fees, which means also the recruitment of staff is part of it. So, this 10 percent is utilised.

The Speaker: 100 percent?

Mr Bazivamo: Yes, the 10 percent from Partner States is utilised but among that 90 percent from the development partners added to the 10 percent from the Partner States, altogether, 25 percent is spent. Therefore, we say that this is a low absorption of the budget. With the 10 percent from Partner States allocated to administrative fees, projects are not able to recruit more staff. Of course, they cannot go and utilise the 90 percent to recruit unless it is just the 12 percent as the Chair, Council of Ministers, has informed us.

The low absorption of the budget is a concern to us, and it is true because I am also a member of the Agriculture Committee and we have been observing that there is also a low absorption of Budget. Therefore, the two committees came to the same conclusion.

I would like to thank all the Members who have contributed to this report, namely; Hon. Mulengani, Hon. Kessy, Hon. Rwigema, Hon. Kabahizi, Hon. Nengo, Hon. Pareno, Hon. Dora, Hon. Nancy, Hon. Ngoga, Hon. Patricia, Hon. Chair, Council of Ministers and Hon. Yves. *(Applause)*

With these few remarks, Rt. Hon. Speaker, I beg that this report be adopted. I thank you so much.

The Speaker: Thank you so much, Chairperson. Hon. Members, the motion on the floor is that the report of the Committee on Accounts on the on spot assessment of the Internal Audit System of Lake Victoria Basin Commission be adopted.

(Question put and agreed to.)

MOTION FOR THE CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, TOURISM AND NATURAL RESOURCES ON THE ON-SPOT ASSESSMENT OF THE LAKE VICTORIA WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION PROGRAMME II

The Chairperson of the Committee on Agriculture, Tourism and Natural Resources (Mr Christophe Bazivamo) (Rwanda): Thank you, Rt. Hon. Speaker. I beg to move that the report of the Committee on Agriculture, Tourism and Natural Resources on the on Spot Assessment of the Lake Victoria Water Supply and Sanitation Programme II in the Republic of Burundi, Rwanda and the United Republic of Tanzania be adopted.

The Speaker: Seconded by Hon. Pareno, Hon. Mumbi, Hon. Patricia, Hon. Leonce, Hon. Isabella; Chair, proceed.

Mr Bazivamo: Mr. Speaker Sir, In accordance with the Treaty for the Establishment of the East African Community and the Rules of Procedure of the East African Legislative Assembly, the mandate of the Committee on Agriculture, Tourism and Natural Resources is among others, to carry out assessments of all Projects and Programs of the Community. In this regard and as a follow up of the previous assessment undertaken in February 2012, the Committee undertook a five-day On-Spot Assessment of the Lake Victoria Water Supply and Sanitation Programme Phase II (LVWATSAN II) in the Republic of Burundi, the Republic of Rwanda and the United Republic of Tanzania.

Phase one of the LVWATSAN program focused on 10 secondary towns within the original EAC Partner States of Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania, with the support of UN-HABITAT. The ten secondary towns included Kisii, Homa Bay and Bondo in Kenya, Nyendo/Ssenyange, Bugembe and Kyotera in Uganda, Bukoba, Bunda and Muleba in Tanzania, and the border town of Mutukula. With the joining of the EAC by the Republics of Rwanda and Burundi, this second phase has been expanded to cover 15 towns, three from each of the five Partner States. Phase II of the LVWATSAN Project follows LVWATSAN Project Phase I which was implemented in the 3 Partner States before the accession by Rwanda and Burundi in the EAC. This Phase II was introduced to cater for the two new countries and for new secondary towns in the other three Partners States.

In the Republic of Burundi the phase focuses on Ngozi, Muyinga and Kayanza; in Kenya: Keroka, Kericho and Isebania; in Rwanda: Kayanza, Nyagatare and Nyanza; in the United Republic of Tanzania, it focuses on Geita, Sengerema and Nansio and; in the Republic of Uganda on Mayuge, Buwama-Kayabwe-Bukakata and Ntungamo. Investment plan preparation for the 15 secondary towns was supported by the African Water Facility (AWF) of the African Development Bank Group (AfDB), which has culminated into the support by the Fund (AfDB) for the physical implementation of the second phase of LVWATSAN program that is expected to run up to 2016. It is envisaged that the program will be expanded to other towns in the basin with subsequent phases. The current project is estimated to cost about US\$ 121 million comprising a US\$ 108 million (89.07%) grant from the AfDB and the Partner States' contribution of US\$ 13 million (10.93%).

When the program is fully implemented, it will achieve 85% coverage in water supply and 80% coverage in sanitation in the target towns. It will also significantly reduce the waste entering into Lake Victoria and hence will improve the ecosystem of the Lake.

Hon. Speaker Sir, rapid urbanization in the Lake Victoria Basin is placing an enormous burden on the 15 secondary urban centres in Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda. The formation of the East African Community (EAC)/ Lake Victoria Basin Commission (LVBC) gives a unique opportunity for these five countries to cooperate and share experiences as positive steps are taken towards extending access to safe water supply, improved sanitation, increased production and income generation, and improved living conditions and quality of life. Taking into consideration the challenges presented by the rapid urbanization in the basin, the exploitation of the natural resources and its relationship to the livelihoods and poverty, the Lake Victoria Water and Sanitation initiative (LVWATSAN) is one of the Programs which was put in place to provide support to small secondary urban centres in the Lake Victoria Basin to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, in particular MDG 7 target 10 and at the same time to reduce pollution of Lake Victoria. This programme, currently ongoing and implemented by UN-HABITAT in partnership with the Governments of East African Community Countries helps to reverse the deteriorating conditions at the lake.

