

KAJIADO COUNTY ANNUAL CAPACITY & PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT (ACPA) REPORT

From

31st July to 4th August 2017

Presented by Lead Consultant

Matengo Githae & Associates
Certified Public Accountants (K)
Head office: 2nd floor, Chaka place,
Chaka Rd. off Argwins Kodhek Rd
Tel: +254 020 2699944

Email: customercare@matengogithae.com
Website: www.matengogithae.com



Table of Contents

ACRONYMS.....	1
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
1.0 METHODOLOGY, ASSESSMENT TEAM AND ACTIVITIES.....	7
1.1 Methodology.....	7
1.2 Time Plan	8
2.0 SUMMARY OF RESULTS.....	9
2.1 Minimum Access Conditions (MAC)	9
2.2 Minimum Performance Conditions.....	11
2.3 Performance Conditions.....	22
3.0 SUMMARY OF CAPACITY BUILDING REQUIREMENTS	74
3.1 Summary of Results.....	74
4.0 CHALLENGES IN THE ASSESSMENT	78
5.0 SPECIFIC AND GENERAL COMMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL ASPECTS OF THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS	79
5.1 MAC's.....	79
5.2 MPC's Issues.....	79
5.3 PMs	79
6.0 NOTIFICATION OF DISAGREEMENT WITH THE OUTCOME OF	82
THE ASSESSMENT ALREADY NOTED DURING THE FIELD-TRIP	82
7.0 OVERVIEW OF THE 5 WEAKEST PERFORMANCES	83
ANNEX 1: MINUTES OF THE ENTRANCE MEETING	85
ANNEX 2: MINUTES OF THE EXIT MEETING	87

ACRONYMS

ACPA	-	Annual Capacity and Performance Assessment
ADP	-	Annual Development Plans
CB	-	Capacity Building
CEC	-	County Executive Committee
CFAR	-	County Financial and Accounting Report
CGK	-	County Government of Kajiado
CIDP	-	County Integrated Development Plan
CO	-	Chief Officer
CPG	-	County Performance Grants
EA	-	Environmental Audits
EIA	-	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMCA	-	Environmental Management and Coordination Act
FS	-	Financial Secretary
FY	-	Financial Year
HRIS	-	Human Resource Information System
ICT	-	Information Communication Technology
IPSAS	-	International Public Sector Accounting Standards
KDSP	-	Kenya Devolution Support Programme
KRA	-	Key Result Area
M&E	-	Monitoring and Evaluation
MAC	-	Minimum Access Conditions
MODP	-	Ministry of Devolution and Planning
MPC	-	Minimum Performance Conditions
NEMA	-	National Environment Management and Coordination Authority
NT	-	National Treasury
NWCPC	-	National Water Conservation and Pipeline Corporation
PFM	-	Public Finance Management (Act)
POM	-	Programme Operation Manual

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The consulting team from **Matengo Githae & Associates** thanks all Kajiado County Government and County Assembly Officials, Senior Management and staff who participated in the Annual Capacity and Performance Assessment. The officials made valuable contributions throughout the assessment and document review processes and provided useful information and insights to the assessors.

The consulting team liaised with the County Government Officials throughout the assessment process. The County Officials provided vital support by following up with departmental heads to avail all records and explanations that the consulting team required.

We sincerely acknowledge Dr. Kennedy Ole Kerei, the County Secretary who welcomed the assessment team to Kajiado County, Mr. Peter Ntiaki, the Head of human resources who presided over the assessment entry meeting and set the tone for the cooperation and coordinated support that we received from all the County Government and County Assembly Officials, senior management and staff we interacted with during the assessment. Mr. Ntiaki was also the focal point and the coordinator of the assessment exercise on behalf of the County Government and County Assembly of Kajiado. We would also like to acknowledge Ms Priscilla Mungai, the Deputy Director of planning, who presided over the exit meeting and assured the consulting team that the Annual Capacity and Performance Assessment program is welcome and its report on capacity gaps will help the Kajiado County Government to continuously improve its performance and service to the County at large. Finally, we would like to acknowledge the entire Kajiado County staff whom we interacted closely during the assessment.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Government of Kenya developed a National Capacity Building Framework – NCBF, in 2013 to guide the implementation of its capacity building support for county governments. The program is a key part of the government’s Kenya Devolution Support Program - KDSP supported by the World Bank. The NCBF spans PFM, Planning and M & E, Human Resource Management, Devolution and Inter-Governmental Relations and Public Participation.

The Ministry of Devolution and Planning–MoDP, state department of devolution subsequently commissioned Matengo Githae & Associates to carry out an Annual Capacity and Performance Assessment – ACPA in forty seven counties. The ACPA aims to achieve three complementary roles.

Evaluating the impact of capacity building support provided by national government and development partners under the NCBF will inform the introduction of a performance-based grant (the Capacity & Performance Grant, which will be introduced from FY 2016/17) to fund county executed capacity building and to increase the incentives for counties to proactively invest in their own capacity.

In preparation for the assessment process, MoDP carried out an induction and sensitization training to the consulting team to help them internalize the objectives of the ACPA, size of capacity and performance grants, County Government’s eligibility criteria, ACPA tool, and the ACPA criteria.

This report documents the key issues that arose during the final assessment of Kajiado County Government spanning the methodology used for the assessment, time plan and the overall process, summary of the results, summary of capacity building requirements and the need for follow – up, challenges in the assessment in general and the training methods.

Table 1: The summary of the assessment was summed as follows:

ACPA Measures	Outcome
MAC	The County has complied with MAC except for item 3 and 4- which are not being assessed at this stage.
MPC	The County has met 8 MPCs, MPC 5-Adherence to Investment Menu is not assessable at this stage.

ACPA Measures	Outcome	Score
PM	KRA 1: Public Financial Management	9
	KRA 2: Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	5
	KRA 3: Human Resources Management	1
	KRA 4: Civic Education and Participation	10
	KRA 5: Investment implementation & Social And environmental performance	1
	TOTAL	26

Achievements

The County performed very well in KRA 4- Civic Education and Participation in comparison with the other KRAs.

- There is a public participation policy in place and the citizens are actively engaged in planning and budget making.
- The civic education component is also quite active in the county with its formation and linked with the administrative structures.
- The County also performed fairly well in KRA 2- Planning and M&E.
- The CIDP adhered to CIDP guidelines,
- The County has clear objectives, priorities, outcomes, reporting mechanism, results matrix, key performance indicators, and
- preparation and submission of ADP timely to County assembly.

Weaknesses

- Key weaknesses were noted in KRA 5 Investment implementation & Social and environmental Performance. The completed projects in the current year could not be matched easily with the projects in the ADP and CIDP
- County projects were also noted as not having been screened and none having EIA or EMPs
- The projects sampled did not have any relevant social safeguards instruments provided
- The budget of County Assembly projects was consolidated therefore it as not easy to establish budgeted cost for individual projects to match with completed individual projects.
- Weaknesses were also noted in KRA 3 Human Resource Management. Besides staffing plans missing and lacking in annual targets, Job appraisals and Performance Contracting had not been undertaken.

- The County did not also have under KRA 3 a staff skills and competency framework
- There were no documents provided by the public service board on staff recruitment, appointments and promotions

Challenges

- The County Assembly did not fully participate in the assessment process and its involvement was only limited to provision of hansard report for budget approval.
- The County was unable to provide sampled procurement files for reviewing compliance with procurement procedures on thresholds and method of sourcing service providers.
- The whole environment team failed to appear for the assessment hence the dismal performance in this area.
- The public service board did not provide documentation on recruitment, appointments and promotion of county staff.

Areas of Improvement

- The County has not developed staff plans and needs to do so for the operationalization of the same and set county staff annual targets.
- Capacity building for senior county staff is necessary to enable them carry out effective appraisal of all staff annually and to develop performance contracting.
- The County also needs to separate the roles and responsibilities of the public service board on staff issues and recruitment with those of the county human resource.
- The County needs to develop a skills and competency framework for its staff so that quality of services is assured.
- On environment, sensitization is required in the area of EIA enforcement for all County projects.
- There is also need for capacity building in screening of environmental social safeguards, follow up and implementation of EIA/EMP procedures is a necessity.
- The County needs to introduce ICT infrastructure to boost revenues revenue collection up to the sub-county level especially in the urban areas of Kitengela, Ongata Rongai, and Ngong Towns.
- The County needs to set up an active and operational Monitoring and Evaluation team in all the departments
- Capacity building of county staff on project management is required so that county projects are not implemented within budgets,

1.0 METHODOLOGY, ASSESSMENT TEAM AND ACTIVITIES

1.1 Methodology

The consultants relied on the following activities in carrying out the capacity assessments

a) Entrance Meeting

The consultants held an entrance meeting with the top County Officials. The purpose was to provide the County Management with the opportunity to appreciate the purpose and objective of the exercise and to point out the need to support the exercise since its outcome would assist counties to strengthen their programs and at the same time avail them with evidence to demonstrate change. This also provided the consultants with opportunity to conduct background review of the County and its operations from internal and external documents.

b) Data Administration

The consultants administered the questionnaire within three (3) working days. The consultants applied experiential learning (EL) to conduct Key group and other interviews, engaged with key Kajiado County Government and County Assembly Officials, senior management and staff who were knowledgeable in areas that related to the ACPA to identify key capacity building issues and areas.

The consultants also used compliance modeling (CM) and organization review (OR) to review whether Existing County Integrated Development Plan – CIDP, Annual Development Plans – ADP's, Budgets, Financial Reports, key project documents, policy documents and strategies; and departmental reports complied with underlying laws, regulations and were modelled to produce the intended results in compliance with current national government laws, guidelines, policies, regulations and ACPA participation and assessment guidelines; and action planning (AP) to develop capacity building recommendations.

c) Exit Meeting-Debriefing

The consultants held a debriefing session with the entire Kajiado County team that also comprised members of county assembly to share the outcome of the assessment process. This was meant to iron out issues and any differences arising from the assessment process, and agree on the said issues if any in order to reduce any potential conflict on the outcome of the results, by explaining the basis for outcome.

The debriefing meeting agenda comprised of the following:

- Preliminary key findings and outcomes of the assessments.
- The level of information availed and the expectation from the manual

1.2 Time Plan

The time plan for the assessment and respective activities is as shown below;

Table 2: Activity Work Plan

Activity	31 st July 2017	1 st July 2017	2 nd July 2017	3 rd July 2017	4 th July 2017
Entrance meeting					
Assessing the Minimum Access Conditions					
Assessing minimum Performance Measures					
Assessing Performance Measures					
Visit to County Projects					
Exit Meeting					
Preparing Report					

2.0 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The summary of the results of the assessments are provided in the tables 3, 4 and 5 below by MACs, MPCs and PMs respectively.

