ELGEYO MARAKWET COUNTY ANNUAL CAPACITY & PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT (ACPA) REPORT

From

17th to 21st July 2017

Presented by Lead Consultant

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

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

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS 1
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT 2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3
1.1 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 32
3.0 SUMMARY OF CAPACITY BUILDING REQUIREMENTS 89
3.1: SUMMARY OF RESULTS 89
4.0 CHALLENGES IN THE ASSESSMENT 94
5.0 SPECIFIC AND GENERAL COMMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL ASPECTS OF THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS 95
5.1 MAC's 95
5.2 MPC's Issues 95
5.3 PMs 95
6.0 NOTIFICATION OF DISAGREEMENT 97
7.0 OVERVIEW OF THE 5 WEAKEST PERFORMANCE 98
APPENDIX 1: ENTRY MEETING MINUTES 99
APPENDIX 2: EXIT MEETING MINUTES 102

ACRONYMS

ACPA	-	Annual Capacity and Performance Assessment
ADP	-	Annual Development Plans
CB	-	Capacity Building
CEC	-	County Executive Committee
CFAR	-	County Financial and Accounting Report
CGEM	-	County Government of Elgeyo Marakwet
CIDP	-	County Integrated Development Plan
CO	-	Chief Officer
CPG	-	County Performance Grants
CPSB	-	County Public Service Board
EA	-	Environmental Audits
EIA	-	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMCA	-	Environmental Management and Coordination Act
FS	-	Financial Secretary
FY	-	Financial Year
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 the entire staff of Elgeyo Marakwet County Government and County Assembly Officials, senior management and staff who participated in the Annual Capacity and Performance Assessment.

In particular the team acknowledges the leadership roles by the **County Secretary, Paul Cheboi Chemuttut**, who welcomed the team during a courtesy call to his office early Monday morning on 17th July 2017. The assessment team notes with a lot of appreciation the key roles played by **Mr John Maritim** who is the **KDSP Elgeyo Marakwet County Focal Person** including chairing the Exit Meeting and also various roles played singularly and jointly by **KRAs Focal Persons** for all entry arrangements, staff mobilization and arranging for assessment sessions and also chairing the Entry Meeting on Mon 17th July 2017. Further the team acknowledges participation and involvement of all staff who participated in Exit Meeting on 19th July 2017.

To all county staff who made valuable contributions, provided data and information and other also who played supportive roles throughout the assessment and document review processes, the assessment team appreciates your time, efforts and dedication to make the process of ACPA a success.

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 assessment aims to achieve three complementary roles, namely:

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 form 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 assessment criteria.

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

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

ACPA Measures	Outcome
MAC	All have complied with MAC except for item 3 and 4 which has not been implemented
MPC	The County has met 7 MPCs, MPC 5-Adherence to Investment Menu is not applicable in this assessment as it has not been implemented. The County did not meet MPC 3 on Audit Opinion

ACPA Measures	Outcome	Score
PM	KRA 1: Public Financial Management	9
	KRA 2: Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	18
	KRA 3: Human Resource Management	5
	KRA 4: Civic Education and Participation	7
	KRA 5: Investment implementation & Social and environmental performance	8
	TOTAL	**47**

Achievement

Identified areas of achievements are as follows:

1. The County has an Internal Audit committee recently inaugurated to offer oversight responsibilities on the activities of the county;
2. The County has developed well planned and functioning Planning and M&E system, framework and documentation process;
3. The County has established a Planning M&E Unit, has a functioning Planning and M&E Committee;
4. M&E systems are in place and in use, county produces C-APRs on schedule;
5. The county produces popular versions of major documents such as CIDP for public consumption and produces, a quarterly bulleting (in collaboration with The Standard Newspaper), Ward Development Booklets for every Ward (there are 20 Wards) which update citizens on topical issues of governance specific to the Ward, e.g. development investments, budgets, abridged M&E reports etc. The county also hosts Town Hall Open Forum in collaboration with Radio Citizen for interactive sessions between the county government and citizens.;
6. The County has core staff duly appointed and in place with clear job descriptions and mandates; their respective positions provided for in the organization structure;
7. The County has operationalized performance contracting for CEC Members, COs and Directors; and
8. Screening of investments for EIAs/EAs and approved/licenced investments by NEMA have EMPs to mitigate against negative environmental and social impacts.