The other target of the programme is the promotion of regional cooperation, partnership-building, institutional and capacity enhancement, and a sense of joint ownership of the resources of the lake and its basin, all of which are central to the over-arching goal of managing the lake basin as a regional public good, Lake Victoria being a major trans-boundary natural resource of the East African Community Partner States. It is a resource of great socio-economic potential that is utilized by its bordering countries for fisheries, transportation, tourism and unfortunately a waste disposal in some areas.

Lake Victoria Basin Commission is complex not only in terms of stakeholders involved in it but also in terms of projects. The Commission is executing seven projects among which is LVWATSAN II, which was the subject of this on-spot assessment.

Mr. Speaker Sir, during its term, the Second Assembly carried out an assessment on this Project in the Republics of Kenya and Uganda in selected towns with the following objectives to:

1. appraise Members on the opportunities and challenges of the Lake Victoria Water and Sanitation Project
2. get information on facilities and infrastructure that are necessary for achieving the project objectives;
3. meet with key officials and share their experiences on the initiative; and
4. to establish the impact the Lake Victoria Water and Sanitation Initiative has on the Community as a whole.

Mr. Speaker Sir, the Third Assembly saw it imperative to undertake an activity to assess the work with a view to visualize progress so far made and challenges faced by the project to help formulation of the relevant recommendations.

Since the Republics of Burundi and Rwanda and the United Republic of Tanzania were not visited before, the Committee on Agriculture, Tourism and Natural Resources of the Third Assembly considered it necessary for another assessment of Phase II to assess if the project had lived to the expectations of the citizens of East Africa and further to confirm if the Project is sustainable.

Objective of the Visit

The overall objective of this activity was assessment of the progress made on the implementation of LVWATSAN II specifically the value for money, the quality of work being undertaken, the identification of challenges if any; status of implementation; and finally awareness creation on the EAC integration process.

Participants

Key participants included:

- District Commissioners
- Local representatives from the Administration
- Officials from the implementing agencies
- Technical staff from the local implementing agencies
- Local government representatives

- Focal point persons from each project
- Beneficiaries of the project.

Methodology

Rt. Hon. Speaker, It is important to note that the Committee started by electing a new Chairperson of the Committee. The former Chairperson Hon. Harelimana was from Rwanda and Members present unanimously elected Hon. Bazivamo Christopher to replace him.

After the election of the Chair, the methodology was agreed upon as follows:

- courtesy calls to representatives of the local administration;
- interactive sessions with the relevant key stakeholders including beneficiaries of the project and Implementing Agencies
- field visits;
- Focused Group Discussions
- In areas where the Project Areas were far apart, the Committee took a decision to work in two groups.

The Implementing Agency shared with the Committee the design of the programme including a presentation of the progress made so far, challenges, support needed from EAC in general and EALA in particular, partners involved (both funding and implementing partners) and future plans.

Findings of the Visit and Observations

Mr. Speaker Sir, the LVWATSAN initiative seeks to provide water and to develop the right balance between investments on water and sanitation infrastructure in the secondary towns and capacity building at the local and regional level to sustain Program benefits. It uses a phased approach to implementation, which focuses first, on immediate interventions designed to deliver immediate results followed by long-term interventions requiring larger investments.

Findings of the Visit in General

Program Components

The objectives of the programme being to improve water and sanitation services in the 15 selected towns in the Lake Victoria Basin, the project focuses on:

- Supporting pro-poor water and sanitation
- building institutional and human resource capacities at local and regional levels for the sustainability of improved water and sanitation services
- facilitating the benefits of upstream water sector reforms to reach the local level
- helping to reduce the environmental impact of urbanization in the Lake Victoria Basin and its components are as follows:

- (a) Water Supply:** This component focuses on high priority secondary towns to develop water supply infrastructure to provide water supply systems that can extract, treat, deliver and distribute sufficient quantities of wholesome water in a secure and sustainable manner. It intends to provide adequate storage facilities in addition to new rehabilitated distribution systems to extend water coverage and enable them to achieve the water and sanitation related MDGs. It seeks to demonstrate that the MDGs can be achieved in a relatively short time frame and that investments can be sustained over the

- long term by effectively integrating physical infrastructure works, training and capacity building into a balanced and cohesive programme of interventions.
- (b) Sanitation: This component aims at addressing the run-down and non-existent basic infrastructure and services that have resulted in significant negative impacts on environment and the fragile ecosystem of the lake. This involves the provision of drainage facilities and improved communal toilet facilities coupled with improved faecal sludge management system. It seeks to improve the health and livelihood of residents as well as the quality of the lake water. The strategy applied adopts a holistic approach in improving sanitation at the household and town levels.
 - (c) Solid Waste Management: This component seeks to minimize negative environmental and health impacts associated with poor solid waste management. The strategy is to provide a sustainable solid waste management system/ interventions for each focal town, capable of collecting, transporting and disposing of (or recycling) the projected volumes of solid waste and new drainage schemes to target high risk/ problematic areas.
 - (d) Storm Water Drainage: This component aims at addressing siltation and pollution of watercourses, caused by soil erosion and accelerated collection and transportation of both solid and liquid wastes. These result in floods and poor quality water bodies that cannot sustain healthy ecosystems. The strategy is to provide storm water drainages with adequate capacity for the catchments and other areas of unused public land, thereby attenuating storm flow, before naturally draining into watercourses.
 - (e) Capacity Building and Training: This component ensures effective delivery of capital investment and long-term sustainability of proposed interventions in all sectors. The strategy involves the establishment of institutions where they do not exist; provision of tools, equipment, offices, staff, etc. and training. It also involves designing new programmes to strengthen new/ existing institutions at local, regional and national levels to help ensure the long-term sustainability of the proposed solutions.