2.1 Minimum Access Conditions (MAC)

Table 3: Summary of results for Minimum Access Conditions

Minimum Conditions for Capacity and Performance Grants (level 1)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification (MoV)	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Finding
1. County signed participation agreement	To ensure that there is ownership and interest from the county to be involved in the Program, and to allow access to information for the AC&PA teams.	Signed confirmation letter/expression of interest in being involved in the Program MoV: Review the confirmation letter against the format provided by MoDP/in the Program Operational Manual (POM).	First ACPA.	Met	The County participation agreement was signed by the Governor on 16 th June 2016 and a copy of the agreement was provided.
2. CB plan developed	Is needed to guide use of funds and coordination. Shows the capacity of the county to be in driver's seat on CB.	CB plan developed according to the format provided in the Program Operational Manual/Grant Manual (annex). MoV: Review the CB plan, based on the self- assessment of the KDSP indicators: MACs, MPC and PMs, and compared with format in the POM /Grant	At the point of time for the ACPA for the current FY. First year a trigger to be achieved prior to the start of FY.	Met	CB Plan developed in the format provided in the Program Operational Manual (POM) and submitted to MoDP on 29 th June 2017, Extracts of the plan and the soft copy were retained as evidence.

Minimum Conditions for Capacity and Performance Grants (level 1)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification (MoV)	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Finding
		Manual (annex).			
3. Compliance with investment menu of the grant	Important to ensure quality of the CB support and targeting of the activities.	<p>Compliance with investment menu (eligible expenditure) of the Capacity and Performance Grant) documented in progress reports.</p> <p>MoV: Review of grant and utilization – progress reports. Reporting for the use of CB grants for previous FYs in accordance with the Investment menu</p>		N/A	Awaiting the release of 2015/2016 audit report by the Office of the Auditor General (OAG).
4. Implementation of CB plan	Ensure actual implementation.	<p>Minimum level (70% of FY 16/17 plan, 75% of FY 17/18 plan, 80% of subsequent plans) of implementation of planned CB activities by end of FY.</p> <p>MoV: Review financial statements and use of CB + narrative of activities (quarterly reports and per the Grant Manual).</p>		N/A	There has been a delay in the program implementation and funding is yet to be disbursed.

2.2 Minimum Performance Conditions

Table 4: Summary of results for Minimum Performance Conditions

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
Minimum Access Conditions complied with					
1. Compliance with minimum access conditions	To ensure minimum capacity and linkage between CB and investments.	Compliance with MACs. MoV: Review of the conditions mentioned above and the MoV of these.	At point of time for the ACPA	Met	The county participation agreement was signed by the Governor on 16 th June 2016 copy of the agreement provided. CB Plan was developed in the format provided in the Program Operational Manual (POM) and submitted to MoDP on 29 th June 2017, The CB plan was availed to the assessment team.
Financial Management					
2. Financial statements submitted	To reduce fiduciary risks	Financial Statements with letter on documentation submitted to the Kenya National Audit Office by 30th September and National Treasury with required signatures (Internal auditor, heads of accounting	3 months after closure of the FY (30 th of September). Complied with if the county is	Met	The County prepared and submitted the Consolidated financial report for 2015/2016 to the Office of Auditor General on time. The report was received on 30 th September 2016 as evidenced

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		<p>unit etc.) as per the PFM Act Art.116 and Art. 164 (4). This can be either individual submissions from each department, or consolidated statement for the whole county. If individual statements are submitted for each department, the county must also submit consolidated statements by 31stOctober. The FS has to be in an auditable format.</p> <p>MoV: Annual financial statements (FSs), submission letters to Office of the Auditor General (OAG) + records in OAG.</p>	<p>submitting individual department statements: 3 months after end of FY for department statements and 4 months after end of FY for consolidated statement.</p> <p>If the council is only submitting consolidated statement: Deadline is 3 months after end of FY.</p>		<p>by receipt date stamp on the face of the report.</p> <p>The financial report was signed by the CO for finance and the head of treasury as required by PFM Act.</p>
<p>3. Audit opinion does not carry an adverse opinion, or a disclaimer on any</p>	<p>To reduce fiduciary risks</p>	<p>The opinion in the audit report of the financial statements for county legislature and executive of the previous fiscal year cannot be adverse or carry a disclaimer on any substantive issue.</p>	<p>Note. This will be last trigger for release as report is not yet there upon time for the ACPA.</p>	<p>Met</p>	<p>Audited financial statements for the year ended 30th June 2016 for the County Executive was issued with a Qualified Opinion while the County Assembly also had Adverse opinion:</p>

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
substantive issue		<p>MoV: Audit reports from Office of the Auditor General.</p> <p>Transitional arrangements: Transitional arrangements are in place as audit report may be disclaimed due to balance sheet issues.</p> <p>First year where the Minimum Performance Conditions are applied (i.e. 2nd AC&PA starting in September 2016) the conditions are as follows:</p> <p>Audit report shows that the county has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided documentation of revenue and expenditures (without significant issues leading to adverse opinion); • No cases of substantial mismanagement (which in itself would lead to adverse audit opinion) and fraud; • Spending within budget 	<p>Transitional arrangements: First ACPA where MPCs are applied i.e. in the 2016 ACPA: Issues are defined for the core issues, which disqualify counties as per audit reports, see previous column.</p>		<p>1. The county did not provide documentations for expenditure</p> <p>a) Lack of documentations such as requisite vouchers to support inprest of Kshs.1,203,526 issued in the year and reflected as surrendered in the register,</p> <p>Lack of details of goods and services consumed but unpaid of Kshs.13,493,769</p>

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		and revised budget; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly reports submitted in last FY to Cob; • Books of accounts (cashbooks) posted with bank reconciliations up-to-date. • Assets register for new assets in place 			
4. Annual planning documents in place	To demonstrate a minimum level of capacity to plan and manage funds	CIDP, Annual Development Plan and budget approved and published (on-line). (Note: The approved versions have to be the version published on county website) (PFM Act, Art 126 (4)). MoV: CIDP, ADP, and budget approval documentation, minutes from council meetings and review of county web-site.	At the point of time of the ACPA, which will take place in Sep-Nov, the plans for current year are reviewed.	Met	CIDP 2013-2017, ADP for 2016-2017 and approved budget for 2016-2017 are in place and copies were retained as evidence. CIDP, ADP, and the approved budget for 2016/2017 have not been uploaded on the county's web-site.
Use of funds in accordance with Investment menu					
5. Adherence with the investment	To ensure compliance with the	Adherence with the investment menu (eligible expenditures) as defined in the PG Grant	In 2016 ACPA (Q3 2016) this MPC will not be	N/A	The investment menu relates to the actual capacity building grant which is yet to

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
menu	environmental and social safeguards and ensure efficiency in spending.	<p>Manual.</p> <p><u>MoV</u>: Review financial statements against the grant guidelines. Check up on use of funds from the CPG through the source of funding in the chart of accounts (if possible through the general reporting system with Source of Funding codes) or special manual system of reporting as defined in the Capacity and Performance Grant Manual)</p> <p>Review budget progress reports submitted to CoB.</p>	measured as the level 2 grant starts only from FY 2017/18.		be disbursed.
Procurement					
6. Consolidated Procurement plans in place.	To ensure procurement planning is properly coordinated from the central procurement unit instead at	<p>Up-dated consolidated procurement plan for executive and for assembly (or combined plan for both).</p> <p><u>MoV</u>: Review procurement plan of each procurement entity and county consolidated procurement plan and check</p>	At point of the ACPA (for current year)	Met	The County executive prepared a combined procurement plan that incorporated all departments. The procurement plan was based on all the county projects. The plan was updated upon

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
	departmental, and to ensure sufficient capacity to handle discretionary funds.	<p>up against the budget whether it encompass the needed projects and adherence with procurement procedures. The procurement plan(s) will have to be up-dated if/and when there are budget revisions, which require changes in the procurement process.</p> <p>Note that there is need to check both the consolidated procurement plan for 1) the assembly and 2) the executive, and whether it is revised when budget revisions are made.</p>			<p>revision of the Budget.</p> <p>The County Assembly did not provide its procurement plan due to absence of the procurement personnel who were on leave.</p>
Core Staffing in Place					
7. County Core staff in place	To ensure minimum capacity in staffing	<p>Core staff in place as per below list (see also County Government Act Art. 44).</p> <p>The following staff positions should be in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The country secretary • Chief officer of finance, 	At the point of time for the ACPA.	Met	<p>-Staff organogram is in place for all the departments.</p> <p>The following positions have been filled by qualified staff who have been substantively appointed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Secretary

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning officer, • Internal auditor, • Procurement officer • Accountant • Focal Environmental and Social Officer designated to oversee environmental and social safeguards for all sub projects • M&E officer <p><u>MoV</u>: Staff organogram, schemes of service to review the qualifications against requirements (hence the staff needs to be substantive compared to the schemes of service), sample check salary payments, job descriptions, interview and sample checks. Staff acting in positions may also fulfill the conditions if they comply with the qualifications required in the schemes of service.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CO Finance • Head of Supply Chain • Director, Planning • Director Internal Audit • Head of Treasury • Director, Environment • M & E Officer <p>Job descriptions are in the place as well as the schemes of services for various professionals. The SRC Job descriptions with specific details on each county core position provided. Sampled staff files contain qualifications of staff that met the requirements for appointment. The sample salary checks were done and the same were availed to the team.</p>

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
Environmental and Social Safeguards					
<p>8. Functional and Operational Environmental and Social Safeguards Systems (i.e. screening/vetting, clearance/approval, enforcement & compliance monitoring, grievance redress mechanisms, documentation & reporting) in place.</p>	<p>To ensure that there is a mechanism and capacity to screen environmental and social risks of the planning process prior to implementation, and to monitor safeguard during implementation.</p> <p>To avoid significant adverse environmental and social impacts</p>	<p>1. Counties endorse and ratify the environmental and social management system to guide investments (from the ACPA starting September 2016).</p> <p>2) All proposed investments screened* against set of environmental and social criteria/checklist, safeguards instruments prepared. (Sample 5-10 projects). (From the second AC&PA, Sept. 2016).</p> <p>3) Prepare relevant RAP for all investments with any displacement. Project Reports for investments for submission to NEMA. (From the 3rd AC&PA, Sept. 2017). Sample 5-10 projects.</p> <p>4. Establishment of County Environment Committee.</p> <p><u>MoV</u>: Review endorsements</p>	<p>Note that the first installment of the expanded CPG investment menu covering sectoral investments starts from July 2017 (FY 2017/18).</p> <p>Hence some of the conditions will be reviewed in the ACPA prior to this release to ascertain that capacity is in place at county level, and other MPCs will review performance in the year after start on the</p>	<p>Met</p>	<p>The County Government has enacted an EMCA Act 2017 which was availed to the team by the County Assembly</p> <p>The County has a 25 member Environment committee in place appointed through gazette notice no. 1418 dated 4th March 2016 a copy of which was also availed to the team</p> <p>There are minutes of a meeting convened on 30th November 2017 by the environmental management committee. The County has plans to undertake Environment Impact Assessments as witnessed in the minutes for proposed , ongoing and completed. The biggest challenge emanates from the initial planning of projects which does not incorporate EIA/EMP and relevant safeguards</p>

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
	<p>To promote environmental and social benefits and ensure sustainability</p> <p>To provide opportunity for public participation and consultation in safeguards process (free, prior and informed consultations – FPIC)</p>	<p>from NEMA, ratification, screening materials and documentation, and contracts. Evidence that all projects are reviewed, coordinated and screened against checklist in Program Operating Manual. Screening may be conducted by various departments, but there is a need to provide an overview and evidence that all projects are screened.</p> <p>* In cases where the county has clear agreement with NEMA that it does the screening and that all projects are screened, this condition is also seen to be fulfilled.</p>	<p>utilization of the expanded grant menu (i.e. in the 3rd AC&PA, see the previous column for details).</p>		<p>instruments.</p> <p>The County does provide opinions for private investment projects screened by NEMA.</p> <p>The projects sampled that did not have any EIA/EMP but the county had plans to undertake EIA were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of Isinya Market Budget: 24,900,247 2. Mile 46 market construction Budget: 24,358,802 3. Cabro works Kitengela Budget: 15,000,000 4. Stalls Construction at Kitengela Bus Park Budget: 28,000,000 5. Sultan Hamud-Mashuuru Road