Weakness

The following are identified areas of weaknesses:

1. Citizens' complaints/grievance committee is not established while appropriate process and procedures are inadequate;
2. In year reports (monthly/quarterly) are not produced;

3. Sector expenses are not produced to monitor performance against budgets;
4. Procurement storage facilities for its records and documents are not well secured;
5. Procurement plans are not updated/reviewed when budgets are adjusted;
6. The County is yet to formally appoint/nominate Planning, M&E focal persons at departments, sub counties and ward levels;
7. The County does not maintain completion of projects register to track its activities;
8. Organization structure is not approved;
9. The County has not operationalized staff appraisal and performance management systems;
10. The County does not have skills and competency framework;
11. The County has not undertaken service re-engineering nor initiated RRIs;
12. Annual staffing levels not met;
13. The County has does not have a policy, guidelines, systems and framework to conduct civic education as well as on communication with citizens and stakeholders;
14. No policy, guidelines or framework to guide management and enforcement compliance with environmental and social safeguards regulations;
15. County Environment Committee is not established; and
16. The County does not allocate budgetary resources to support maintenance and commensurate with additional investments (infrastructure, plant and equipment).

Challenges

The following challenges were encountered:

1. Lack of documents and delays to access verification documents;
2. Poor and unreliable Internet Connectivity;
3. Unreliability of the IFMIS system hence getting some reports from the system was a major challenge; and
4. The input of the County Assembly was rather minimal only to the extent of the bills and acts passed and financial statement;

Areas of improvements

The following are proposed areas of improvements:

1. County to establish citizens' complaints/grievance committee; to develop, operationalize and publicize a comprehensive citizens' complaints/grievance framework, guidelines, process and procedures;
2. Procurement plans to be updated/reviewed when budgets are adjusted;
3. Develop and maintain a completion of assets register;
4. The County to formally appoint/nominate Planning, M&E focal persons at departments, sub counties and ward levels;
5. The County to approve organization structure, to operationalize staff appraisal and performance management systems, and to develop a skills and competency framework for job holders;
6. The County to prioritize and plan to undertaken service re-engineering and initiated RRIs for improvement of service delivery;

7. The County formulate and approve a policy, guidelines, systems and framework to conduct civic education and collaborations with NGOs;
8. The County to develop a policy and framework for communication with citizens and stakeholders;
9. The County to develop policy, guidelines or framework to guide management and enforcement compliance with environmental and social safeguards regulations;
10. The County Environment Committee to be established;
11. The County to allocate budgetary resources to support maintenance and commensurate with additional investments (infrastructure, plant and equipment)

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 on 17th uly, 2017. 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 Elgeyo Marakwet County Government and County Assembly Officials, senior management and staff who were knowledgeable in areas that related to the ACPA assessment 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 Elgeyo Marakwet County team to share key issues identified in the assessment on 19th July, 2017. This was meant 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.
- Way forward.

1.2 Time Plan

Table 2: Activity Work Plan

Activity	17th July 2017	18th July 2017	19th July 2017	20th July 2017	21st July 2017
Inception meeting					
Assessing the Minimum Access Conditions					
Assessing minimum Performance Measures					
Assessing Performance Measures					
Visit to County projects					
Exit meeting					
Preparing draft 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

MACs and PG (level 1)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment	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**	Participation Agreement signed and stamped by the Governor on 15th June 2016. The agreement was reviewed by the assessment team and a copy was retained.
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 for the county based on the self-assessment of the KDSP indicators: MACs, MPC and PMs. Approved, stamped and signed CB Plan by Focal Person and County Secretary on 30th June 2017 was reviewed by the assessment team and

MACs and PG (level 1)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment	Detailed Assessment Finding
		Manual (annex).			a copy retained.
3. Compliance with investment menu of the grant	Important to ensure quality of the CB support and targeting of the activities.	Compliance with investment menu (eligible expenditure) of the Capacity and Performance Grant) documented in progress reports. MoV: Review of grant and utilization – progress reports. Reporting for the use of CB grants for previous FYs in accordance with the Investment menu		N/A	Funds had not been disbursed
4. Implementation of CB plan	Ensure actual implementation.	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. MoV: Review financial statements and use of CB + narrative of activities (quarterly reports and per the Grant Manual).		N/A	Program implementation delayed and funding is yet to be released.