Mr. Speaker Sir, as highlighted above, the interventions are in two stages. The first stage addresses the need for immediate service improvements through intervening in short term critical aspects that will provide quick wins to serve up to 2016. These include water supply and management of solid waste in Burundi and Tanzania whereas it is Sanitation and storm water drainage system in Rwanda. The second stage includes long-term interventions requiring larger investments like water supply infrastructure

Status of project Implementation

The LVBC is responsible for overall LVWATSAN Phase II program supervision and coordination at regional level, especially regional level capacity building and reporting. The regional level coordination is further strengthened through the existing Regional Policy Steering Committee (RPSC) composed of the sector ministers of the five Partner States and the various technical organs of the EAC. The Regional Policy Steering Committee provides the overall operational and high level policy guidance to ensure that project/program components and activities implemented nationally blend as intended to fulfil the regional objectives of the program. Each Partner State shall be responsible for execution of sub-Programs under the program within their respective towns.

Thus, the implementation phase of the short-term interventions of the project has started in visited countries but not all are at the same rate of implementation. Some have gone to almost a hundred per cent whereas others are almost at the beginning of implementation.

The Implementing Agencies (IAs) are the following:

- Régie de Production et de Distribution de l' Eau et de l'Electricité (REGIDESO) for Burundi, a state Parastatal under the Ministry of Energy and Mines, but the focal Ministry is the Ministry of Water, Environment, Lands and Urban Planning;
- Water and Sanitation Corporation under the Ministry of Infrastructure for Rwanda but now it is the Energy, Water and Sanitation Authority (EWSA).
- Mwanza Urban Water and Sewerage Authority (MWAUWASA) for Tanzania, under the Ministry of Water.

Specific Findings by Country

Status of implementation in the Republic of Burundi

The project has started but it is at its initial stage of implementation. The first disbursement was made on 13 March 2012 and an amount of 295,000 USD was disbursed. With that amount, the following have been implemented:

- a) Procurement of a consultant to undertake feasibility studies on the implementation of the project
- b) Procurement of IT and office furniture
- c) Procurement of 4 vehicles and 3 Motorcycles
- d) Procurement of 6 tractors and trailers, 64 skips, 3 waste exhausters as well as 9 mobile toilets is completed. Note that handover of exhausters has not been yet finalized as they were found with technical problems and returned to supplier for correction;
- e) Recruitment of contractors to start works on water supply was done in February 2015 as bidders were invited
- f) Construction of nine blocks of public toilets started on February 6th, 2015 and it will take six months to be finalized.
- g) Identification of water catchments areas and space for Public toilets construction

To fast-track implementation of activities on water supply, works have been subdivided into 3 lots; a lot on water supply by gravitation in Kayanza, a lot of boreholes in Muyinga and Ngozi and for a large number of water supply system in Muyinga and Ngozi.

Observations, challenges and recommendations

Observations

- The Committee observed that citizens' expectations are so high and they wish Members to advocate for quick disbursement of funds from the African Development Bank through the Lake Victoria Basin Commission.
- The Committee observed that there was need for sensitization for sanitation mainly to traders with regard to their contribution in waste management.
- The Committee observed that there was a steering Committee, which has been created to fast track the project implementation.

Challenges

- Low absorption rate: only 5 per cent of the budget has so far has been utilized, with 95% still awaiting non-objection clearance for execution of physical activities. The

justification for this low rate is that 80 per cent will be allocated for physical works and these have not yet started as they are inviting bidders to execute the works.

- the catchment areas are located in valleys and the region is mountainous and this will require a lot of means.
- Lack of water mainly in Muyinga province.
- Low pace of budget disbursement and slow pace in submission of documents due to technical problems in preparation of those documents.
- Feasibility study took longer.

Recommendations

- There is need to work in synergy.
- There was need to fast-track implementation to meet the deadline.

Status of implementation in the Republic of Rwanda

In the Republic of Rwanda, two sub-committees assessed the project implementation in two places, namely in Nyanza District and Kayonza District. The following are the findings.

Nyanza District

The Sub-Committee led by Hon. Patricia Hajabakiga assessed the project implementation in Nyanza. The Mayor accompanied by his senior officers received members.

Observations, challenges and recommendations

Observations

- Request for African Development Bank no objection to the evaluation of bids to construct water treatment plant, water supply system, modern landfills, faecal sludge treatment plants and retention dam was done on August 2014.
- Starting of contract execution for consultancy to implement hygiene and sanitation promotion in both beneficiary towns would be effective in 14 months from August 2014.
- Starting of contract execution for supply of faecal suction trucks was effective from May 15th 2014. Acquisition of vehicles, motorcycles and equipment required by the programme was already done.
- Only short term interventions were implemented at a 100% namely sanitation in terms of availing public toilets and storm water drainage.
- 23 per cent of the budget was disbursed to allow implementation of sanitation and storm water drainage and works were finalized in August 2014.
- Eight neatly constructed toilets were found in Nyanza and targeted areas were public areas such as bus stations, health centres and churches.
- A danger was observed with regard to open water drainage areas which may cause accidents to children from schools

Challenges

The main challenge observed was the low pace in disbursement of funds, taking into account that the project is scheduled to stop by December 2016.

Recommendation

Committee Members were requested to advocate for fast tracking of disbursement to allow finalization of the project implementation.

Mr. Speaker Sir, the Sub-Committee seized the opportunity of being in Nyanza Province to visit Christ the King Church located in the original Monarchy town. It also visited the King's Palace where Members learnt a lot about the culture of Rwanda and found it rich. The Committee also visited an area where more than 20,000 people killed during genocide have been buried with dignity. This was the most difficult moment of the mission as people could realize how genocide ideology is the worst thing not only for Rwanda but also for the whole EAC region and the entire world.