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					Budget:20,000,000 6.Singiraine Leremit Oltinkard road Budget:20,000,000 7.Iseuri Bridge Budget:7,000,000 8.Ilorero Bridge Budget: 9,400,000 9.Olkirdish (Bwana Kala Road) Budget:10,000,000 10. Upgrade of Namanga HC Budget: 10,118,134

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
9. Citizens' Complaint system in place	To ensure sufficient level of governance and reduce risks for mismanagement.	<p>Established an operational Complaints Handling System, including a:</p> <p>(a) complaints/grievance committee to handle complaints pertaining to fiduciary, environmental and social systems.</p> <p>b) A designated a Focal Point Officer to receive, sort, forward, monitor complaints</p> <p>c) simple complaints form/template designed and available to the public</p> <p>d) Multiple channels for receiving complaints e.g. email, telephone, anti-corruption boxes, websites etc.)</p> <p>e) Up to date and serialized record of complaints coordinate implementation of the Framework and a grievance committee is in place.</p> <p><u>MoV</u>: Review county policy, availability of the focal office</p>	At point of time for the ACPA.	Met	<p>Public Participation Act is in place and in use</p> <p>a).The County does have a Complaints Committee established although the County has, through the focal point person, directed all complaints to be attended to through various departments for resolutions and feedback</p> <p>b)A designated focal point person has been appointed, has a job description that meets the designated job and is fully in office. He was recruited through a competitive job interview and appointed as a Manager. His job mainly entails coordinating the complaints within the County by redirecting the complaints to respective departments</p>

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		<p>(recruitment files, salary payments, job description for focal point, and evidence for operations, etc. + members of grievance committee, minutes from meetings, various channels for lodging complaints, official and up to date record of complaints etc. <i>See also County Government Act Art. 15 and 88 (1)</i>)</p>			<p>c).There is a complaints form/ template is available for recording complaints.</p> <p>d).Complaints are shared verbally, through public information boxes and through phone calls. Other ways complaints are shared include chief's barazas and short messaging services which is not retrievable to print. There is no email service for receipt of complaints</p> <p>e).The County does have a serialized record of complaints. All complaints are attended to through various departments for resolutions and feedback</p>

2.3 Performance Measures

Table 5: The summary of results for Performance Measures

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
KRA 1: Public Financial Management Max score: Maximum 30 points.							
<i>Strengthened budget formulation, resource mobilization and allocation</i>							
1.1	Program Based Budget prepared using IFMIS and SCOA	Budget format and quality	The annual budget approved by the County Assembly is: a) Program Based Budget format. b) Budget developed using the IFMIS Hyperion module.	Review county budget document, IFMIS uploads, the CPAR, 2015. Check use of Hyperion Module: all budget submissions include a PBB version printed from Hyperion (submissions may also include line item budgets prepared using other means, but these must match the PBB budget – spot check figures between different versions).	Maximum 2 points. 2 milestones (a & b) met: 2 points 1 of the 2 milestones met: 1 point	1	The County budget is classified into programmes and objectives of the programmes are described for all departments. For instance one programme under the office of the Governor is; Programme 1: General administration, planning and support services Strategic objective: To provide human resource management, policy direction and overall sector

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							<p>coordination to enhance efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.</p> <p>The budget is in program based format</p> <p>The budget is developed in excel and then uploaded into IFMIS Hyperion Module</p>
1.2		Budget process follows clear budget calendar	<p>Clear budget calendar with the following key milestones achieved:</p> <p>a) Prior to end of August the CEC member for finance has issued a circular to the county government entities with guidelines to be followed;</p> <p>b) County Budget review and outlook paper – submission by</p>	<p>PFM Act, art 128, 129, 131.</p> <p>Review budget calendar, minutes from meetings (also from assembly resolutions) circular submission letters, county outlook paper, minutes from meetings and Financial Statements.</p>	<p>Max. 3 points</p> <p>If all 5 milestones (a-e) achieved: 3 points</p> <p>If 3-4 items: 2 points</p> <p>If 2 items: 1 point</p> <p>If 1 or 0 items: 0 points.</p>	3	<p>a) The CEC for finance planning issued a budget circular Ref: County Treasury Circular No. 1/2015/15 dated 31st August 2015. This was within the due date.</p> <p>b) The CBROP was prepared and submitted by CEC for finance to County Assembly via letter Re:CGK/FINANCE/Budget/Vol.2/5/80 dated</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			<p>county treasury to CEC by 30 September to be submitted to the County assembly 7 days after the CEC has approved it but no later than 15th October.</p> <p>c) County fiscal strategy paper (FSP) – submission (by county treasury) of county strategy paper to county executive committee by 28th Feb, County Treasury to submit to county assembly by 15th of march and county assembly to discuss within two weeks after mission.</p> <p>d) CEC member for finance submits budget estimates to county assembly by 30th April latest.</p>				<p>13th October 2015. The submission was within the due date.</p> <p>c) The CEC for finance submitted the County Fiscal Strategy Paper to County Assembly vide letter Ref: CGK/EP/CESP/12/1 dated 26th February 2016. The submission was within due date.</p> <p>d)The county prepared and submitted the budget estimated for 2016/2017 to the county assembly on 29th April 2016. The submission was done on due date.</p> <p>e)The budget was deliberated by the county assembly and approved on time by 30th June 2016.</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			e) County assembly passes a budget with or without amendments by 30 th June latest.				
1.3		Credibility of budget	<p>a) Aggregate expenditure out-turns compared to original approved budget.</p> <p>b) Expenditure composition for each sector matches budget allocations (average across sectors).</p>	Review the original budget and the annual financial statements, budget progress reports, audit reports, etc. Use figures from IFMIS (general ledger report at department (sub-vote) level).	<p>Max. 4 points.</p> <p><u>Ad a):</u> If expenditure deviation between total budgeted expenditures and total exp. in final account is less than 10 % then 2 points.</p> <p>If 10-20 % then 1 point.</p> <p>More than 20 %: 0 point.</p> <p><u>Ad b):</u> If average deviation of expenditures across sectors is less than 10 % then 2 points.</p> <p>If 10-20 % then 1</p>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>a)Actual expenditure 2015/2016</p> <p>Kshs.5,049,173,179</p> <p>Approved budget</p> <p>Kshs.6,588,790,982</p> <p>Deviation 23.36%</p> <p>b)Expenditure out turns compared with original budget per sector.</p> <p>County assembly budget</p> <p>Kshs.668,637,597</p> <p>Actual</p> <p>Kshs.453,743,869</p> <p>Variance 32.14%</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
					point. More than 20 %: 0 point.		Office of the Governor Budget Kshs.189,566,475 Actual Kshs.186,412,567 Variance1.66% Public Service Administration Budget Kshs.427,968,251 Actual Kshs.370,274,202 Variance 13.48% Public Service Board Budget Kshs.89,177,511 Actual Kshs.85,801,429 Variance 3.79% Finance and Planning

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							Budget Kshs.610,,063,193 Actual Kshs.529,285,442 Variance 13.24% Trade& Enterprise Dev. Budget Kshs.366,830,927 Actual Kshs.223,725,111 Variance 39.01% Agriculture Budget Kshs.302,548,497 Actual Kshs.226,173,557 Variance 25.24% Water & Irrigation Budget

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							Kshs.480,195,895 Actual Kshs.261,472,552 Variance 45.55% Education Budget Kshs.931,148,203 Actual Kshs.642,979,275 Variance 30.95% Health Budget Kshs.1,562,070,890 Actual Kshs.1,321,018,851 Variance 15.43% Lands & Physical Planning Budget Kshs.218,727,952

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							Actual Kshs.136,129,658 Variance 37.76% Works and Housing Budget Kshs.844,816,958 Actual Kshs.572,463,418 Variance 32.24% ICT Budget Kshs.134,780,017 Actual Kshs.131,732,481 Variance 2.26% Cross sector average deviations 22.5%
	Revenue Enhancement						
1.4	Enhanced revenue management	Performance in revenue administrati	Automation of revenue collection, immediate banking and control	Compare revenues collected through automated processes as	Max: 2 points. Over 80% = 2 points	0	Total OSR 2015/2016 Kshs.650,984,978 No automation in

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
	and administration	on	system to track collection.	% of total own source revenue.	Over 60% = 1 point		2015/2016, Percentage 0% automation commenced in April 2017
1.5		Increase on a yearly basis in own source revenues (OSR).	% increase in OSR from last fiscal year but one (year before previous FY) to previous FY	Compare annual Financial Statement from two years. (Use of nominal figures including inflation etc.).	Max. 1 point. If increase is more than 10 %: 1 point.	0	OSR 2015/2016 Kshs. 650,984,978 OSR 2014/2015 Kshs. 772,577,000 Variance (15.74%)
<i>Enhanced capacity of counties on execution (including procurement), accounting and reporting</i>							
1.6	Reporting and accounting in accordance with PSASB guidelines	Timeliness of in-year budget reports (quarterly to Controller of Budget).	a) Quarterly reports submitted no later than one month after the quarter (consolidated progress and expenditure reports) as per format in CFAR, submitted to the county assembly with copies to the controller of budget, National Treasury and CRA. b) Summary revenue, expenditure and progress report is	Review quarterly reports, date and receipts (from CoB). Check against the PFM Act, Art. 166. CFAR, Section 8. Review website and copies of local media for evidence of publication of summary revenue and expenditure outturns.	Max. 2 points. (a &b) Submitted on time and published: 2 points. (a only): Submitted on time only: 1 point.	0	The county availed only two quarterly budget reports for 3 rd quarter 2015/2016(January-March 2016), and 1 st quarter 2016/2017(July-September 2016). The 1 st quarter report for 2016/17 was submitted to county assembly late. It was submitted on 7 th December 2016 as per

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			published in the local media/web-page.			0	<p>the date stamp on the face of the report. The report also bears stamps of National Treasury, CRA and CoB all indicating they were received on 6th December 2016 .No date stamp is on the 3rd Quarter 2015/16. The reports were due by 31st October 2016.The copies of the reports have been retained as evidence.</p> <p>Publication of summary revenue and expenditure out turn was not done.</p>
1.7		Quality of financial statements.	Formats in PFMA and CFAR, and standard templates issued by the IPSAS board are applied and the FS include cores issues such as trial balance, bank reconciliations linked	Review annual financial statements, bank conciliations and related documents and appendixes to the FS, date and receipts (from CoB and NT).	Max. 1 point. Quality as defined by APA team or NT assessment (excellent/satisfactory): 1 point	1	The Financial statement for 2015/16 in compliance with the PFMA, CFAR and standard template issued by IPSAS Board in respect Statement of receipts and