2.2 Minimum Performance Conditions

Table 4: Summary of results for Minimum Performance Conditions

MPCs for CPG (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**	Participation Agreement signed and stamped by the Governor; CB plan approved, stamped and signed
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 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	3 months after closure of the FY (30th of September). Complied with if the county is submitting individual department statements: 3 months after end of FY for department	**Met**	Individual Financial Statements 2015/2016 submitted by 30/09/2016 as confirmed on stamped reports. The reports are in auditable formats. Reports are signed off by the Chief Officer-Finance & Economic Planning and Director of Accounting. Consolidated Financial Statements for the FY

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		statements are submitted for each department, the county must also submit consolidated statements by 31st October. The FS has to be in an auditable format. MoV: Annual financial statements (FSs), submission letters to Office of the Auditor General (OAG) + records in OAG.	statements and 4 months after end of FY for consolidated statement. If the council is only submitting consolidated statement: Deadline is 3 months after end of FY.		2015/16 are in place.
3. Audit opinion does not carry an adverse opinion, or a disclaimer on any substantive issue	To reduce fiduciary risks	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. MoV: Audit reports from Office of the Auditor General. **Transitional arrangements:** Transitional arrangements are in place as audit report may be disclaimed due to balance	Note. This will be last trigger for release as report is not yet there upon time for the ACPA. ***Transitional arrangements:*** First ACPA where MPCs are applied i.e. in the 2016 ACPA: Issues are defined for the core issues, which	**Not Met**	Audited financial statements for the year ended 30th June 2016 for the County Executive was issued with a Disclaimer of Opinion while the County Assembly had Adverse Opinion. Basis for Disclaimer of Opinion for the County Executive were; **1.** There was a variance between receipts as per IFMIS and the financial statements of KES 2,840,737,615 **2.** Personnel costs as per the financial statements

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		sheet issues. First year where the Minimum Performance Conditions are applied (i.e. 2nd AC&PA starting in September 2016) the conditions are as follows: Audit report shows that the county has: • 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 and revised budget; • 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	disqualify counties as per audit reports, see previous column.		varied with the payroll by KES 47,691,259 3. There were unauthorized changes to the bill of quantities during the construction of Kamaring stadium 4. Asset in the financial statements and the register had a variance of KES 534,414,119 5. Assets inherited from the former local authorities are not included in the financial statements 6. Staff costs were 43% of the total expenditures above the limit of 35% 7. There was under absorption of the budget by 22% 8. 98% of the staff were from the dominant tribe above the 70% limit The basis of adverse opinion for the Assembly were; 1. The statement of budget had a variance with IFMIS amounting

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					to KES 98,923,288 2. Statements of receipts and payments from the exchequer indicates KES 439,951,066 while the, controller of budget indicated KES , 419,470,000 3. Expenses amounting to KES 14,549,290 were not supported 4. There was delay in the completion of some projects There was no asset register 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	At the point of time of the ACPA, which will take place in Sep-Nov, the plans for current year are reviewed.	Met	CIDP 2013/17 Annual Development Plan, 2015/16 and budgets for the period 2015/16 approved and published on-line.

