ELITES NETWORK FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT



(ENCISUD) CAC/IT/NO 109900

(Motto: Unity for Progress)

Website: www.enetsud.org
Email: info@enetsud.org
Phone: +2348067509458

Date: 1st March, 2021

Our Ref: ENetSuD/KWSG/01/33

His Excellency, Alhaji AbdulRahman AbdulRazaq, The Executive Governor of Kwara State, Government House, Ilorin.

Through:

SSA to the Governor on Monitoring and Evaluation, Room 27/28, Ministry of Finance and Planning, GRA, Ilorin.

Dear Sir,

SOCIAL AUDIT REPORT ON GERI ALIMI UNDERPASS PROJECT, ILORIN

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PREAMBLE

Your Excellency may wish to recall that, following your kind approval, we were provided with the Bill of Engineering Measurement and Evaluation (BEME) and other documents for the Social Audit of six (6) projects during our first phase exercise. Reports on four (4) of the projects, including College of High Education Road Ilorin (ENetSuD/KWSG/01/26), Government School Ilorin (ENetSuD/KWSG/01/27), Ilesha Baruba - Gwanara Road (ENetSuD/KWSG/01/29), and Patigi Secondary School, Patigi (ENetSuD/KWSG/01/30) had been submitted to your office for your information and further necessary actions. We have also audited Cargo Terminal and noticed that the documents provided to us might not have been the actual ones used to execute the project. Our observations on the Cargo Terminal have been communicated to your focal person. We are pleased to submit the report of the last project in the first phase (Geri Alimi Underpass) for your information and necessary actions.

FINDINGS

1. Our BEME re-examination showed that the contract sum (\text{\mathbb{N}}3,639,444,659:93) was correctly

calculated. Thus, the contract sum is not questioned in terms of calculation.

2. Considering the nature of the project, many structures are buried underground and could have been measured accurately only during the execution stage. Our assessment has a lot of limitations because it was impossible for us to measure what we did not see. Thus, we were neither able to access nor

assess many components of the project.

3. A few components were assessable, and we were able to calculate a questionable shortage of about One Hundred and Seven Million, Eight Hundred and Three Thousand, One Hundred and Fifty-five Naira (\text{\text{N107,803,155}}) (subject to our final coring test) from those few components only.

4. We speculated that there might be a lot of other shortages that we were unable to determine, but we limited our quantification to what could be objectively measured without ambiguity. We did this in good faith to avoid any form of misinterpretation of facts.

5. A lot of provisional items in Bill 1 are questionable and should be defended by the Ministry.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. There is a need for a re-cast of the damaged stamped concrete at the walkways along sawmill and Dangote routes

TYFOR PRO

2. The wearing course of the road needs to be well bonded or repaired

3. The retaining wall finishes have peeled off and should be repaired

PRAYER

Your Excellency is kindly requested to consider and approve:

A. The return of the contractor to the site to work on the project shortages as per the approved specifications in the BEME.

B. The contractor should justify shortages worth at least \mathbb{N}107,803,155 as detailed in the full report.

C. A 1-day release of coring machine by the Ministry of Works to ENetSuD for coring test of the road to ascertain the thickness of all the specified layers as per the approval in the BEME.

ALAGBONSI Abdullateef, Ph.D.

Coordinator

FULL REPORT

Bill 1 (General and Provisional items)

- I. The existence of the site office (cost: №2,500,000) during the project execution could not be ascertained
- II. The present status of the project vehicle (cost: №19,025,750) procured for the consultants during the execution of the project is not known. We strongly believe that the vehicle should have been returned to and become the property of KWSG
- III. A provisional sum of ₹17,000,000 was billed for the provision and erection of road signs. The specific number of these signs need to be clearly stated to know if it is reasonably equivalent to the sum. However, we found only 4 road signs. How this costs ₹17,000,000 need to be questioned critically.
- IV. A provisional sum of №15,000,000 was billed for the provision of road marking. However, we found road markings of 132 meters only at the underpass. How this costs №15,000,000 need to be questioned critically.
- V. A provisional sum of №50,000,000 was billed for compensation and acquisition. We were not able to determine if this sum was truly used for compensation or not, and to what extent it was used.
- VI. A provisional sum of №102,298,426 was billed for the removal and relocation of existing service installations for electricity, telephone, water supply and other utilities along the alignment. We confirmed that the water main was diverted and existing pipes were relocated. We also confirmed that the existing electrical installation was diverted along Sawmill to Olorunsogo. However, is was impossible for us to ascertain if the quantum of the removal and relocation works done was as much as the billed amount (№102,298,426)
- VII. A provisional sum of ₹1,500,000 was billed for the provision of personal computers, printers, video camera, software, and accessories as may be required by the Engineers' representatives. While the exact quantity of items provided was not stated and not also sighted, it is important to verify if all the procured items were returned to the KWSG as we believe that they should remain the property of the State
- VIII. A provisional sum of ₹7,500,000 was billed for the site confirmatory investigation and deep boreholes before and during construction works. There is a need to determine the actual borehole points to ascertain their existence. However, our findings suggested that a borehole was drilled