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			with closing balances, budget execution report, schedule of outstanding payments, appendix with fixed assets register.	<p>Check against the PFM Act, Art. 166 and the IPSAS format.</p> <p>CFAR, Section 8. Check against requirements.</p> <p>If possible review ranking of FS by NT (using the County Government checklist for in-year and annual report), and if classified as excellent or satisfactory, conditions are also complied with.</p>			expenditure, the statement of assets, statement of cash flow, summary statement of appropriation; recurrent and Development combined, Summary of appropriation- Recurrent, and summary of appropriation- Development, just to mention a few.
1.8		Monthly reporting and up-date of accounts, including:	<p>The monthly reporting shall include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Income and expenditure statements; 2. Budget execution report, 3. Financial statement including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Details of income and revenue 	<p>Review monthly reports.</p> <p>See also the PFM Manual, p. 82 of which some of the measures are drawn from.</p>	<p>Max. 2 points.</p> <p>If all milestones (1-3): 2 points</p> <p>If 1 or 2: 1 point</p> <p>If none: 0 points.</p>	0	<p>The county does not prepare monthly financial reports</p> <p>The quarterly reports have monthly figures and the total for the quarter. And this is done at the end of the quarter.</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			<p>b. Summary of expenditures</p> <p>c. Schedule of imprest and advances;</p> <p>d. Schedule of debtors and creditors;</p> <p>e. Bank reconciliations and post in general ledger.</p>				
1.9		Asset registers up-to-date and inventory	Assets registers are up-to date and independent physical inspection and verification of assets should be performed once a year.	<p>Review assets register, and sample a few assets. PFM Act. Art 149.</p> <p>Checkup-dates.</p>	<p>Max. 1 point.</p> <p>Registers are up-to-date: 1 point.</p> <p>Transitional arrangements:</p> <p><u>First year:</u> Assets register need only to contain assets acquired by county governments since their establishment.</p> <p><u>Second year onwards:</u> register must include all assets, including</p>	1	<p>The county has developed an asset register and last posting was done on 10th June 2016. No posting has been done for the financial year 2016-2017. The register has the following details;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Asset code 2.Subcounty 3.Ward 4.Building 5.Department

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
					those inherited from Local Authorities and National Ministries		6.Section 7.Class 8.Date of Purchase 9.Asset attribute 10.Asset description 11.Manufacturer 12.Model 13.Value 14. Conditions Sample Assets from the register
<i>Audit</i>							
1.10	Internal audit	Effective Internal audit function	Internal audit in place with quarterly IA reports submitted to IA Committee (or if no IA committee, in place, then reports submitted to Governor)	Review audit reports. Check against the PFM Act Art 155	Max. 1 point. 4 quarterly audit reports submitted in previous FY: 1 point.	1	The County Executive internal audit unit has an approved work plan and reports are prepared on quarterly basis and are submitted to internal audit committee. However we could not get the status of

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							County Assembly internal audit unit since the internal auditor was on leave.
1.11		Effective and efficient internal audit committee.	IA/Audit committee established and review of reports and follow-up.	Review composition of IA/Audit Committee, minutes etc. for evidence of review of internal audit reports. Review evidence of follow-up, i.e. evidence that there is an ongoing process to address the issues raised from last FY, e.g. control systems in place, etc. (evidence from follow-up meetings in the Committee). PFM Act Art 155.	Max. 1 point. IA/Audit Committee established and reports reviewed by Committee and evidence of follow-up: 1 point.	1	<p>The county executive constituted the internal audit committee on 14th August 2015. The committee is composed of a Chairman, 4 (four) members and the internal auditor is the secretary of the committee.</p> <p>The committee were trained on the roles and the functions of the audit committee on 13th March 2016.</p> <p>The committee has held two meetings on 30th sept-1st October 2016, and 9th-10th February 2017 to</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							<p>review the audit annual work plan and review internal audit reports.</p> <p>No information was provided by the county assembly on the status of the internal audit committee, since the internal auditor was on leave.</p>
1.12	External audit	Value of audit queries	The value of audit queries as a % of total expenditure	<p>Review audit report from KENAO.</p> <p>Total expenditure as per reports to CoB.</p>	<p>Max. 2 points</p> <p>Value of queries <1% of total expenditures: 2 points</p> <p><5% of total expenditure: 1 point</p>	0	<p>value of audit queries=$696,492,750/5,049,173,179*100=13.8\%$</p>
1.13		Reduction of audit queries	The county has reduced the value of the audit queries (fiscal size of the area of which the query is raised).	Review audit reports from KENAO from the last two audits.	<p>Max. 1 point.</p> <p>Audit queries (in terms of value) have reduced from last year but</p>	0	<p>value of audit queries 2015/2016- 13.8%</p> <p>Value of audit queries 2014/2015=$74,826,387/5,094,129,200*100$</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
					one to last year or if there is no audit queries: 1 point.		=1.5% Increase in value of audit queries
1.14		Legislative scrutiny of audit reports and follow-up	Greater and more timely legislative scrutiny of external audit reports within required period and evidence that audit queries are addressed	Minutes from meetings, review of previous audit reports.	Max. 1 point. Tabling of audit report and evidence of follow-up: 1 point.	0	Legislative scrutiny of audit reports and follow-ups are not conducted
Procurement							
1.15	Improved procurement procedures	Improved procurement procedures including use of IFMIs, record keeping, adherence to procurement thresholds and tender evaluation.	Note: When PPRA develop a standard assessment tool, APA will switch to using the score from the PPRA assessment as the PM (PfR may incentivize PPRA to do this in DLI 1 or 3). a) 25 steps in the IFMIS procurement process adhered with. b) County has submitted required procurement reports to PPRA on time.	Annual procurement assessment and audit by PPRA and OAG Sample 5 procurements (different size) and review steps complied with in the IFMIS guidelines. Calculate average steps complied with in the sample. Review reports submitted. Check reports from	Max. 6 points. a) IFMIS Steps: <15steps=0 points; 15-23=1 point; 24-25= 2 points b) Timely submission of quarterly reports to PPRA (both annual reports plus all reports for procurements above proscribed thresholds):	0 0 0	a) The county has adopted 10 steps of IFMIS e-procurement; b) The county does not prepare and submit quarterly reports to PPRA as required c) adherence with procurement thresholds The county only availed one file from the list of 5 sampled

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			<p>c) Adherence with procurement thresholds and procurement methods for type/size of procurement in a sample of procurements.</p> <p>d) Secure storage space with adequate filing space designated and utilized – for a sample of 10 procurements, single files containing all relevant documentation in one place are stored in this secure storage space (1 point)</p> <p>e) Completed evaluation reports, including individual evaluator scoring against pre-defined documented evaluation criteria and signed by each member of the evaluation team, available for a sample of</p>	<p>tender committees and procurement units.</p> <p>Check a sample of 5 procurement and review adherence with thresholds and procurement methods and evaluation reports.</p> <p>Check for secure storage space and filing space, and for a random sample of 10 procurements of various sizes, review contents of files.</p>	<p>1 point</p> <p>c) Adherence with procurement thresholds and procurement methods for type/size of procurement in a sample of procurements: 1 point.</p> <p>d) Storage space and single complete files for sample of procurements: 1 point</p> <p>e) Evaluation reports: 1 point</p>		<p>files for review on adherence with thresholds, procurement methods and evaluation reports.</p> <p>1.KAJ/IED/137/15-16</p> <p>Construction works Loitoktok</p> <p>Method Restricted Tender</p> <p>Contract Sum Kshs.27,947,613</p> <p>The above procurement complied with procurement procedures in terms of thresholds, and methods of sourcing the service provider.</p> <p>The following files were not provided</p> <p>1.Gravelling, grading and installation of</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			5 large procurements (2 points)				<p>culverts at Kumpa Trading Centre to Olkejuado</p> <p>Contract Sum Kshs.9,995,952</p> <p>2.Construction of Modern sports complex in Ngong</p> <p>Contract sum Kshs.198,464,940</p> <p>3.Construction of Modern stalls in Kitengela Bus Park</p> <p>Contract sum Kshs.26,399,825.76</p> <p>4.Tarmac/Cabro Kitengela Town Centre</p> <p>Contract sum Kshs.19,952,800</p> <p>d) The county has a spacious, secure and well arranged store for</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
						1	<p>procurement documents.</p> <p>They following are 10 sampled procurement single file from the store containing;</p> <p>Requisitions Bills of quantities Notification of award Acceptance Contract agreement Contract sum Invoice Certificate of practical completion Inspection report Project implementation progress report Payment certificate The files sampled</p> <p>1.CGK/TD/61/2015-2016 Isinya Market</p> <p>2.CGK/TD/CWS/75/2015-2016 construction</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							<p>of Mile 46 Market</p> <p>3.CGK/DEV/17/2015-2016 Construction of classrooms at Iltripen primary school</p> <p>4.CGK/RPWET/GGDC WS/48/2015-16 Construction of county road</p> <p>5.CGK/DEV/58/2015-16 Construction of Kijito Water project</p> <p>6.CGK/DEV/03/2015-16 Construction of sanitation block at Olekasasi stadium</p> <p>7.CGK/TD/CWS/80/2015-16 Construction of Embulbul Market</p> <p>8.CGK/HS/CWS/102/2</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
						0	<p>015-16</p> <p>Construction of fence upgrade at Namanga sub county hospital</p> <p>9.CGK/EYSSS/CWS/12/2015-16</p> <p>Construction of a modern ECDE classrooms at Oloonkai</p> <p>10.CGK/WI/RIKWSP/18/2015-16</p> <p>Construction of a modern ECDE classrooms at Emakoko</p> <p>e) The sampled procurement files in (d) above contain evaluation reports, however signed score sheets by individual evaluators were missing.</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
Key Result Area 2: Planning and M&E Max score: (tentative 20 points)							
2.1	County M&E system and frameworks developed	County M&E/Planning unit and frameworks in place.	a) Planning and M&E units (may be integrated in one) established. b) There are designated planning and M&E officer and each line ministry has a focal point for planning and one for M&E c) Budget is dedicated for both planning and M&E.	Review staffing structure and organogram. Clearly identifiable budget for planning and M&E functions in the budget.	Maximum 3 points The scoring is one point per measure Nos. a-c complied with.	0	The county has not established planning and M&E, however a project implementation unit has been constituted under procurement department.
2.2		County M&E Committee in place and functioning	County M&E Committee meets at least quarterly and reviews the quarterly performance reports. (I.e. it is not sufficient to have hoc meetings).	Review minutes of the quarterly meeting in the County M&E Committee.	Maximum: 1 point Compliance: 1 point.	0	The county has not constituted the county M&E committee. A policy document on county M&E has been developed, but it is yet to be approved by the CECMs