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		and review of county web-site.			
Use of funds in accordance with Investment menu					
5. Adherence with the investment menu	To ensure compliance with the environmental and social safeguards and ensure efficiency in spending.	Adherence with the investment menu (eligible expenditures) as defined in the PG Grant Manual. MoV: 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) Review budget progress reports submitted to CoB.	In 2016 ACPA (Q3 2016) this MPC will not be measured as the level 2 grant starts only from FY 2017/18.	**N/A**	The investment menu relates to the actual capacity building grant which is yet to be disbursed.
Procurement					
6. Consolidated Procurement plans in place.	To ensure procurement planning is properly	Up-dated consolidated procurement plan for executive and for assembly (or combined plan for both).	At point of the ACPA (for current year)	**Met**	Procurement plan for 2015/2016 is in place. County Assembly maintains developed its procurement

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
	coordinated from the central procurement unit instead at departmental, and to ensure sufficient capacity to handle discretionary funds.	MoV: Review procurement plan of each procurement entity and county consolidated procurement plan and check 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. 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.			plans but not updated to reflect budgets revisions. Procurement plans for County executive original procurement plans are in place but not updated to reflect revised budgets. Original procurement plans encompass the original budget plans as planned.
Core Staffing in Place					
7. County Core staff in place	To ensure minimum capacity	Core staff in place as per below list (see also County	At the point of time for the	**Met**	Yes, the core staff are in place and the respective positions are provided for

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
	in staffing	Government Act Art. 44). The following staff positions should be in place: • The country secretary • Chief officer of finance, • 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 MoV: 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	ACPA.		in the organization structure. The assessment team reviewed respective personal files (official HR records), interacted and interviewed many of the core persons as evidenced in minutes of entry and exit meetings (Annex 1 and 2). Further the assessment team verified the following: County Secretary, Mr Paul Chemuttut was among candidates interviewed by County Public Service Board. His appointment approved by County Assembly as indicated in Daily Hansard of 22/11/2016, 1st Assembly 4th Session no. 110 which was reviewed by the assessment team. He was appointed through letter ref: EMC/ADM/CEC/13/01/18 of 28/11/2016 which specifies his job descriptions and

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		schemes of service.			responsibilities. He holds an MBA (Moi Univ.), B.Ed (KU) and various advanced public management courses with Kenya School of Government. His pay and salary structure is as directed by Salaries and Remuneration Commission Circular no. SRC/TS/CGOVT/3/61(84) of 31/7/2014. He satisfies job requirements as specified in the County Govt. Act 2012 Art 44. Chief Of Finance is Mr Jeremiah Rotich Changwony was among candidates interviews by County Public Service Board. His appointment approved by County Assembly as per Daily Hansard of 8/07/2014, 1st Assembly 2nd Session no. 115 which was reviewed by the assessment team. He was appointed through letter ref:

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					EMC/ADM/CEC/14/12 of 13/04/2014 which spells out his job descriptions and responsibilities. He is pursuing a D. Phil (Business Management – Finance); he holds MBA (Finance), Bachelor of Business Mgt (Moi Univ.), CPS (K), Member of ICPAK and a Certified Securities and Investment Analyst. His pay and salary structure is as directed by Salaries and Remuneration Commission Circular no. SRC/TS/CGOVT/3/61(84) of 31/7/2014. He satisfies job requirements as specified in the County Govt. Act 2012 Art 45. Planning Officer Mr John Kipyegon Martim was interviewed and appointed by County Public Service Board to the position by letter EMB/PSB/ADM/14/19 on 3/02/2014 which spells out his job descriptions

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					and responsibilities. He holds a Masters of Int.Dev Studies (Japan), B.A. Econ (moi Univ) and several short courses on Project Management, M&E Financial Management and Induction Course for Economists with Kenya School of Government. He satisfies the national government Scheme of Service for Economists and Statisticians. His salary, pay structure and allowances are guided civil service remunerations for Economists. Internal Auditor, Mr Paul Nzimba Mutua was interviewed and appointed by County Public Service Board to the position by letter EMB/PSB/ADM/14/9 on 14/01/2014 which spell out his job description and responsibilities. He holds a B.Com (Finance), Member of ICPAK, CPA (K), A