Kayonza District

Mr. Speaker Sir, the sub-committee led by Hon. Christophe Bazivamo assessed the project implementation in Kayonza.

It was noted that two components were already implemented namely:
Public toilets and Water Drainage system.

Beneficiaries of the components are the following:

1. The Kayonza Youth Centre which now has nine modern public toilets which were constructed during this term;
2. a Health Centre;
3. a public primary school; and
4. Secondary schools; Market; a Public Playground; and Church.

The Committee met with key actors in the project, including the Mayor of Kayonza and technical staff in the town. Some of the facilities visited were the Kayonza Youth Centre, a primary school, a water drainage system and the District Headquarters.

The Mayor and other technical staff expressed concern about delays in the commencement of the programme implementation on the ground and urged the Regional Parliament Legislators to lobby the concerned actors to speed up the process of implementation of the Programme. It was noted that there was a lack of information about project progress and the community had high expectations as some of the challenges need immediate attention. The delegation echoed the same concern and pledged to advocate for the speedy implementation of the project.

Observations, Challenges and Recommendations

The Committee took stock of the following observations and challenges and further made recommendations:

Observations

1. Water supply activities had not begun.
2. The implementers informed the Committee Members that the delay was caused by the lack of "no objection" being received from the African Development Bank which is the financier of this project.

3. The two tractors for garbage collection were already in Kigali and therefore the residents were awaiting for them to be delivered to Kayonza.
4. Exhauster trucks had been procured but were to be delivered in Kayonza.
5. Water drainage open areas needed to be covered or fenced to avoid accidents.
6. The water treatment plant is not yet built, reason being that the “no objection” has not yet been received from the African Development Bank.
7. The 2.4 kilometres stretch is complete but with the challenge of an open perimeter wall which poses a danger among others to the school-going children.
8. The Members were informed that the entire project infrastructure were guaranteed maintenance by the Municipal Council.

Challenges

The challenges being faced under the implementation of Public Toilets component is mainly the lack of sufficient water. Sorghum

The Members were informed that water shortage was rife in Kayonza. It was further noted that it was not possible for boreholes to be dug for water supply because the water contained big volumes of iron. According to the Mayor, filtration could not be done to purify the water since the process would be very expensive and slow. It was further noted that the water supply had fallen from a 660 cubic meters per day to 300 cubic meters a day.

On the possibility of water being supplied from Lake Muhazi, the technical staff informed the Members that the Treatment Plant had not yet been constructed since they were still awaiting for the “no objection” clearance from the African Development Bank.

Recommendations

- a) The Committee Members encouraged the technical staff as well as the local authority to invest in water harvesting by using the roof gutters. It was noted that Kayonza District had sufficient rainfall and instead of the water flowing down to cause floods, it would be better if the same was harvested and used for the cleaning of toilets in the different centres and for other domestic use within the District.
- b) The Committee Members recommended that a wall be constructed round the perimeter wall of the drainage system to ensure that children are not exposed to any danger.
- c) The Committee Members recommended that the Technical Officers liaise with the African Development Bank (AfDB) Offices through the Lake Victoria Basin Commission to follow up on the delay and subsequently come up with a way forward.

Rt.Hon. Speaker, it was later reported that partly due to our visit the non-objection was finally given.

Findings in the United Republic of Tanzania

In the United Republic of Tanzania, the Program is implemented in the towns of Sengerema, Geita, Nansio and Sirari. However, the Committee was able to assess the status of implementation of the programme in two towns namely in Sengerema and

Geita towns. Like in other countries, they have implemented only two components in the short-term interventions though they informed the Committee that they are in process of submitting requests for no objection clearance to continue other components.

Observations, Challenges and Recommendations

Observations

(i) Short Term Intervention (STI) Implementation Status

The Short Term Interventions (STIs) involved procurement of goods, improvements of water supply infrastructures and sanitation facilities. The STIs activities were intended to improve water supply and sanitation situation, which will bring immediate impacts to the population while waiting for Long Term Interventions (LTIs) which involved feasibility studies and design works.

(ii) Procurement of Goods

The procurement of goods such as motor vehicles, tractors with tipping trailers, solid waste skip containers, motor cycles, sludge exhausters and sludge vaculugs are already completed and delivered to the project towns and are in use.

(iii) Water Supply and Sanitation Civil works

The current physical works progress for improvement of water supply systems and sanitation intervention up to February 2015 is 99 percent in all the project towns of Sengerema and Geita. It involves the followings:

- i) Construction of two blocks school toilets at Primary schools
- ii) Construction of Public toilet block at Market areas;
- iii) Rehabilitation of storm water drainage of four hundred (400m) with stone pitching including construction of four (4) culverts of six hundred (600mm) diameter
- iv) Laying water distribution network
- v) Construction of water kiosks;
- vi) Supply of different materials;

In Geita, it was observed that drilling of three new boreholes has been done, that flushing of existing six boreholes and pump testing have been completed since 21st July 2014. The contractor submitted final report and 89.85 percent has been paid and the remaining is retention money.

Long Term Interventions Implementation Status

Observations

(i) Sengerema Town

In Sengerema Town, implementation of the project is at 14% for all components (water supply, sanitation and water drainage system).

(ii) Geita Town:

The procurement of Contractor for Long Term Interventions activities are at Evaluation stage. The planned implementation period for this contract is twelve month (360 days) which is expected to start from April 2015.

Benefits from the Project

After completion and handing over of the ongoing Short Term Interventions Civil works, the following are benefits expected from the project:

Sengerema Town:

- i) 4,511 pupils will be using modern sanitation facilities at two primary and secondary schools;
- ii) 75% of solid wastes produced are now collected from 26% of the production before procurements of solid waste management facilities; and
- iii) 5.0 Km of distribution network is extended.