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
2.3	County Planning systems and functions established	CIDP formulated and updated according to guidelines	<p>a) CIDP: adheres to guideline structure of CIDP guidelines,</p> <p>b) CIDP has clear objectives, priorities and outcomes, reporting mechanism, result matrix, key performance indicators included; and</p> <p>c) Annual financing requirement for full implementation of CIDP does not exceed 200% of the previous FY total county revenue.</p>	<p>CIDP submitted in required format (as contained in the CIDP guidelines published by MoDP).</p> <p>See County Act, Art. 108, Art 113 and Art. 149.</p> <p>CIDP guidelines, 2013, chapter 7.</p>	<p>Maximum: 3 points</p> <p>1 point for compliance with each of the issues: a, b and c.</p>	3	<p>CIDP adheres to the structure of CIDP guidelines</p> <p>The CIDP plan has clear objectives, priorities and outcomes, reporting mechanism, result matrix, and key performance indicators.</p>
2.4		ADP submitted on time and conforms to guidelines	<p>a) Annual development plan submitted to Assembly by September 1st in accordance with required format & contents (Law says that once submitted if they are silent on it then it is assumed to be passed).</p> <p>b) ADP contains issues</p>	<p>Review version of ADP approved by County Assembly for structure, and approval procedures and timing, against the PFM Act, Art 126, 1.</p>	<p>Maximum: 4 points</p> <p>Compliance a): 1 point.</p> <p>b) All issues from A-H in PFM Act Art 126,1: 3 points 5-7 issues: 2 points</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>The ADP was prepared and submitted to the County assembly on 1st September 2015. This is evidenced by the county assembly date stamp on the ADP document</p> <p>ADP contains 4 issues</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			mentioned in the PFM Act 126,1, <u>number A-H</u>		3-4 issues: 1 point, see Annex.		mentioned in the PFM Act Art126 these are on; a)Strategic priorities, c)Programs to be developed, e)Significant projects, and f)Detailed description of HRM development The ADP contains 3 issues mentioned in the PFM Act 126,1 there are a,c, e and f
2.5		Linkage between CIDP, ADP and Budget	Linkages between the ADP and CIDP and the budget in terms of costing and activities. (costing of ADP is within +/- 10 % of final budget allocation)	Review the three documents: CIDP, ADP and the budget. The budget should be consistent with the CIDP and ADP priorities. The costing of the ADP is within +/- 10% of final budget allocation. Sample 10 projects and	Maximum: 2 points Linkages and within the ceiling: 2 points.	0	10 projects were sampled for Linkage between ADP and the budget in terms of costing of activities, 2 out of 10 projects sampled had costing deviation of within +- 10% and 8 out of 10 projects had deviation of greater then +-10 %.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
				check that they are consistent between the two documents.			<p>The following projects were sampled;</p> <p>1. The following 8 markets were projected to cost Kshs.70M in the Annual development plan of 2016/2017, no individual costing was given for each market, and the budget however gives individual allocation for each market. The total budget allocation for the eight(8) markets is Kshs.170M</p> <p>Markets</p> <p>Namanga</p> <p>Loitoktok</p> <p>Kimana</p> <p>Kiserian</p> <p>Matasia</p> <p>Bulbul</p> <p>Kajiado</p> <p>Isinya</p> <p>ADP Kshs.70M</p> <p>Budget Kshs.170</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							<p>Variance 142.86% Greater than +-10%</p> <p>2. Construction of modern stalls at Kitengela Bus Park ADP kshs.50M Budget Kshs.28M Deviations 44%</p> <p>3.Street lighting in five sub counties; Kitengela,Ngong,Kiserian,Loitoktok,Rongai ADP Kshs.25M Budget Kshs.10M Variance 60% Greater than +-10%</p> <p>4.Drilling and equipping 10 water boreholes across the county ADP Kshs.70M Budget Kshs.92M Variance 31.43% Greater than +-10%</p> <p>5.Upgrading of 5</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							<p>Health facilities; Matasia Rongai Kajiado Loitoktok Ngong ADP Kshs.130M Budget Kshs.118.9M Variance 9.2% within +-10%</p> <p>6. Revenue automation ADP Kshs.50M Budget Kshs.42.42M Variance 15.16%</p> <p>7.County spatial plan ADP Kshs. 60M Budget Kshs.50M Variance 16.7% Greater than +-10%</p> <p>8. Construction of Modern Library ADP Kshs.83M Budget Kshs.40M Variance 51.8% greater than +-10%</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							<p>9. Installation of WAN& LAN ADP Kshs.50M Budget Kshs.21M Variance +-58% Greater than +-10%</p> <p>10.Construction of County assembly chambers ADP Kshs.120M Budget Kshs.120.5M Variance .0.42% Within +-10%</p>
2.6	Monitoring and Evaluation systems in place and used, with feedback to plans	Production of County Annual Progress Report	<p>a) County C-APR produced;</p> <p>b) Produced timely by September 1 and</p> <p>c) C-APR includes clear performance progress against CIDP indicator targets and within result matrix for results and implementation.</p>	<p>Check contents of C-APR and ensure that it clearly link s with the CIDP indicators.</p> <p>Verify that the indicators have been sent to the CoG.</p>	<p>Maximum: 5 points.</p> <p>a) C-APR produced = 2 points</p> <p>b) C-APR produced by end of September. 1 point.</p> <p>c) C-APR includes</p>	0	The county does not prepare the C-APR.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			(Ad b) Compliance if produced within 3 months of the closure of a FY and sent to Council of Governors for information. This will be done in reference with the County Integrated M&E System Guidelines.		performance against CIDP performance indicators and targets and with result matrix for results and implementation: 2 points. (N.B. if results matrix is published separately, not as part of the C-ADP, the county still qualifies for these points)		
2.7		Evaluation of CIDP projects	Evaluation of completion of major CIDP projects conducted on an annual basis.	Review completed project and evaluations (sample 5 large projects).	Maximum: 1 point. Evaluation done: 1 point.	0	Evaluation of completion of major CIDP projects are not conducted on annual basis
2.8		Feedback from Annual Progress Report to	Evidence that the ADP and budget are informed by the previous C-APR.	Review the two documents for evidence of C-ARP informing ADP and budget	Maximum: 1 point. Compliance: 1	0	The county does not prepare the CAPR, hence we were not able to determine

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
		Annual Development Plan			point.		what informed the development of the ADP And the budget for 2016/2017
Key Result Area 3: Human Resource Management Max score: 12 points.							
3.1	Staffing plans based on functional and organization assessments	Organizational structures and staffing plans	<p>a) Does the county have an approved staffing plan in place, with annual targets?</p> <p>b) Is there clear evidence that the staffing plan was informed by a Capacity Building assessment / functional and organizational assessment and approved organizational structure?</p> <p>c) Have the annual targets in the staffing plan been met?</p>	<p>Staffing plan</p> <p>Capacity Building Assessment / CARPS report</p> <p>Documentation evidencing hiring, training, promotion, rationalization, etc.</p> <p>In future years (after first AC&PA), there has to be evidence that CB/skills assessments are conducted annually to get points on (b). Targets within (+/- 10 % variations).</p>	<p>Maximum 3 points:</p> <p>First AC&PA: a = 2 points, b = 1 point c = NA.</p> <p>Future AC&PAs: a=1 point, b = 1 point, c = 1 point</p>	<p>a)0</p> <p>b)0</p>	<p>a).The County does not have staffing plans and there are no annual targets.</p> <p>b).There is a CARPS report prepared for the County but it has not been adopted by the PSB which would have informed the preparation of the staffing plans</p> <p>c).Since there are no plans, then there are no annual targets to be met</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
3.2	Job descriptions, including skills and competence requirements	Job descriptions, specifications and competency framework	<p>a) Job descriptions in place and qualifications met (AC&PA 1: Chief officers / heads of departments; 2nd AC&PA: all heads of units; future AC&PAs: all staff (sample check))</p> <p>b) Skills and competency frameworks and Job descriptions adhere to these (AC&PA 1: Chief officers / heads of departments; 2nd AC&PA: all heads of units; future AC&PAs: all staff (sample check))</p> <p>c) Accurate recruitment, appointment and promotion records available</p>	<p>Job descriptions</p> <p>Skills and competency frameworks.</p> <p>Appointment, recruitment and promotion records</p>	<p>Maximum score: 4 points</p> <p>All a, b and c: 4 points.</p> <p>Two of a-c: 2 points</p> <p>One of a-c: 1 point</p>	1	<p>a).The Job Descriptions (JDs) for the County positions are contained in separate SRC developed documents that are not found in staff files. The JDs have not been signed by the staff. The sampled staff have equivalent qualifications in their respective files as per the various job specifications.</p> <p>b).The County does not have a skills and competency framework in place for its staff. The appointments for the various positions did not exhibit any of the competencies required for the positions.</p> <p>c).The staff files</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							contain a record of accurate recruitment and appointment records. Separately there are promotion records availed to the team showcasing procedures met for promotions and letters to that effect.A process of competitive recruitment through interviews is shared in the respective files of staff availed to the team.
3.3	Staff appraisal and performance management operationalized in counties	Staff appraisals and performance management	a) Staff appraisal and performance management process developed and operationalized. b)Performance contracts developed and operationalized	Review staff appraisals. County Act, Art 47 (1). Country Public Service Board Records. Staff assessment reports. Re-engineering reports	Maximum score: 5 points.¹ a) Staff appraisal for all staff in place: 1 point. (If staff appraisal for b) Performance Contracts in place for CEC Members	0	The County Government did not avail any records of staff appraisals and performance contracting undertaken. There are no tools developed for the exercise and it was

¹ Note: higher points only expected in subsequent ACPAs, but PM is kept stable across ACPAs.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			c) service re-engineering undertaken d) RRI undertaken	covering at least one service RRI Reports for at least one 100 day period	and Chief Officers: 1 point Performance Contracts in place for the level below Chief Officers: 1 point c) Service delivery processes re-engineered in counties: 1 point d) Rapid Results Initiatives-RRIs launched/upscaled : 1 point	0 0 0	not possible to tell if any is planned since there were no documents availed . There were no performance contracts developed by the County CEC to evaluate the performame of CEC members and Chief Officers c).There is no service Re-engineering initiated by the County. d).No Rapid Results Initiative undertaken by the County
Key Result Area 4: Civic Education and Participation - <i>A citizenry that more actively participated in county governance affairs of the society</i> Max score: 18 points							
4.1	Counties establish functional Civic education	CEU established	Civic Education Units established and functioning: (a) Formation of CE	County Act, Art 99-100.	Maximum 3 points. CEU fully established with	3	a).Civic Education Units have been formed in the County and they are

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
	Units		units (b) Dedicated staffing and (c) Budget, (d) Programs planned, including curriculum, activities etc. and (e) Tools and methods for CE outlined.		all milestones (a) - (e) complied with: 3 points. 2-4 out of the five milestones (a-e): 2 points Only one: 1 point.		operational b).Staff dedicated to the civic units include the Manager appointed specifically to oversee the CE units in all sub-counties. The administrative staff in the sub-counties are incorporated into the CE units. c).Budgets for their respective activities were availed d).Planned programs for the coming year were availed with their curriculums e). Reference materials for the Civic Education at the County level was availed and it was adopted from the MoDP .This included- manuals, curriculum and workbooks as Tools and methods

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							that were availed for the civic education
4.2		Counties roll out civic education activities	Evidence of roll-out of civic education activities – (minimum 5 activities).	County Act, art. 100. Examples are engagements with NGOs to enhance CE activities/joint initiatives on training of citizens etc. Needs to be clearly described and documented in report(s) as a condition for availing points on this.	Maximum 2 points. Roll out of minimum 5 civic education activities: 2 points.	0	The county does not have any partnerships with the local and international NGOs in rolling out any civic education activities
4.3	Counties set up institutional structures systems & process for Public Participation	Communication framework and engagement .	a) System for Access to information/ Communication framework in place, operationalized and public notices and user-friendly documents shared In advance of public forums (plans, budgets, etc.) b) Counties have designated officer in place, and officer is	County Act, Art. 96. Review approved (final) policy / procedure documents describing access to information system and communication framework and review evidence of public notices and sharing of documents. Review job descriptions, pay-sheets and / or	Maximum 2 points. a) Compliance: 1 point. b) Compliance: 1 point.	1	The public participation act has been enacted by the County Assembly putting into place a strong framework of a communication system in place. There is information shared on plans and budgets with public in advance of engagement through posters, media adverts