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					member of Certified Fraud Examiners, Member of Institute of Internal Auditors and has attended several short courses on auditing and financial management. He meets requirements of national government Scheme of Service for Accountants. His salary, pay structure and allowances are guided civil service remunerations for Audit staff. Procurement Officer, Mr Robert Kiprop Chelagat was interviewed and appointed by County Public Service Board to the position by letter EMB/PSB/ADM/14/4 on 13/01/2014 which spells out his job descriptions and responsibilities. He holds a Moi Univ. Bachelor of Business Management (Accounting); MBA (Strategic Management), Kabarak University and is

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					a Member of Kenya Inst of Supplies Management. He meets requirements of national government Scheme of Service for Supply Chain Management Personnel. His salary, pay structure and allowances are guided by remunerations for procurement staff in national govt. civil service. Head of County Treasury/ Accountant is Mr Philip Kimosop Seronei was interviewed and appointed by County Public Service Board to the position by letter EMB/PSB/ADM/14/10 on 14/01/2014 which spells out his job descriptions and responsibilities. He holds a Bachelor of Business Management and a MBA (Financial Management). He is appointed on Scheme of Service for Accountants from the national

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					government and his salary, pay structure and allowances. Environment officer is Mr. Charles Chelimo Suter. He was interviewed and appointed by County Public Service Board and appointed to the position by letter EMB/PSB/DRC/010/2015 on 9/01/2015 which spell out his job descriptions and responsibilities. He holds a B.Sc. in Forestry (Moi Univ.), A Cert and Dip in Forestry from Kenya Forestry Collage. He is a Registered and Licenced by NEMA as an Associate Expert in EIAs/EAs which enriches his skills and experiences as a Focal Person to manage Environmental and Social Safeguard issues. He is appointed on scheme of service for Natural Resources Staff from the

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					national government and his salary, pay structure and allowances. By a letter ref: EMC/ADM/65/II/54 of 30th Nov 2017 he was appointed as a Focal Person for Environment and Social Safeguards. M&E Officer is Mr Titus Biwott Kosgei. He was seconded to the county from MODP by letter 201000556-41/43 of 26/8/2014 and appointed to the position by the county government on 24/09/2014 by letter ref; EMC/EPD/S1/17 which gives his job description and responsibilities. He holds a B.A. (Economics & Statistics). He is appointed on Scheme of Service for Economists and Statisticians from the national government and his salary, pay structure and allowances. Elgeyo Marakwet meets all

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					the core staff criteria and is therefore assessed MET.
Environmental and Social Safeguards					
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.	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. To avoid significant adverse environmental and social impacts To promote environmental and social benefits and ensure sustainability	1. Counties endorse and ratify the environmental and social management system to **guide investments** (from the ACPA starting September 2016). 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). 3) Prepare relevant **RAP for all investments with any displacement. Project Reports for investments for submission to NEMA**. (From the 3nd AC&PA, Sept. 2017). Sample 5-10 projects. 4. Establishment of County Environment Committee.	Note that the first installment of the expanded CPG investment menu covering sectoral investments starts from July 2017 (FY 2017/18). 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 utilization of the expanded grant menu (i.e.	**Met**	1. In a letter ref: LWENR/NEMA/Vol. 1/(04) of 28/11/2017 the county requested NEMA for support and capacity to regulate devolved functions under EMCA (Amendment) 2015 Act which is accepted by NEMA in their response letter ref: NEMA/EMT/CEC/2 of 29/11/2018. Therefore, the county collaborates with NEMA in all aspects of investments following EMCA law and regulations. There is an Environmental Bill (2015) which is going through process of finalization/approval 2. County Government presented reports for 10

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
	To provide opportunity for public participation and consultation in safeguards process (free, prior and informed consultations – FPIC)	MoV: Review endorsements 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. * 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.	in the 3rd AC&PA, see the previous column for details).		investments qualifying to undergo screening and EIA. 9 investments are approved after screening and therefore licenced by NEMA (these are gen ref NEMA/PR/EMT/5/2: then specific projects references are: 1 0070 – Proposed Wildlife Restocking for Rimoi Reserve; 2 0050 – Proposed Improvements to Kamariny Stadium; 3 0065 – Proposed Tomato Processing Plant at Kibendo Emsoo; 4 0064 – Proposed Potato Cold Storage at Kipyego; 5 0058 – Proposed Residence for the Governor at Iten Town; 6 0088 – Proposed Extensions/renewals for Kamariny Stadium; 7 0094 – Proposed