Geita Town:

- iv) 6,012 pupils will be using modern sanitation facilities at three primary schools; and
- v) 38 tonnes (65.5%) of daily solid waste produced are now collected from 12.15 tonnes (28% of the production) before procurements of solid waste management facilities; and
- vi) 2.5 Km of distribution water network has been extended.

Challenges

- The feasibility studies took longer to negotiate than was anticipated.
- The main challenge observed was hazardous garbage littering when garbage collectors are available.
- The second challenge was delays in disbursement of funds by AfDB.

Recommendation

There was need for sensitization of the users on the proper use of garbage collectors; There was need for the Members to plead for disbursement to allow finalization of the project before deadline.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The following were the general observations of the Committee:

1. More sensitization sessions on proper disposal of garbage into the garbage bins needs to be done particularly at current project stage as well sensitization of the citizens of EAC on the EAC integration process.
2. The project will change positively the livelihoods of people when it is well implemented. There is a need for Partner States to ensure the sustainability of the project
3. The “No-Objection” from African Development Bank needs to be fast-tracked with the help of Partner States and Lake Victoria Basin Commission to allow for the project implementation to the next level.

4. Water harvesting needs to be encouraged particularly for areas that are prone to long periods of drought and it is important to note that preservation of water is important.
5. On the sanitation component, by-laws need to be put in place by the different Municipal Councils so that the deterrence of littering in towns is addressed.
6. For sustainability purposes, there is need for governments and local councils to put in place measures to ensure funding of the established facilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends the following:

1. Partner States should avoid unnecessary bureaucracies in the implementation of the Project.
2. Partner States should enhance mass sensitization activities on the necessity of all the components of the project.
3. The Implementing Agencies should ensure that all EAC projects are branded as such.
4. Community Involvement and partnership should be promoted between all levels of Civil Society as well as between them and both private and public sectors, because involving the community as Partners and not just as casual observer ensures that the interventions are community responsive, community-owned and socially inclusive.
5. The House should urge Partner States to ensure that timely disbursement of remaining amounts is done to allow smooth implementation of the LVWATSAN project within required time.
6. The Agriculture, Tourism and Natural Resources Committee should assess the sustainability of phase I and check if the project meets stakeholders' expectations.
7. Governments of the EAC Partner States should learn from the project implementation for replication purposes. This will assist the EAC Partner States to practice self-sufficiency.
8. The Assembly urges the EAC Council of Ministers to declare and dedicate the year 2016 as the year of "access to safe water for EAC" and construction of toilets for all.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker Sir, Hon. Members, the Committee appreciates the visit as very enlightening and affirms that the project is relevant. The Committee also noted that Phase II of the LVWATSAN should be built on the best practices from Phase I.

The Committee also appreciates that physical infrastructural implementation of this project is anticipated by June 2015 and is of the view that if well implemented, the project will augment the relevance of integration and the EAC would be seen once again doing something good and tangible for East African citizens. The Committee is of the view that LVBC, as a Coordinator at the regional level should remain responsible and continually encourage the Implementing Agencies and monitor the implementing process keenly. In addition, the LVBC needs to anticipate and ably handle all the dynamics to avoid project failure and unnecessary embarrassment to the EAC.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Committee thanks the Rt. Hon. Speaker for availing time and means to the Committee to enable it discharge its mandate. It further appreciates the office of the Clerk for facilitating this activity.

The Committee thanks representatives of Local Administration of the Republic of Burundi, Republic of Rwanda and those of the United Republic of Tanzania for all the courtesies extended to Members of the Committee in their respective offices and jurisdictions. The Committee thanks them particularly for sharing information, concerns and the way forward for the Project.

The Committee appreciates all Focal Point Persons on the LVWATSAN Project II and officials from the implementing agencies for the warm welcome and cooperation given to the Committee at all levels and for coordinating the activities as well as briefing Committee Members on the progress made so far and for their involvement in the implementation of the project.

Finally, the Committee thanks all the people involved in the activity for its success.
Mr. Speaker Sir, I beg to move.

The Speaker: Thank you, Hon. Chair. Hon. Members, the motion on the floor is that the report of the Committee on Agriculture, Tourism and Natural Resources on the on Spot Assessment of the Lake Victoria Water Supply and Sanitation Programme II in the Republic of Burundi, Rwanda and the United Republic of Tanzania be adopted. Debate is open. We shall give three minutes each.

Ms Judith Pareno (Kenya): Thank you, Rt. Hon. Speaker. I rise to support this Committee report and in particular, I want to say and put it on record that this is one project that I was personally really happy with. Though it looked like the implementation was a bit slow, I thought that it was slow and sure when we visited most of the areas that are reported on.

Rt. Hon. Speaker, when we visited, I participated in Sengerema, Geita and parts of Kayonza. We found that the systems like the drainage and waste management system was well done with a few adjustments to be done. Of course, we recommended that the drainage system be done in such a way that we have some security rails around it because it looked a bit dangerous for the population and especially school going children. Otherwise the job was well done.

Looking at the workmanship of the toilet blocks that were all over the schools and the polytechnics and near a certain market, the models were so good. However, we were so saddened, R. Hon. Speaker when we asked the children, especially the ones who were using these toilets – they were in use when we visited some of these areas- we asked them whether they knew who was funding that project and they said, it was the World Bank. They did not even know anything to do with EAC.

We interacted with the children, and when we asked them whether they knew the EAC and the countries that make it up, they would say Kenya, Uganda and then somewhere you would see them hesitating to mention the next country as if they don't know the countries that form the EAC.

Therefore, we took time and interacted with the polytechnics, interacted with the children in school and they said this is very good. We were simply saddened that they did not know that this was an EAC project.