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			operational.	other relevant records to ascertain whether designated officer is in place; review documents evidencing activities of the designated officer (e.g. reports written, minutes of meetings attended etc.)		1	A Communication Officer has been appointed to manage communications and the officer is functionally in office.
4.4		Participatory planning and budget forums held	<p>a) Participatory planning and budget forums held in previous FY before the plans were completed for on-going FY.</p> <p>b) Mandatory citizen engagement /consultations held beyond the budget forum, (i.e. additional consultations)</p> <p>c) Representation: meets requirements of PFMA (section 137) and stakeholder mapping in public participation</p>	<p>PFM Act, Art. 137.</p> <p>County Act, 91, 106 (4), Art. 115.</p> <p>Invitations Minutes from meetings in the forums.</p> <p>List of attendances, Meetings at ward levels, Link between minutes and actual plans.</p>	<p>Maximum 3 points.</p> <p>All issues met (a-f): 3 points.</p> <p>4-5 met: 2 points.</p> <p>1-3 met: 1 point.</p>	3	<p>a).There were participatory planning and budget meetings held at Kimana Social Multi-Purpose Hall on 4/3/2016, Ilasit AIC church on 5/3/16 and Olchoro on 6/4/2016</p> <p>b).Additional Citizen Participation through consultation in smaller stakeholder groups were held in Osoita lodge-Ongata Rongai 9/5/16. Minutes for the meeting availed having various stakeholder inputs on</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			<p>guidelines issued by MoDP.</p> <p>d) Evidence that forums are structured (not just unstructured discussions)</p> <p>e) Evidence of input from the citizens to the plans, e.g. through minutes or other documentation</p> <p>f) Feed-back to citizens on how proposals have been handled.</p>	<p>List of suggestions from citizens, e.g. use of templates for this and reporting back.</p> <p>Feedback reports / minutes of meetings where feedback provided to citizens</p>			<p>budget</p> <p>c).Reports having minutes from various meetings availed to the team contained lists of attendees for the meetings and indicated inclusivity of various stakeholder groups. The attendance also included the Governor, people representing professionals, business leaders, leaders on labour issues, persons with disabilities and faith based organizations’/institutions as per the PFM act sec 137</p> <p>d). Forums were structured, agenda items for discussions provided, Input from citizens included in the report and minutes. Reports availed reflected the actual</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							<p>plans provided The reports also had views by citizens</p> <p>e)Reports containing suggestions from the citizens were availed to the team</p> <p>f).Feed-back to citizens was not provided as expected but a four year devolution milestones report was shared at the end of the four year period in office</p>
4.5.		Citizens' feed back	Citizen's feedback on the findings from the C-APR/implementation status report.	Records of citizens engagement meetings on the findings of the C-APR. Review evidence from how the inputs have been noted and adhered with and whether there is feed-back mechanism in place.	Maximum points: 1 Compliance: 1 point.	0	The County has not been able to produce the Annual Progress reports but a four year Devolution Milestones 2013-2017 report was shared at the end of the four year period in office. The report underlines the milestones achieved within the four year

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							period and an indicative expenditure in each respective department on the milestones achieved. However, the report follows no laid down format as per the C-APR structure. The report was done in April 2017. Since the County did not produce any C-APR, there are no records of engagement on the same
4.6		County core financial materials, budgets, plans, accounts, audit reports and performance assessments published	Publication (on county web-page, in addition to any other publication) of: i) County Budget Review and Outlook Paper ii) Fiscal Strategy Paper iii) Financial statements or annual budget execution report	PFM Act Art 131. County Act, Art. 91. Review county web-page. (N.B.) Publication of Budgets, County Integrated Development Plan and Annual Development Plan is covered in Minimum	Maximum points: 5 points 9 issues: 5 points 7-8 issues: 4 points 5-6 issues: 3 points	0	The County has NOT uploaded the following documents on their website i)County Budget Review and Outlook Paper ii)Fiscal Strategy Paper iii)Financial statements or annual budget

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
		and shared	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv) Audit reports of financial statements v) Quarterly budget progress reports or other report documenting project implementation and budget execution during each quarter vi) Annual progress reports (C-APR) with core county indicators vii) Procurement plans and rewards of contracts viii) Annual Capacity & Performance Assessment results ix) County citizens' budget 	Performance Conditions)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3-4 issues: 2 points 1-2 issues: 1 point 0 issues: 0 point. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> execution report iv)Audit reports of financial statements v)Quarterly budget progress reports or other report documenting project implementation and budget execution during each quarter vi)Annual progress reports (C-APR) with core county indicators vii)Procurement plans and rewards of contracts viii)Annual Capacity & Performance Assessment results ix)County citizens' budget
4.7		Publication of bills	All bills introduced by the county assembly have been published in	County Act, Art. 23. Review gazetted bills	Maximum 2 points	2	The County assembly bills and acts have been gazetted in the Kenya Gazette but not

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			the national and in county gazettes or county web-site, and similarly for the legislation passed.	and Acts, etc. Review county web-site.	Compliance: 2 points.		available online
Result Area 5. Investment implementation & social and environmental performance Max score: 20 points.							
5.1	Output against plan – measures of levels of implementation	Physical targets as included in the annual development plan implemented	The % of planned projects (in the ADP) implemented in last FY according to completion register of projects <i>Note: Assessment is done for projects planned in the Annual Development Plan for that FY and the final contract prices should be used in the calculation. Weighted measure where the size of the projects is factored in. If there are more than 10 projects a sample of 10 larger projects is made,</i>	Sample min 10 larger projects from minimum 3 departments/sectors. Points are only provided with 100 % completion against the plan for each project. If a project is multi-year, the progress is reviewed against the expected level of completion by end of last FY. Use all available documents in assessment, including: CoB reports,	Maximum 4 points (6 points in the first two AC&PAs).² More than 90 % implemented: 4 points (<u>6 points</u> in the first two AC&PAs). 85-90 %: 3 points 75-84%: 2 points 65-74%: 1 point Less than 65 %: 0 point.	0	The Project Completion register did not provide information to determine the completed projects against the ADP. The information on most of the projects was missing and some of the projects completed/ongoing are not in the ADP. The projects sampled ranged from 2013 to date

²As VFM is only introduced from the third ACPA, the 5 points for this are allocated across indicator 5.1 to 5.4 in the first two ACPA on the top scores in each PM, e.g. from 4 points to 6 points in the Performance Measure No. 5.1

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			and weighted according to the size.	procurement progress reports, quarterly reports on projects, M&E reports etc.	<p>If no information is available on completion of projects: 0 point will be awarded.</p> <p>An extra point will be awarded if the county maintains a comprehensive, accurate register of completed projects and status of all ongoing projects (within the total max points available, i.e. the overall max is 4 points/6 respectively in the first two AC&PA).</p>		<p>The projects sampled are:</p> <p>1.Construction of Isinya Market Budget: 24,900,247 Award: 19,995,952 Variance 20%</p> <p>2.Mile 46 market construction Budget: 24,358,802 Award:11,858,802.95 Variance 51%</p> <p>3.Cabro works Kitengela Budget:15,000,000 Award:19,952,800 Variance 32.58%</p> <p>4.Stalls Construction at Kitengela Bus Park</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							Budget:28,000,000 Award:26,399,825.76 Variance 17.5% 5.SultanHamud-Mashuuru Road Budget:20,000,000 Award: 19,989,816 Variance 0% 6.Singiraine Leremit Oltinkard road Budget:20,000,000 Award:19,890,539.84 Variance: 0% 7.Iseuri Bridge Budget:7,000,000 Award: 6,965,684 Variance 0% 8.Ilorero Bridge

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							Budget: 9,400,000 Award: 9390,002 Variance 0% 9.Olkirdish (Bwana Kala Road) Budget:10,000,000 Award: 9,999,200 Variance 0% 10. Upgrade of Namanga HC Budget: 10,118,134 Award:10,118,134 Variance 0%
5.2	Projects implemented according to cost estimates	Implementation of projects and in accordance with the cost	Percentage (%) of projects implemented within budget estimates (i.e. +/- 10 % of estimates).	Sample of projects: a sample of 10 larger projects of various size from a minimum of 3 departments/ sectors. Review budget,	Maximum 4 points. (5 points in the first two AC&PAs). More than 90 % of the projects are	1	The projects sampled were six out of ten projects and they had a variance of zero. This gave a percentage of 60% The projects sampled

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
		estimates		<p>procurement plans, contract, plans and costing against actual funding. If there is no information available, no points will be provided. If the information is available in the budget this is used. (In case there are conflicts between figures, the original budgeted project figure will be applied). Review completion reports, quarterly reports, payment records, quarterly progress reports, etc. Review M&E reports.</p> <p>Compare actual costs of completed project with original budgeted costs in the ADP/budget.</p>	<p>executed within +/-5 of budgeted costs: 4 points (5 points in the first two AC&PAs)</p> <p>80-90%: 3 points</p> <p>70-79%: 2 points</p> <p>60-69%: 1 point</p> <p>Below 60%: 0 points.</p>		<p>are:</p> <p>1.Construction of Isinya Market Budget: 24,900,247 Award: 19,995,952 Variance 20%</p> <p>2.Mile 46 market construction Budget: 24,358,802 Award:11,858,802.95 Variance 51%</p> <p>3.Cabro works Kitengela Budget:15,000,000 Award:19,952,800 Variance 32.58%</p> <p>4.Stalls Construction at Kitengela Bus Park Budget:28,000,000</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							Award:26,399,825.76 Variance 17.5% 5.SultanHamud-Mashuuru Road Budget:20,000,000 Award: 19,989,816 Variance 0% 6.Singiraine Leremit Oltinkard road Budget:20,000,000 Award:19,890,539.84 Variance: 0% 7.Iseuri Bridge Budget:7,000,000 Award: 6,965,684 Variance 0% 8.Ilorero Bridge Budget: 9,400,000

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							<p>Award: 9390,002</p> <p>Variance 0%</p> <p>9.Olkirdish (Bwana Kala Road)</p> <p>Budget:10,000,000</p> <p>Award: 9,999,200</p> <p>Variance 0%</p> <p>10. Upgrade of Namanga HC</p> <p>Budget: 10,118,134</p> <p>Award:10,118,134</p> <p>Variance 0%</p>
5.3	Maintenance	Maintenance budget to ensure sustainability	Maintenance cost in the last FY (actuals) was minimum 5 % of the total capital budgeted evidence in selected larger projects (projects which have been completed 2-3 years ago) have been sustained with actual	<p>Review budget and quarterly budget execution reports as well as financial statements.</p> <p>Randomly sample 5 larger projects, which have been completed 2-3 years ago.</p>	<p>Maximum 3 points (4 points in the first two AC&PAs).</p> <p>Maintenance budget is more than 5 % of capital budget and sample</p>	0	Maintenance costs for various projects have not been factored in the budgets. The sampled projects were the same in 5.2. Maintenance costs were allocated at the end of the projects and were lumped