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					Chesewen-Mogil Access Road (gravel); 8 0097 – Proposed Maro-Wewei-Mungwo (gravel) Access Road; 9 0096 – Proposed Rehabilitation of Iten Health Facility; and 10 Proposed Passion Fruit Processing Plant at Kipkabus is undergoing review by NEMA 3. N/A. Reported county has not implemented a project involving RAP. 4. County presented signed copies of Gazette Notice ref: CMC/ADM/6310 of 29/11/2017 and proforma by Government Printer to Gazette County Environment Committee. Names of nominated persons from

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					county/national govt. departments and other stakeholders forwarded to the Government Printer to be gazetted. The county has an operational County Environmental Technical Committee, copies of members and minutes of two meetings were presented to the assessment team during the field visits. Following the consensus arrived at during the stakeholder consultative forum on 27th Nov 2017 at Kenya School of Government, that CETC can stand in as counties prepare to formalize appointment of CEC the assessment is MET.

MPCs for CPG (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.	Established an operational Complaints Handling System, including a: (a) complaints/grievance committee to handle complaints pertaining to fiduciary, environmental and social systems. b) A designated a Focal Point Officer to receive, sort, forward, monitor complaints c) simple complaints form/template designed and available to the public d) Multiple channels for receiving complaints e.g. email, telephone, anti-corruption boxes, websites etc.) e) Up to date and serialized record of complaints coordinate implementation of the Framework and a grievance committee is in place. MoV: Review county policy, availability of the focal office	At point of time for the ACPA.	**Met**	Citizens' complaint system for the county is at its formative stage and has not started functioning effectively. The assessment team verified the following: a) Complaints/grievance (and Compliments) Committee is established as per letter EMC/E. 2. V1/19 of 10/7/2017 which was reviewed and a copy retained by the assessment team. A training/induction report for committee members as well as minutes of inauguration meeting for the committee held on 26/05/2017 are provided as evidence of a functional committee. It was reported that members of the committee are attending a 2nd training where they are expected to

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		(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. *See also County Government Act Art. 15 and 88 (1)*			develop/customize tools, work plans, framework to operationalize activities of Complaints/grievance and Compliments Committee and service to the public. b) Focal officer Michael Sengech appointed by letter EMC/E. 2. V1/19 of 10/7/2017 c) County has developed templates, forms etc for complaints. Samples presented to assessment team. d) County has developed comprehensive systems to capture and record including managing process of dealing with complaints and feedback. Hard copies have been presented after 27th Nov 2017.

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					County has established a Complaints and Grievance Committee and has developed related work plans at departmental levels to operationalize a frame work as envisaged in County Government Act 2012 Art. 15 and 88, for the Committee to function effectively. On this basis, therefore, the assessment is MET

2.3 Performance Conditions

Table 5: The summary of results for Performance Conditions

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (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).						
	Strengthened budget formulation, resource mobilization and allocation						
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 up-loads, 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**	**a)** Program Based budgets are developed at the County **b)** Hyperion module NOT used at the County Level
1.2		Budget process follows clear budget calendar	Clear budget calendar with the following key milestones achieved:	PFM Act, art 128, 129, 131. Review budget calendar, minutes from meetings	**Max. 3 points** If all 5 milestones (a-e) achieved: 3	**2**	a) CEC member for finance has issued a circular to the county government entities with guidelines to be

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			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; b) County Budget review and outlook paper – submission by 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. c) County fiscal strategy paper (FSP) – submission (by county treasury) of	(also from assembly resolutions) circular submission letters, county outlook paper, minutes from meetings and Financial Statements.	points If 3-4 items: 2 points If 2 items: 1 point If 1 or 0 items: 0 points.		followed on the 29/08/2014;9 **(Not Met)** b) County Budget review and outlook paper – submitted by county treasury to CEC 14/09/2016 which was submitted to the County assembly on 14/10/2016. CBROP adopted on 14/10/2016. **(Met)** c) County fiscal strategy paper to county executive committee discussed on 27/02/2015 through special minutes of meeting reviewed. County Treasury submitted to county assembly by 27th of February 2015 and