- and sited along sawmill route and was channeled back to the central post, leaving it inaccessible to the populace
- IX. A provisional sum of №10,000,000 was billed for the erection of the police post. We found a fabricated framework provided by the contractor as the police post. However, the billed amount (№10,000,000) needs to be questioned.
- X. A provisional sum of №80,000,000 was billed for the electrification of the project. Truly, electrification was done, but a detailed Bill of Quantity to breakdown the sum is required to enable proper re-assessment of the electrification works and determine if the works done are equivalent to the sum. However, we found some streetlights and CCTV on the site.
- XI. A provisional sum of №10,000,000 was billed for the provision of water supply and sprinter services. We found 6 nos but we don't know the exact number that ought to be provided based on the billed sum.

Bill 2 (Clearing and earthworks)

- I. This bill consists of the following items:
 - a. Scarification of existing pavement carriageway and shoulders, shaping and compaction to receive additional fill material (\frac{\text{\text{N12,351,600}}}{12,351,600})
 - b. Excavation and hauling of materials (except rock) to other locations (\$\frac{1}{8}98,409,600)
 - c. Excavation of materials in rock formation and side drains and hauling to other locations (₹38,438,097)
 - d. Excavation from approved borrow pits, hauling, deposition and compaction on carriageway and shoulders (№26,326,646)
 - e. Excavation of unsuitable material below formation in cuttings and side drains except rock and hauling to spoil (№20,214,096)
 - f. Dubbing in grass to shoulders and slopes of embankment (₹225,774)
 - g. Excavation from approved borrow pits, hauling, deposition and compaction as backfilling for culverts and washed embankments (N28,903,770)
 - h. Excavation of unsuitable materials below subbase level and replacement with hardcore and blinding with sharp sand or equal filter material (N8,250,000)
- II. All the earthworks listed in items Ia Ih under this Bill were not assessable by us as the project had been completed. However, available pictures suggested that they were done. Since we were not able to quantify these items, we cannot conclude whether the sum of ₹233,119,585 used for the items in Bill 2 was appropriately spent or not.

Bill 3 (Culverts and Lined Drains)

- I. A sum of №825,190 was billed for the demolition and removal of 89.89m failed pipe culverts including wing walls, aprons, and headwalls. Since we did not witness the quantity of what was demolished and removed, we were unable to assess and quantify this item.
- II. A sum of ₹5,218,560 was billed for the demolition and removal of 1,920m existing failed lined drain. Since we did not witness the quantity of what was demolished and removed, we were also unable to assess and quantify this item.
- III. A sum of №29,190,699 was billed for the excavation of 6,875.32 m³ of non-rock and rock materials for storm pipe as a lined drain, backfilling, compaction and disposal of surplus materials. We were also unable to assess and quantify this item.
- IV. A sum of ₹12,052,972 was billed for the provision of 373m of 750mm x 600mm x 125mm concrete grade 25 in lined drains including reinforcement and shuttering. We were also unable to assess and quantify this item, but we had an impression that it was executed as seen in the pictures.
- V. A sum of №84,955,392 was billed for the provision of 1,928m of 600mm balloon drains as storm pipe including sand bedding, hunching and surround, and shuttering. We were also unable to assess and quantify this item, but we had an impression that it was executed as seen in the pictures.
- VI. A sum of №40,281,411 was billed for the provision of 629m of 900mm balloon drains in the median. We were also unable to assess and quantify this item, but we had an impression that it was executed as seen in the pictures.
- VII. A sum of №10,196,121 was billed for the provision of 58 nos reinforced concrete manhole along the profile of the diameter 600 mm storm pipes. However, we found 61 nos of these manholes.