So, one of the recommendations that we have made, as an Assembly, is that we should label all the EAC projects. Whenever you complete your project, you should put the usual branding that this is an EAC/ Donor project, because this is a way to sensitise the people on the projects that we have undertaken.

Yes, they have benefitted from the projects; yes, the toilet is in use; yes, we have the garbage collectors but if they do not know that this is an EAC benefit, then we are also losing on sensitisation. So, we have recommended that for every project that we do out there, like such projects, we should put the usual tag showing that it is an EAC/ whatever donor project – (Interruption).

The Speaker: Yes, Hon. Mulengani on information.

Mr Mulengani: Thank you, Hon. Pareno for giving way and thank you, Mr Speaker. The information I would like to give to the Member is that if you could look at the way our Partner States operate, when there is a launch of any infrastructure that has been put in place, the politicians are invited to launch the infrastructure.

In the same vein, I would wish to inform you that it is also good if the Community can adopt the Partner States good working methods and maybe continue to invite the Chair, Council of Ministers to inaugurate some of these infrastructures. That is the information I wanted to give you my colleague, Hon. Pareno.

The Speaker: Thank you, Hon. Bernard.

Ms Pareno: Yes, I think that is very relevant information, especially for politicians. Because when you are launching these projects, you should be able to be present and show that we are really politicians for the East African region. So, it would be an addition to actually telling people that this is EAC, we are actually here and this is our project. I think that will be another sensitisation tool that we can use as an Assembly.

Now, the other thing, Rt. Hon. Speaker that we noted is that we visited these institutions - (Interruption)

Dr. Nderakindo: Information.

The Speaker: I can see Hon. Kessy is up.

Dr. Nderakindo: Thank you, Rt. Hon. Speaker and thank you, Hon. Pareno for giving way. I would like to let you know that maybe the problem of branding the product, in particular the toilets is that in many of the international agencies, the report is saying that “We, politicians don’t find it attractive to launch that kind of toilet.” However, Ministers of Health and even Education, if you call the Minister of Education to launch that project – toilets for the school – they would not come.

They would like to launch projects like hospitals, which hospitals are the product of not having toilets. (Laughter) They would rather launch the hospital. Okay, they would launch a water project but not toilets.

So, we as politicians, as you were saying that we are being blamed for not prioritising this issue of toilets; rather we are waiting for the international agencies to advertise them for us. So, the blame is on us that we have to make it look a little bit sexy. Thank you. (*Applause*)

The Speaker: Yes, Hon. Pareno just before you take the floor, this is a serious matter and it is the third time it is coming on this floor. That is the question of branding.

We have a fully-fledged department of Public Relations and something with a lot of funding at the Secretariat. I think it should be taken as a policy matter that this department should brand and find ways of working with all projects to make sure all EAC projects are branded. This should not only be during the project implementation but for the lifetime of the project.

Hon. Pareno, you must remember that you have only three minutes and they are eating into your time.

Ms Tiperu: Mr Speaker, I would like to thank Hon. Pareno for giving me the permission to make a point or two. The other issue you may notice is that all these projects are in our respective countries. However, there is a tradition with the Community of never involving the Members of Parliament. (*Applause*) None of us has even just being given information that there is a project being launched in Kyotera, please come.

We have the capacity to fuel our own vehicles, come, associate with the project, and thereafter talk about the project. So, we hope that tradition changes. *Asanteni sana*.

Ms Pareno: Thank you for that very useful information. I was just going to add, Rt Hon. Speaker that as we were moving round, we actually resolved as a Committee that as we shall be moving round as Committees, in future, can we be given these promotional materials? Like when we went to these schools, we wanted to give out a flag and a copy of the anthem to each school – in fact, we went around with Hon. Shy-Rose, she is not here but she was guiding us and we kept singing the anthem to these children and they were so excited.

So, we were thinking that as a way to make use of these visits, could we also have these promotional materials – the flag and the anthem so that we are also able to sensitise the East Africans as we move around. We know the Ministries of EAC are doing it but it is not enough; it is not being felt and we in this Committee said that as we move round, we now want to be given a package of these promotional materials, especially the flag and the anthem for us to be able to distribute them as we move. We are ready to sing with the student.

Now, that means that this touches on the Budget. Are we budgeting for enough promotional materials to be able to show that we are East Africans out there?

We want that department that you have talked about, Rt. Hon. Speaker, to take into account that as Committees go round, we can also be making a difference in terms of not just visiting but also leaving these promotional materials behind.

Other things that we noted, Rt. Hon. Speaker are on how the projects are going to be sustained. We were very disappointed when we went to either Geita or Kyengereba and we found the bins overflowing with all sorts of litter. The bin is not full but somebody is just recklessly throwing litter all over. The trucks were there but nobody had even come early to collect the garbage for purposes of people having more room to refill.

We wondered how the local authority managing these bins could help us. They should make bylaws to manage and sustain this programme because it is not for the EAC to do such a

programme and then go back and micromanage. Therefore, we recommended that we should have bylaws that will sustain the programme because the bins are good; they are in use but of course being misused. And we feel that the Partner States should help us sustain this programme.

Then there is the issue of the classrooms. We went to a school with 2000 pupils with only 40 classrooms in a row and none of these classrooms had a gutter for harvesting water. When we looked at the roof and how much water would have been harvested for purposes of domestic use – and they said, “In fact this toilet is so good but we don’t have water.” Then I asked them, how could you say you do not have water when it rains every single day with such a catchment area of this roof? They would have been able to clean the toilets for a whole year.

That is one of the other things that we have recommended. We have been told there is already a policy even in that country that you must have gutters to harvest rainwater. But what have they done? They have not yet done that and yet our project is there. It is good but clean. They were saying they don’t have enough water and yet the catchment area would have been able to supply that water.