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			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. d) CEC member for finance submits budget estimates to county assembly by 30th April latest. e) County assembly passes a budget with or without amendments by 30th June latest.				thereafter county assembly adopted it on 12/03/2105. (**Met)** d) CEC member for finance submitted budget estimates to county assembly by 29th April 2015. (**Met)** e) County assembly passed the county budget on 30th June 2015. Hansards submitted for review. (**Met)**
1.3		Credibility of budget	a) Aggregate expenditure out-turns compared to	Review the **original** budget and the annual financial statements,	\`**Max. 4 points.** Ad a): If	**1**	a)As per 2015/2016 Financial Statements, Total budget

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			original approved budget. b) Expenditure composition for each sector matches budget allocations (average across sectors).	budget progress reports, audit reports, etc. Use figures from IFMIS (general ledger report at department (sub-vote) level).	expenditure deviation between total budgeted expenditures and total exp. in final account is less than 10 % then 2 points. If 10-20 % then 1 point. More than 20 %: 0 point. <u>Ad b):</u> If average deviation of expenditures across sectors is less than 10 % then 2 points. If 10-20 % then 1 point. More than 20 %: 0 point.		expenditures are registered as Ksh.5,820,009,113 and total actual expenditures is Ksh.4,998,491,128. The deviation is between 10%-20%, and stands at 14.115%. b) No data availed on sector expenditures. The different sector expenditure data were not availed for comparison as the county prepares consolidated information for the County.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
	Revenue Enhancement						
1.4	Enhanced revenue management and administration	Performance in revenue administration	Automation of revenue collection, immediate banking and control system to track collection.	Compare revenues collected through automated processes as % of total own source revenue.	**Max: 2 points.** Over 80% = 2 points Over 60% = 1 point	0	Automation process not started. A contract has been entered in May 2017 to roll out the revenue collection system.
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	FY2015/2016-128,055,734 FY2014/2015-118,663,575 Increase registered as 8%.
	Enhanced capacity of counties on execution (including procurement), accounting and reporting						
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	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	**Max. 2 points.** (a &b) Submitted on time and published: 2 points. (a only): Submitted on time only: 1 point.	0	a) 2015/2016 Quarterly reports were NOT being prepared, only annual reports. Quarterly reports started 2016/2017 after training and issuance of templates of reporting. b) No reports are published in the local media/webpage.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			budget, National Treasury and CRA. b) Summary revenue, expenditure and progress report is published in the local media/web-page.	and expenditure outturns.			
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 with closing balances, budget execution report, schedule of outstanding payments, and appendix with fixed assets register.	Review annual financial statements, bank conciliations and related documents and appendixes to the FS, date and receipts (from CoB and NT). Check against the PFM Act, Art. 166 and the IPSAS format. CFAR, Section 8. Check against requirements. If possible review	**Max. 1 point.** Quality as defined by APA team or NT assessment (excellent/satisfactory): 1 point	**1**	Satisfactory as formats adopted are prepared according to IPSAS. The format used comprises of significant accounting policies, statement of receipts and payments, statement of assets, statement of cash flow, statement of appropriation i.e. recurrent and development.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
				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.			
1.8		Monthly reporting and up-date of accounts, including:	The monthly reporting shall include: 1. Income and expenditure statements; 2. Budget execution report, 3. Financial statement including: a. Details of income and revenue b. Summary of expenditures c. Schedule of imprest and	Review monthly reports. See also the PFM Manual, p. 82 of which some of the measures are drawn from.	**Max. 2 points**. If all milestones (1-3): 2 points If 1 or 2: 1 point If none: 0 points.	1	1) Income and expenditure statements NOT done monthly. Budget execution report done on a monthly basis. Details of income and revenue Not Done Summary of expenditures Not Done. Schedule of imprest and advances not prepared on a monthly basis.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			advances; **d.** Schedule of debtors and creditors; **e.** Bank reconciliations and post in general ledger.				Schedule of debtors and creditors, not done monthly. Bank reconciliations and posting in the general ledger done on a monthly basis.
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.	Review assets register, and sample a few assets. PFM Act. Art 149. Checkup-dates.	**Max. 1 point.** Registers are up-to-date: 1 point. Transitional arrangements: <u>First year:</u> Assets register need only to contain assets acquired by county governments since their establishment. <u>Second year</u>	1	Asset Register of the defunct municipal council is in place. Comprehensive County asset register is in place and updated for assets acquired since 2013 for the County Executive. Records for the assets taken over from the defunct local authorities are also updated. Details in the register include: asset description, asset classification, serial number, acquisition