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			maintenance budget allocations (sample of min. 5 larger projects).	Review if maintenance is above 5 % of the capital budget and evidence that budget allocations have been made for projects completed 2-3 years ago and evidence that funds have actually been provided for maintenance of these investments.	<p>projects catered for in terms of maintenance allocations for 2-3 years after: 3 points (4 in the first two AC&PA).</p> <p>More than 5 % but only 3-4 of the projects are catered for: 2 points.</p> <p>More than 5 % but only 1-2 of the specific sampled projects are catered for: 1 point.</p>		together ,thus making it difficult to ascertain the specific costs to a project
5.4	Screening of environmental social safeguards	Mitigation measures on ESSA through audit reports	Annual Environmental and Social Audits/reports for EIA /EMP related investments.	Sample 10 projects and ascertain whether environmental/social audit reports have been produced.	<p>Maximum points: 2 points (3 points in the first two AC&PAs)</p> <p>All 100 % of sample done in accordance with framework for all</p>	0	The County projects have not undergone any Environmental Impact Assessment. The projects that were sampled in 5.2 above did not have any EIAs or EMP

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
					<p>projects: 2 points (3 points in the first two AC&PAs)</p> <p>80-99 % of projects: 1 points</p>		
5.5	EIA /EMP procedures	EIA/EMP procedures from the Act followed.	<p>Relevant safeguards instruments Prepared: Environmental and Social Management Plans, Environmental Impact Assessment, RAP, etc. consulted upon, cleared/approved by NEMA and disclosed prior to commencement of civil works in case where screening has indicated that this is required. All building & civil works investments contracts contain ESMP implementation provisions (counties are expected to ensure their works contracts for which ESIA's /ESMPs have been prepared and</p>	Sample 5-10 projects	<p>All 100 % of sample done in accordance with framework for all projects: 2 points</p> <p>80-99 % of projects: 1 points</p>	0	<p>The projects sampled did not have any relevant safeguards instruments prepared well in advance of construction</p> <p>The sampled projects were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Construction of Isinya Market Budget: 24,900,247 2.Mile 46 market construction Budget: 24,358,802 3.Cabro works Kitengela Budget:15,000,000 4.Stalls Construction at

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			approved safeguards provisions from part of the contract.				Kitengela Bus Park Budget:28,000,000 5.SultanHamud-Mashuuru Road Budget:20,000,000 6.Singiraine Leremit Oltinkard road Budget:20,000,000 7. Upgrade of Namanga HC Budget: 10,118,134
5.6	Value for the Money (from the 3 rd AC&PA).	Value for the money.	Percentage (%) of projects implemented with a satisfactory level of value for the money, calibrated in the value for the money assessment tool.	To be included from the 3rd AC&PA only. A sample of minimum 5 projects will be reviewed. The methodology will be developed at a later date, prior to the 3 rd AC&PA. Note that a sample will	Maximum 5 points. To be developed during implementation based on the TOR for the VfM. Points: maximum 5, calibration between 0-5 points.		

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
				be taken of all projects, not only the ones, which are funded by the CPG. The % of projects (weighted by the size of the projects) with a satisfactory level of value for the money will be reflected in the score i.e. 80 % satisfactory projects= XX points, 70 % = XX points.	E.g. more than 90 % of projects Satisfactory: 5 points, more than 85 % 4 points, etc.		
					Total Maximum Score: 100 points.	26	

3.0 SUMMARY OF CAPACITY BUILDING REQUIREMENTS

3.1 Summary of Results

Table 6: Summary of Results for Minimum Access Conditions

Minimum Conditions for Capacity and Performance Grants (level 1)	Assessment Met/ Not Met
1. County signed participation agreement	Assessment Met
2. Capacity Building plan developed	Assessment Met
3. Compliance with investment menu of the grant	Not applicable
4. Implementation of CB plan	Not applicable

Table 7: Summary of Results Minimum Performance Conditions

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Assessment Met/ Not Met
Minimum Access Conditions Complied with Compliance with Minimum access conditions	To ensure minimum capacity and linkage between CB and Investments	Assessment Met
Financial Management Financial statements submitted	To reduce fiduciary risks	Assessment Met
Audit Opinion does not carry an adverse opinion or a disclaimer on any substantive issue	To reduce Fiduciary risks	Assessment Met
Planning Annual planning documents	To demonstrate a minimum level of capacity to plan and	Assessment Met

in place	manage funds	
Adherence with the investment menu	To ensure compliance with environmental and social safeguards and ensure efficiency in spending	Not Applicable
Procurement Consolidated procurement plans in place	To ensure procurement planning is properly coordinated from the central procurement unit	Assessment Met
County Core staff in place	Core staff in place as per County Government Act	Assessment Met
Environmental and social safeguards	To ensure that there is a mechanism and capacity to screen environmental and social risks	Assessment Met
Citizens' Complaint System in place	To ensure sufficient level of governance and reduce risks for mismanagement	Assessment Met

Table 8: Summary of Results for Performance Measures

Key Result Areas	Result/Score
KRA 1: Public Financial Management	9
KRA 2: Planning and monitoring and evaluation	5
KRA 3: Human Resources Management	1
KRA 4: Civic Education and Participation	10
KRA 5: Investment implementation & Social and environmental performance	1
TOTAL SCORE	26

The following is a summary of findings on capacity building requirements of the county based on the assessment (overall indicative areas) listed by Key Result Areas.

a) Public Finance management

- There is need to train relevant staff on the use of IFMIS Hyperion module, the budget current is prepared in excel and the uploaded into the system.
- Sensitization of relevant staff on the PFM requirements on submission due dates for budget quarterly report, preparation of monthly financial reports, publishing financial information such as the quarterly budget reports, financial reports, publishing of planning documents such as the CIDP, ADP CBROP, CFSP and the annual budgets.
- There is need to train staff on Asset management to ensure the county develop a comprehensive asset register.
- The county need to sensitize Procurement staff on the Public Procurement and Disposal Act 2015, related legislation and reporting obligation to the Public Procurement Regulatory Authority.
- Capacity building is required for relevant staff and the service providers on full adoption of e-procurement, the county has a challenge in full utilization of 25 steps of IFMIS e-procurement.

b) Human Resources

- Sensitize relevant personnel on the need to develop appraisals and performance contracts for staff and operationalize the same annually
- Relevant staff need to incorporate annual targets for the operationalization of the staff plans
- The Public Service Board's role and that of the Human resource personnel in the executive needs to be clearly spelt out to avoid the current stalemate on roles and appropriateness of responsibilities in order to deliver for the staff
- Sensitize County PSB on speedy appointments and perform complementary roles with the HRM department
- Develop capacity in service reengineering such as automation of revenue collection
- Initiate and develop innovative RRI on service delivery for county citizens in various departments

c) Environment and Social Safeguards

- Sensitize all County Staff in the department of Environment on EIA enforcement for all county projects
- Capacity building in screening of environmental social safeguards and follow up and implementation of EIA/EMP procedures.
- Short courses for key staff on EIAs/EAs process; conducting public participation processes, support continuous professional development and accreditations;
- Participation in workshops and conferences arranged by professional bodies and special interest groups/networks (e.g. NEMA);
- Sensitize County Assembly staff on the need to domesticate the EMCA and passing a policy on local aspects on environment

d) Monitoring and Evaluation

- Sensitization of county top management on the need to set up a County M&E Committee

- Sensitization of top county management on the need of establishing the planning and M&E function, designating planning and M&E staff in each line ministry and dedicating a budget line to the unit
- There is need for the county to fast-track approval of the draft M&E policy by CEC for implementation
- There is need to sensitize staff on the development of the ADP since the ADP does not contain the budget
- There is need to induct the M&E officers once recruited on their role in terms of production of the C-Annual Progress Reports and the need to evaluate major completed CIDP projects.

e) Civic education and participation

- Make operational a complaint handling system that is not reliant on individuals but a team. A complaints handling committee needs to be appointed so as to handle the diverse array of citizens' i.e. urban elite and rural illiterate.
- Institutionalize publication of relevant County documents for public consumption on the website as well as other appropriate form for the rural illiterate such as pre-recorded media in local dialect
- Review and develop public participation and information dissemination methodologies that respond to the specific circumstances and socio-cultural context of Kajiado. There is also a need to develop shared forms of information to suit the urban set up and rural illiterate citizens
- Reports of all County activities need to be captured and shared in the annual progress reports. The reports can take the form of alternative pre-recorded messaging suitable for the illiterate rural folk

4.0 CHALLENGES IN THE ASSESSMENT

The following were some of the key challenges encountered during the process of undertaking the assignment.

- The input of the County Assembly was very minimal only limited to provision of Hansard report for budget approval, the followings were not provided; procurement plan, Hansard proceeding for scrutiny of audit reports and the bills that have been tabled, deliberated and passed by the assembly.
- The county only provided one out of the five sampled procurement files required by the assessment team to review compliance with procurement procedures on thresholds and method of sourcing service providers.
- The whole environment team failed to appear for the assessment throughout the period of the assessment
- The public service board did not provide any documentation in relation to the County staff
- The County assembly were not part of the devolution team and did not have information on the assessment. The relevant personnel could not avail documentation

5.0 SPECIFIC AND GENERAL COMMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL ASPECTS OF THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Issues raised and respective recommendations made by individual aspect of assessment, i.e. MACs, MPCs and PMs are provided in the following sections 5.1 to 5.3.

5.1 MAC's

The signed participation agreement in place as well as the capacity building plans.

5.2 MPC's Issues

- Financial statements for assembly carry an adverse opinions.
- The planning documents are in place, however they are not published
- Procurement plans availed are not consolidated
- Core staffing is in place except for M&E officer.
- EIA and Environmental and Social Safeguards systems were not fully applied and enforced although the EMCA act was passed by the County Assembly.
Civic Complaints system was not in place and needs to be effected so that citizen's complaints are fully addressed.

5.3 PMs

KRA 1: Public Finance Management

The following observations were made:

- IFMIS Hyperion is only used for uploading the budget developed in excel format.
- E procurement (IFMIS) has not been fully adopted to enable end to end procurement processes
- The county commenced automation of revenue collection, report and accountability in phases starting with sub counties in April 2017, there is need to fast tract the process.
- The county failed to provide forwarding letters to confirm the quarterly budget reports were submitted to County assembly and copies to CoB, CRA and national Treasury on time
- There is need to sensitize management on preparation of monthly financial reports, these reports will enable management monitor financial performance and take prompt corrective actions when need be.
- Though the county has developed an asset register, they is need to train staff to enable them make the register comprehensive
- The county executive has constituted an internal audit committee that has been inducted, and held two meetings to review the annual audit work plan and the internal

audit reports, however no information was provided on status of audit committee in the county assembly. The audit staff for county assembly were said to be on leave.

- The county assembly did not provide the hansard reports to confirm scrutiny and follow up of audit reports
- The county availed one out of five sampled procurement files the assessors required to review compliance with procurement procedures on thresholds and method of sourcing service providers.