 This is equivalent to an excess of №527,385.6.
- VIII. A sum of №4,894,848 was billed for the provision of 14 nos reinforced concrete manhole along the profile of the diameter 900 mm storm pipes. We found 23 nos of this. There is an excess of №2,097,792.
 - IX. A sum of ₹7,111,035 was billed for the provision and placement of 950 m² of 150mm thick concrete pitching at concrete inlets and outlets. We could not assess this.
 - X. A sum of N8,541,450 was billed for the provision and laying of 7,839 meters of concrete kerbs (Types I and II) grade 25 along median along media, edges and high embankment. We measured 7,173 meters without being able to differentiate the types. Using the rate of Type 1, this is equivalent to a shortage of N4,918,478.
 - XI. A sum of ₹35,424,113 was billed for the provision and laying 4,815.58 m² of precast interlocking paving stone walkway with keying edges concrete. However, we found 4,793.05 m² of stamp

- concrete in the site instead of 4,815.58 m² provided in the BEME. This is equivalent to a shortage of \$\frac{1}{2}165,734\$.
- XII. A provisional sum of №63,793,548 was billed for the provision of sub-drain. The quantity of the sub-drain that warranted this huge amount was not stated in the BEME. We were unable to assess it.
- XIII. A sum of №2,415,000 was billed for the provision and laying of 46 meters' concrete barricade between the two bridges including 50mm diameter galvanized pipe. However, we found a barricade of 40 meters instead of 46 meters provided in the BEME. This is equivalent to a shortage of №315,000.

Bill 4 (Pavement and Surfacing)

- I. A sum of №3,331,233 was billed for the shaping and compaction of 30,092 m² formation in cuttings. However, we estimated about 25,344.4 m² on site based on the assumption that the thickness was achieved. This is equivalent to a shortage of №525,559.
- II. A sum of №12,458,270 was billed to provide, place, shape and compact 30,092 m² of approved naturally occurring laterite material to 150mm thickness as sub-base to carriage/shoulder. However, we estimated about 25,344.4 m² on site based on the assumption that the thickness was achieved. This is equivalent to a shortage of №1,965,689.
- III. A sum of №15,599,921 was billed to provide, place, shape and compact 30,092 m² of approved naturally occurring laterite material to 150mm thickness as base to carriage/shoulder. However, we estimated about 25,344.4 m² on site based on the assumption that the thickness was achieved. This is equivalent to a shortage of №2,461,155.8.
- IV. A sum of №47,508,000 was billed to provide, spread, shape and compact 4,400 m³ of approved granite crushed rock stone base to a compacted thickness of 150mm. We estimated about 3,801.7 m³ based on the assumption that the thickness was achieved. This is equivalent to a shortage of №6,829,810.
- V. A sum of №1,408,548 was billed to provide, spread, shape and compact 131.64 m³ of approved granite crushed rock stone base to a compacted thickness of 30mm as extra to make up 180 mm on shoulders. There is no shoulder, especially on the new road. This is equivalent to a shortage of №1,408,548.
- VI. A sum of ₹12,595,118 was billed to provide and lay 29,586.84 m² of prime coat including blinding with sand or quarry fine. However, we found 25,344.4 m² on site. **This is equivalent** to a shortage of ₹1,806,007.

- VII. A sum of ₹165,682,373 was billed to provide, lay and compact 25,198.84 m² of asphaltic concrete binder course to a compacted thickness of 60 mm. We Speculated that there is no binder coarse on the road when checked from the failed parts (this is subject to a further confirmation by coring test).
- VIII. A sum of №11,130,599 was billed to provide and apply 29,586.92 m² of bituminous tack coat. However, we found 25,344.4 m² on site. This is equivalent to a shortage of №1,596,036.
- IX. A sum of №15,520,639 was billed to provide, lay and compact 4,388.08 m² of asphaltic binder course of 30 mm thickness to shoulders. There is no shoulder on the road, let alone of the binder coarse. This is equivalent to a shortage of №15,520,639.
- X. A sum of №133,141,140 was billed to provide, lay and compact 29,586.92 m² of asphaltic concrete wearing course to a compacted thickness of 40 mm to carriageway and shoulders. However, we found 25,344.4 m² on site. This is equivalent to a shortage of №19,091,340.