So, we have recommended that at least these Partner States can help us by putting in place those policies like doing water catchment from roofs so that they can be able to sustain this programme because they are lacking in terms of water supply.

Finally, on the issue of no objection, we found out that the low absorption of the funds that the Hon. Martin Ngoga was talking about, which was in the other report was not because they are not able but because of a lot of technicalities in terms of the paper work, documentation and there was something they kept saying that the low absorption is what is delaying us.

I am happy to say that with the intervention of this Committee, immediately after we left Rwanda, the no objection was obtained and I am reliably told that they are on course. Therefore, it was not as if they were not able to absorb the money. *(Applause)* It is that they had so much technicalities and paper work for the money to be released but the money was there.

So, this one project was very good. They reflected well of our project; slow but sure. Thank you very much, Rt. Hon. Speaker. *(Applause)*

Mr Martin Ngoga (Rwanda): Thank you very much, Rt. Hon. Speaker. I want to support the report and commend the Committee for the observations and good recommendations.

I particularly want to address myself to general observation No. 5 where the Committee is saying, “*Governments of the EAC Partner States should learn from the project implementation for replication purposes. This will assist the EAC Partner States to practice self-sufficiency.*” I think we must emphasise this point because these projects, looking at the purposes they intend to achieve, the area that we intend to cover and the number of people that we want to benefit from them, they would serve no more purpose than just being a wakeup call for Partner States to implement similar projects using other sources including the ones they can raise locally.

I believe - I was not part of this thing but – these public toilets that the Committee was able to in Nyanza, the local council there has the ability to mobilise resources and have them in all the villages. They would not have to wait for the African Development Bank to come and build eight more toilets. *(Applause)* It would not make sense.

Every district council across East Africa has the capacity to mobilise the population to do water utilisation. They have the capacity to mobilise the population to harvest rainwater. Yes, we have tried to implement that and we still have many challenges but at least do we identify it as one of the solutions that we can start implementing? So, we must emphasise the point on how these projects should enlighten out authorities to implement them and not having to wait for big funding.

This is the proper definition, in my opinion, of sustainability. Because sustainability is not just waiting to do repairs of these toilets after two or three years. I think the proper definition of sustainability is how we can spread it to cover more people and a bigger area using the means that we can raise locally. Because these are interventions that the population would quickly realise the benefits from, are mobilised, and participate in their implementation. Thank you very much, Rt. Hon. Speaker. (*Applause*)

Dr. James Ndahiro (Rwanda): Thank you very much, Rt. Hon. Speaker. I want also to support the report by the Committee. I want to move an amendment; it is a friendly amendment. I want to urge and ask the Council of Ministers to consider and dedicate the year 2016 to be the year for safe and clean water for all East Africans. (*Applause*) Rt. Hon. Speaker, I will send the written amendment. Thank you.

The Speaker: You will just send it to the Chair.

Mr Issa Twaha Taslima (Tanzania): Thank you, Rt. Hon. Speaker. I would just like to point out one observation, which is under the general observations at page 20. That is No. 6, which says, “*On the sanitation component, bylaws need to be put in place by the different municipal councils.*” Now, I am thinking about the line of command from the East African Legislative Assembly to the municipal council but at the same time, I am also thinking about the municipal councils, for example, in Tanzania the way I know a person in Tanzania is going to perceive what a municipal council means.

He will take the municipal to mean that municipality, which is bigger than these towns like Geita and Sengerema. So, a person at Sengerema will think that they are not being told to do this because they are not a municipality.

Secondly, in order for the municipal council to have these bylaws, in most cases, yes, they can have their bylaws and I think they are in place right now. Why don't we come up with a law here, which can be East African and then it is spread all over so that it can be used uniformly? That is my suggestion.

Mr Celestine Rwigema (Rwanda): Thank you, Rt. Hon. Speaker. I support the report but I need more clarification from the Chair of the Committee at page 4 where he stated that the coverage for water supply and sanitation in this town would be at 85 percent for water supply and 80 percent for sanitation. So, I need to know what exactly the magnitude of this project will be. What length are they going to cover? Are they going to cover what was existing because I am thinking that in this town there is a certain level of coverage?

This also reminds of what Hon. Martin Ngoga was saying about something, which can be done locally if it is at the district at a rate of 75 percent. So if the project is bringing 5 percent, it is good but I wonder whether it is really needed. So, if we can get exactly what the coverage is and compare it to what was existing. Thank you.

Dr. Perpetua Kessy Nderakindo (Tanzania): Thank you, Rt. Hon. Speaker. I hope my colleagues will not find that I am talking about sanitation so much. But this came up after we had a short workshop with Hon. Abubakar Zein about the MDGs and the SDG and knowing that this is the last year for MDGs and in September, the world will be sitting to endorse the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG).

So, in reading the report about the MDGs in reaching the targets, in general the MDGs were actually, though theoretically meant for every country, but practically meant for the developing countries to implement and achieve the targets.

So, in looking at the developing countries and the regions, we find that one of the sad stories is that the sub-Saharan Africa, which we are a sub group of, is the one, which is lagging behind in sanitation. And even worse, is that, the progress in sanitation in sub-Saharan Africa is going down.

How is it possible and while we see that the LVBC Programme in water and sanitation has some progress. This is due to the fast population growth. So, it overrides the improvements that we are doing in the sub-Saharan Africa.

So, what should we do? I remember very well Mwalimu Nyerere saying, “While the world is walking, we should be running.” Now, the East Asian, especially South East Asian is running. We sub-Saharan Africa should be sprinting.

Why? It is said, from the same report that 2.5 billion people in the world out of the 7.5 billion - more than three out of 10 do not have proper sanitation. And of that 1.1 out of the 7 billion practice or Open Defecation (OD). The big part of it is in South East Asia, which I congratulate the Minister of India for personally making a big effort of building toilets.