KRA 2: Planning and Monitoring & Evaluation

- The county has not established planning, and M&E unit
- There are no designated planning and M&E officers in each line ministry
- The county is yet to constitute County M&E committee
- Whereas CIDP, ADP and Budgets are in place, however the planning documents have not been published on the county website.
- The county does not prepare the annual progress report, hence not able to determine what informed the development of the ADP and the Budget

KRA 3: Human Resource

- There was no approved staffing plan in place. The capacity of the staff needs to be built to understand and appreciate their own annual targets and those of the County
- Staff Appraisals and performance contracting tools not available and no appraisals had been done and no performance contracting in place.
- There is no skills and competency framework. Capacity to develop and operationalize is required
- Uptake of technology in the County to re-engineer collection of revenue should be prioritized so as to ensure personal responsibility by the citizens in participating in development.
- The County should also ensure a Rapid Results Initiates on service delivery is initiated to avoid compromising on quality and timeliness of service

KRA 4: Civic Educations and Participation

- There is a Civic Education Unit (CEU) in place that has communication frameworks for effective engagement with the citizens.
- The CEU needs to have a proper and active link with CSOs in the County to utilize on their capacity and network to roll out its activities and partnerships.
- There is no feedback and sharing of memorandum from public on county reports such as the Devolution Milestones report

- Core financial materials/information on plans, budgets, accounts, audit reports and assessments are neither published in the website nor shared with the public despite these being public documents

KRA 5 Investments and Social Environment Performance

- Project completion registers are available but do not have adequate project information in place.
- Projects are initially budgeted without maintenance costs. These maintenance costs are then introduced in the year immediately after the project ends and are all lump sum amounts. This makes it very hard to determine the exact maintenance costs allocated to any specific project.
- County Government and County Assembly have implemented development projects without any of them being screened for the EIA. Projects sampled do not have any environmental and social safeguards procedures followed.
- The projects do not have any social safeguard plans and/or procedures/instruments prepared. There are no environmental and social management plans available thus none of the county projects bear NEMA approvals.

6.0 NOTIFICATION OF DISAGREEMENT WITH THE OUTCOME OF THE ASSESSMENT ALREADY NOTED DURING THE FIELD-TRIP

- No notice of disagreement was noted as the team gave an overview of their experience during the assessment and a highlight of the weak areas that needed improvement and which the County staff admitted as a need.
- None of the Quality assurance variation issues have arose so far on the assessment report.

7.0 OVERVIEW OF THE 5 WEAKEST PERFORMANCES

Table 9: Areas of the county of weakest performance during the field visit.

KRA	Performance Measure	Issues
KRA 1	Public Finance Management	<p>The County needs to build capacity in use of IFMIS Hyperion in development of budget.</p> <p>The County needs to build capacity to enable it fully embraces E procurement (IFMIS).</p> <p>The County commenced automation of revenue collection, reporting and accountability in phases starting with sub counties in April 2017, there is need to fast track the process.</p> <p>There is need to sensitize management on preparation of monthly financial reports, these reports will enable management monitor financial performance and enable the county take prompt corrective action when need be.</p>
KRA 2	Planning &M&E	<p>The County needs to ensure planning, and M&E unit is established.</p> <p>Once the unit is established, the County will need to appoint designated planning and M&E officers in each line ministry</p> <p>The County will need to constitute County M&E committee</p>
KRA 3	Human Resource Management	<p>The County Government needs to ensure that the staff appraisals and Performance Contracting is done and on an annual basis.</p> <p>A skills and competency framework needs to be established to guide capacity in the county on delivery</p> <p>The roles of the Public Service Board and Human Resource need to be streamlined to ensure service delivery and provision of requisites in the County Human Resource</p>

<p>KRA 4</p>	<p>Civic Education and Participation</p>	<p>There is no complaints/grievances committee in place</p> <p>The County core financial material including financial statements and budget execution reports, audit reports, quarterly budget progress reports, annual progress reports (C-APR) and procurement plans and award of contracts are not published on the website</p> <p>There is a need to develop relevant structures for a communication framework that is suitable for both the urban elites and the illiterate rural folk of Kajiado County</p>
<p>KRA 5</p>	<p>Investment implementation & social and environmental performance</p>	<p>The absolute failure by the County Government to ensure that all county projects that require screening are subjected to environmental and social audits before commencement</p> <p>The failure by County Government to provide specific budget for maintenance on all projects to ensure sustainability</p>

ANNEXTURE

ANNEX 1: MINUTES OF THE ENTRANCE MEETING

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL CAPACITY AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT ENTRY MEETING HELD ON 31st JULY 2017 AT THE GOVERNOR'S BOARDROOM KAJIADO COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Present

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 1. Peter Ntiaki | Head of Human Resource Management(Chair) |
| 2. Jonathan Turere | Director Budget and Economic Planning |
| 3. Priscilla Mungai | Deputy Director Budget |
| 4. Antony Saitabai | Manager Public Participation |
| 5. Rachael Keteko | Manager ICT |
| 6. Fred Swalah | Principal Planner |
| 7. Emmily Kwambai | Statistician |
| 8. Maryanne Kariuki | Economist |
| 9. Teresa Kambari | Accountant |
| 10. Joel Katampoi | Sub County Revenue Officer |

MGA Team

- | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Rutto Kibiwott David | Consultant/Team Leader |
| Whycliffe Imoite Ijackaa | Consultant |
| Mary Kitelo | Support Consultant |

AGENDA

1. Introduction
2. Matengo Githae & associates presentation
3. AOB

Min 1 Introduction

The meeting started with a word of at 10.35 am by Teresa Kambari. Mr. Jonathan Turere who chaired the meeting welcomed all members present and requested everyone to introduce themselves. He assured the members that the county was ready and officers involved have prepared documents.

He informed the members of the funding which County was to receive but had not been disbursed. He noted that the County Officials were ready since the same exercise had been carried out with other partners.

Min 3. Assessment team

The Assessment team leader thanked the County representatives for warm welcome. He noted that teamwork was key to success of the exercise.

He explained the check list and the indicative person to interact with throughout the assessment. He informed the County members that the exercise was not Audit but assessment and that the information and documentation will be confidential and safe.

He reminded the member that the assessment was evidence based and therefore documentation were key for exercise.

He informed members of three key areas of assessment which are minimum access condition, minimum performance condition, and performance measures. In minimum performance condition, he informed the meeting that two areas were not being assessed at the time of exercise.

In performance condition, the assessment were divided into five key result areas which were KRA 1, KRA 2, KRA 3, KRA 4, KRA 5.

He informed members that an exit meeting will be held on the third day to share issues that might arise from the assessment.

Min. AOB

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 12.09 p.m.

ANNEX 2: MINUTES OF THE EXIT MEETING

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL CAPACITY AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT EXIT MEETING HELD ON 2ND JULY 2017 AT THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT OF KAJIADO BOARDROOM.

1	Priscilla Mungai	Deputy Director Budget (Chair)
2	Jonathan Turere	Director Planning
3	Antony Saitabai	Manager Public Participation
4	Emmily Kwambai	Statistician
5	Maryanne Kariuki	Economist
6	John G Njoroge	Office Assistant
7	Samson Sirere	Principal Fiscal Analyst

MGA Team

Rutto Kibiwott David	Consultant /Team Leader
Whycliffe Imoite Ijackaa	Consultant
Mary Kitelo	Support Consultant

AGENDA

1. Opening remarks
2. Key finding of the assessment
3. A.O.B

Min 1. Opening remarks

The meeting was called to order at 12.56 pm and a member Emmily Kwambai was requested to offer a word of prayer. Priscilla Mungai who chaired the meeting welcomed all members present. She appreciated all county official for the willingness to share information as well as avail document required for the assessment. She thanked the consulting time for the patience accorded to ensure the exercise ran smoothly.

She noted of the challenges the County went through in availing the documents and embrace the assessment as it was an eye opener for them for future assessment.

Min 2 Key finding of the assessment

The consultants went through the general findings and areas of weaknesses as follows

a) Minimum Performance Condition

- The county executive prepared a consolidated procurement plan that incorporated all departments. The county assembly did not provide its procurement plan due to absence of the procurement personnel who was said to be on leave.
- The setting up the planning, and M&E unit, recruitment of designated planning and M&E officers and the constitution of County M&E committee is awaiting the approval of county M&E policy / framework document.
- The County has a 25 member Environment committee in place which was appointed vide gazette notice no. 1418 dated 4th March 2016. However the committee has not held even a single meeting for the purposes of transacting environmental matters
- The County to date does not undertake any Environment Impact Assessments as witnessed in all the projects proposed, ongoing and completed. The biggest challenge emanates from the initial planning of projects which does not incorporate EIA/EMP and screening
- The County has not established Complaints Committee though complaints are currently attended to through various departments.
- No complaints form/template is available for recording complaints and resolution of the same.
- The budget is developed in excel and then uploaded into IFMIS Hyperion Module

b) Performance measures

KRA 1

- Though the budget is captured in IFMIS Hyperion Module, it was observed that it was prepared in excel and uploaded.
- E procurement (IFMIS) has not been fully adopted to enable end to end procurement processes
- The county commenced automation of revenue collection, report and accountability in phases starting with sub counties in April 2017, however there is need to fast tract the process.
- The county failed to provide forwarding letters to confirm the quarterly budget reports were submitted to County assembly and copies to Cob, CRA and the National Treasury on time.
- The county need sensitization in preparation of monthly reports which is a requirement for management decision.
- Though the county has developed an asset register, they is need to train staff to enable them make the register comprehensive

- The County Executive internal audit unit has an approved work plan and prepares reports on quarterly basis which are then submitted to internal audit committee for review. However we could not get the status of county assembly internal audit unit since the internal auditor was on leave.

KRA 2

- It was noted that the county has not established planning M & E unit as a result County Annual progress Reports were not prepared.
- In the absence of the financial year 2015/2016 financial statement hence assessors were not able to determine whether the annual financing requirement for full implementation of CIDP does not exceed 200% of the 2015/2016 total revenue.
- The county does not prepare the annual progress report, hence not able to determine what informed the development of the ADP and the Budget

KRA 3

- The County does not have staffing plans and there are no annual targets since the entire role is with public service board.
- The county prepares CARPS reports but it has not been adopted by the PSB.
- The County does not have a skills and competency framework in place for its staff
- Uptake of technology in the County to re-engineer collection of revenue should be prioritized so as to ensure personal responsibility by the citizens in participating in development.
- The County should also ensure a Rapid Results Initiates on service delivery is initiated to avoid compromising on quality and timeliness of service

KRA 4

- There is a Civic Education Unit (CEU) in place that has communication frameworks for effective engagement with the citizens.
- The CEU needs to have a proper and active link with CSOs in the County to utilize on their capacity and network to roll out its activities and partnerships.
- There is no feedback and sharing of memorandum from public on county reports such as the Devolution Milestones report
- Core financial materials/information on plans, budgets, accounts, audit reports and assessments are neither published in the website nor shared with the public despite these being public documents

KRA 5

- Project completion registers are available but do not have adequate project information in place.
- Projects are initially budgeted without maintenance costs. These maintenance costs are then introduced in the year immediately after the project ends and are all lump sum amounts. This makes it very hard to determine the exact maintenance costs allocated to any specific project.
- County Government and County Assembly have implemented development projects without any of them being screened for the EIA. Projects sampled do not have any environmental and social safeguards procedures followed.
- The projects do not have any social safeguard plans and/or procedures/instruments prepared. There are no environmental and social management plans available thus none of the county projects bear NEMA approvals.

Min 3 A.O.B

There being no other business the meeting adjourned at 01.49pm