Bill 5 (Bridge Works)

- I. A lump sum of N4,000,000 was billed to demolish and cart away existing road superstructures, substructures, returnwalls, retaining walls, etc. We could not assess this.
- II. A lump sum of №3,750,000 was billed for diversion of water, cofferdam and other works to keep off flooding from the works. We could not assess this.
- III. A sum of №14,784,241 was billed to excavate 4,643 m³ of materials (except rock) for all foundation, works, dewatering, shoring and backfilling. demolish and cart away existing road superstructures, substructures, return walls, retaining walls, etc. we could not assess this. We could not assess this.
- IV. A lump sum of №15,360,000 was billed for bringing pilling plant crane and other equipment to site, and for all works necessary for erecting, dismantling, removal and making good all the relevant works on site. We could not assess this.
- V. A provisional sum of №3,672,000 was billed for the confirmatory deep soil investigation at the bridge site prior to construction works. We could not assess this.
- VI. A provisional sum of №6,120,000 was billed for design as per revised deep soil investigation. We could not assess this.
- VII. A sum of №601,600,000 was billed to provide and drive 2,560 meters of 750 mm diameter precast concrete friction piles through soils to any depth not exceeding 40 meters. We could not assess this because part of it has already been driven into the ground.

- VIII. A sum of №16,702,302 was billed to provide and drive 30 meters of 750 mm diameter precast concrete friction piles through rocks to any depth not exceeding 40 meters. We could not assess this because part of it has already been driven into the ground.
- IX. A sum of №6,200,000 was billed to allow for load tests on 750 mm diameter piles to 1.5 of the design load. We could not assess this.
- X. A sum of \mathbb{N} 5,130,000 was billed to allow for integrity test on piles. We could not assess this.
- XI. A sum of №21,847,697 was billed to provide, mix and place 5,580.51 m² of mass concrete blinding grade 10 to bottom of pilecaps and foundations to piers, abutments and retaining walls. We could not assess this.
- XII. A sum of №287,091,050 was billed to provide, mix and place 4,323.12 m³ of grade 30 concrete in retaining walls, pilecaps and foundations, including bituminous coating for contact with water or soil. We were only able to measure 236 m³ that is visible, while other portions of the wall base, pile cap, and foundation were not measured because they were buried in the ground.
- XIII. A sum of №357,670,237 was billed to provide, cut and fix 947.96 metric ton of high tensile reinforcement in pilecaps, foundations, and retaining walls. Since the full measurement of the structures was impossible, we were not able to ascertain the quantity of reinforcement used for them.
- XIV. A sum of №241,233,462 was billed to provide, mix and place 3,632.58 m³ of grade 30 concrete in abutments, retaining walls, piers and capping beams, including bituminous coating for contact with water or soil. We were not able to measure this.
- XV. A sum of №17,486,476 was billed to provide, place, and fix 6,184.43 m² of wrought shuttering to exposed surfaces of abutments, piers, wing walls, and retaining walls. We were not able to measure this.
- XVI. A sum of ₹28,146,805 was billed to provide and fix 8,386.76 m² of wrought shuttering to unexposed surfaces of abutments, etc. We were not able to measure this.
- XVII. A sum of №30,158,005 was billed to provide, cut and fix 79.93 metric ton of high tensile reinforcement in abutments, piers, and capping beams. Since the full measurement of the structures was impossible, we were not able to ascertain the quantity of reinforcement used for them.
- XVIII. A sum of №162,302 was billed to provide and fix 75 mm diameter PVC pipe as weep hole in abutments and wing walls. We confirmed that the pipe was used as weep hole.
- XIX. A sum of №38,218,320 was billed to provide 5,600 m² of filter layers behind abutments, wing walls, and retaining walls. We could not assess it.