The second region lagging behind in the big number of people who practice OD is sub-Saharan Africa. Therefore, to add it to this is for that reason of the members of the United Nations finding that Sub-Saharan Africa is lagging behind, they had to dedicate the year 2008 to sanitation for all. Also, the United Nations has designated November 19th to be the world toilet day. So, in the recommendations, I would suggest that we also say that the East African Partner States have to observe November 19th as a toilet day and, therefore, we should do something because we have a big problem in sanitation.

I give hand to my colleagues, Dr Ndahiro about setting a year, which will be probably not sanitation for all because that has already been done by the United Nations but we could do something maybe toilets for all in east Africa. That is just to add for the recommendations. Thank you. *(Applause)*

The Speaker: Thank you. Hon. Nancy, three minutes and then I invite the Chairperson to comment.

Ms Nancy Abisai (Kenya): Thank you, Rt. Hon. Speaker. I will in fact take shorter than that.

Rt. Hon. Speaker, I just wanted to bring to the attention of Members because I have actually wanted to raise it as a clarification when the Chair was presenting the report but I missed that opportunity.

Now, what I wanted to find out is that we have two reports; the annual report that talked about the low absorption capacity that says the Committee noted that LVWATSAN Programme has

extremely a low budget absorption. You can read on and then this report on page 21 on recommendations.

Dr Nderakindo: The LVWATSAN is only on the part of Kenya. The other countries are doing well. Thank you.

Ms Abisai: Thank you for that information but I think what I wanted to raise is this, there is a recommendation in terms of the House urging Partner States to ensure timely disbursement of remaining amounts is done to allow smooth implementation of LVWATSAN Project within the required time.

Now, if you look at the recommendations from the two, it is the same project. So, I think there is need for some synergy and harmonisation. I just wanted clarification from the Chair of the Committee, maybe in his response, so that some of us can understand who didn't have the opportunity to visit some of those projects because it could fall under the ambit of the two different Committees. But in my understanding, it is the same project and the recommendations from the two Committees are very different in terms of the implementation process. I just thought that I would ask for that but I support this report. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you so much. Chairperson, can you respond and take into consideration the amendments as given by the Hon. Dr Ndahiro. I hope you will be given a copy.

The Chairperson of the Committee on Agriculture, Tourism and Natural Resources (Mr Jeremie Ngendakumana): Thank you, Rt. Hon. Speaker. To give clarification, I have rightly highlighted that this project has two implementation phases. The first one being short term interventions while the second one being long-term interventions.

When it comes to short-term interventions in all Partner States but Burundi, the achievements are high. It means the implementation has been done in a satisfactory manner.

However, when it comes to the long-term interventions, I have highlighted water supply networks and other infrastructure, which are either on water supply or sanitation or drainage system. These are not yet done and it is critical because the project is coming towards its end. It is said in all Partner States that it will end in 2016.

So, we fear that the time remaining is quite short but we were told was that the prerequisite was done. They were waiting for non-objection because this hard work actually takes a bigger share of the funding. If this money is disbursed and implementation is done correctly, then it will be okay.

However, for the time being I do not see any contradictions because it is also clear that if you take both projects, the disbursement rate is still around 20 percent. It is not too high. Now one part is finished and it is only the other one that is remaining.

Rt. Hon. Speaker, I accept the amendment of Dr Ndahiro having in mind that this has to be combined with the amendment of Hon. Kessy. So, we shall see how to fine-tune it so that it is clear. *(Applause)*

The other observation came from Hon. Twaha Taslima when in it comes to bylaws. Our recommendations go to Partner States and we wish that Partner States ensure that these bylaws are there using internal mechanisms of enacting bylaws from the national to local levels. It is actually up to Partner States to ensure that these bylaws are in place.

I find it a bit difficult to sit at the level of the Community to put in place bylaws. We should think about laws that highlight somewhere that this has to be put in place. But I think that it will be a bit difficult to do it at this level.

Rt. Hon. Speaker, I have followed attentively all interventions on this report and I thank all Members who have had the floor because we have all supported the report.

Honourable Kabahizi requested to do something about the coverage. This 80 and 85 percent that you see in general and in each town was before the project was financed. They have done a kind of planning and the budget for all the Partner States is different according to the project coverage submitted. In general, it is said when the project is fully implemented in each town, the target is to be at around this figure of 85 and 80 percent.

We think that it is possible because in all cities that we have been, we did not have complaints from the local communities, especially the local administration. What you have seen is if they are, involvement is fully there, actually, the project as highlighted by Hon. Pareno is good and touches the needs of our citizens. The most important request is to follow it up and ensure that it is implemented as planned.

Rt. Hon. Speaker, let me thank Hon. Pareno for her contribution and the following Members also; Hon. Martin Ngoga, Hon. Ndahiro, Hon. Twaha, Hon. Kabahizi, Hon. Kessy and Hon. Nancy. *(Applause)*

Rt. Hon. Speaker and Hon. Members, I beg to move that the report be adopted. Thank you. *(Applause)*

The Speaker: Thank you so much, Hon. Ngendakumana. Members, the motion on the floor is that the report of the Committee on Agriculture, Tourism and Natural Resources on the on spot Assessment of the Lake Victoria Water Supply and Sanitation Programme II, be adopted.

(Question put and agreed to.)

The Speaker: Hon. Members, we have other matters on the Order paper but I think we have done a good job. We have dealt with two reports. I would like to take this time to adjourn the House to tomorrow, 2.30p.m. The House stands adjourned.

(The House rose at 5:59 p.m. and adjourned until Thursday, 14 May 2015 at 2.30p.m.)