- XX. A sum of №277,603 was billed to provide and place 3.5 m³ of specially designed concrete (grade 35) bearing plinths on abutments and piers including shuttering and floating to smooth level.
- XXI. A lump sum of №34,720,000 was billed to provide and apply approved finished materials on the exposed surface of retaining wall and abutments.
- XXII. A sum of №2,538,480 was billed to provide, mix and place 32.17 m³ of grade 30 concrete as protection to piers, including reinforcement and shuttering.
- XXIII. A sum of №12,970,100 was billed to provide and place 143 m³ of grade 40 precast reinforced concrete main beams, including buried dowels for cross beams, cuts for joints and all works as required. We could not assess this.
- XXIV. A sum of №3,050,024 was billed to provide 908.8 m² of wrought shuttering to precast rectangular beams. We could not assess this.
- XXV. A sum of №26,600,017 was billed to provide and fix 70.5 metric ton of high tensile reinforcement to precast rectangular beams and diaphragm beams of the superstructure. We could not assess this.
- XXVI. A sum of N6,302,000 was billed to provide and place 460 m² of 75 m thick reinforced grade 30 N/mm2 concrete precast planks as permanent shuttering to deck including steel reinforcement. We could not assess this.
- XXVII. A sum of №11,682,548 was billed to provide and place 175.92 m³ of grade 30 concrete in deck slab of superstructure and diaphragm beams. We could not assess this.
- XXVIII. A sum of №3,864,963 was billed to provide and place 58.20 m³ of 75 m thick reinforced grade 30 N/mm2 concrete precast planks for transition slab including steel reinforcement. We could not assess this.
- XXIX. A sum of №29,867,480 was billed to provide and fix 79.16 metric ton of high tensile reinforcement to deck slabs and transition slabs. We could not assess this.
- XXX. A sum of ₹2,970,149 was billed to provide 885 m² of sawn shuttering to diaphragm beams, deck slabs and transition slabs. We could not assess this.
- XXXI. A lump sum of ₹18,500,000 was billed for launching of RC concrete beams. We could not assess this.
- XXXII. A sum of №1,286,669 was billed to provide and place 48 meters of grade 30 concrete in precast inner kerbs including reinforcement and shuttering. We could not assess this.
- XXXIII. A sum of №8,248,781 was billed to provide and place 144 meters of concrete parapets, including reinforcement and shuttering. We could not assess this.

- XXXIV. A sum of ₹2,882,520 was billed to provide 50 m² of concrete walkways to include service ducts, inspection chambers, and bases for poles of street lights. We did not assess this.
- XXXV. A sum of ₹9,165,312 was billed to provide and install 48 nos FSC elastrometric bearing rubber blocks reinforcement with steel plates type 371044. We did not assess this.
- XXXVI. A sum of №3,055,104 was billed to provide and install 16 nos free elastomer bearings of approved design and type on top of carriageway. We did not assess this.
- XXXVII. A sum of №16,803,566 was billed to provide and build 67.8 meters of WBSO expansion joint of extended elastomer profile or other approved design in specific areas of the carriagewall. We found 57 meters of the extension joint. This is equivalent to a shortage of №2,676,674.
- XXXVIII. A sum of ₹238,680 was billed to provide and fix 5 meters of PVC drainage pipes in bridge deck. We did not assess this.
- XXXIX. A sum of №91,584 was billed to make 96 meters of water drip throat at the soffit of the deck for discharge. We did not assess this.
- XL. A sum of №17,626 was billed to provide and make 12 nos curb opening in the kerbs for drainage of the deck 5 meters of PVC drainage pipes in bridge deck. We did not assess this.
- XLI. A sum of №32,423,026 was billed to provide and erect 1,666 meters of standard aluminum handrailing of extruded rectangular section. We found 1,168 meters. This is equivalent to a shortage of №9,691,877.
- XLII. A sum of №3,058,776 was billed to apply 1,666 meters of double coat bituminous paint to abutment and railing walls. We did not assess this.
- XLIII. A sum of №4,274,345 was billed to provide and lay 75.4 meters of steel pipe barricade at the roundabout island. We found 85 meters. This is equivalent to an excess of №544,214.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS

- I. A lump sum of N5,642,456 was billed for the repair of failed road. The breakdown of this was not stated. We did not assess it.
- II. A lump sum of №11,585,324 was billed for the construction of service road. The breakdown was not stated, and the work done on such service road is not known. We did not assess it.

ALAGBONSI Abdullateef, Ph.D.

Coordinator