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
					onwards: register must include all assets, including those inherited form Local Authorities and National Ministries		date and location. The asset register for the County Assembly is not place Independent physical inspection and verification of assets is performed once a year for the County Executive but the County Assembly did not confirm of its own asset verification
	Audit						
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.	0	Internal Audit function in place. 5 staff in place including the Head of Internal Audit. **Quarterly Reports not done.** Annual audit reports done on annual basis. Reports submitted to Governor.
1.11		Effective and efficient	IA/Audit committee established and	Review composition of IA/Audit Committee,	**Max. 1 point.** IA/Audit	0	Internal Audit Committee

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
		internal audit committee.	review of reports and follow-up.	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.	Committee established and reports reviewed by Committee and evidence of follow-up: 1 point.		inaugurated on 27/2/2017. Training conducted for the committee. County treasury sensitized and made aware on the Internal Audit committee and formally requested to offer logistical support to execute her mandate. **No reports have been reviewed as the IAC is recently established.**
1.12	**External audit**	Value of audit queries	The value of audit queries as a % of total expenditure	Review audit report from KENAO. Total expenditure as per reports to CoB.	**Max. 2 points** Value of queries <1% of total expenditures: 2 points <5% of total expenditure: 1 point	**0**	Value of audit queries for county government: 1. Difference between financial statements and IFMIS records Kshs. 2,840,937,685 2. Compensation of employees difference Kshs. 47,691,259

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							3. Unsupported domestic travel expenses Kshs.2,661,901 4. Insurance costs Kshs. 4,631,715 5. Outstanding imprests Kshs. 2,218,000 6. Pending bills Kshs. 805, 056,690 7. Fixed assets differences Kshs. 421,120,842 Total value of queries Kshs. 4,124, 319,032 Total expenditure as the audited accounts Kshs. 2,999,530,907 Value of audit queries is 137.5%
1.13		Reduction of audit queries	The county has reduced the value of the audit queries (fiscal size of the	Review audit reports from KENAO from the last two audits.	**Max. 1 point.** Audit queries (in terms of value) have	**0**	Value of audit queries for the financial year 2014/15: 1. Unreconciled

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			area of which the query is raised).		reduced from last year but one to last year or if there is no audit queries: 1 point.		deficit Kshs. 494,962,937 2. Variance between IFMIS and budget Kshs. 102,261,301 3. Acquisition of assets Kshs. 273,884,886 4. Translocation of wildlife species Kshs. 5,021,400 5. Payments for sports personnel Kshs. 2,213,400 6. General account and vote difference Kshs. 32,792,429 Total value Kshs. 1,185,237, 506 Value of queries increased in the financial year 2015/16 by Kshs. 2,939,081,526

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
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	Audited financial statements for the year 2015/16 are yet to be submitted by the Auditor General to the county government. However, 2014/2015 audit queries were responded to and tabled in the county assembly and attended to by the County Treasury.
	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	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.	**Max. 6 points.** a) IFMIS Steps: <15steps=0 points; 15-23=1 point; 24-25=**2 points** b) Timely submission of quarterly reports to	2	13 steps being used in e-procurement which are 1,2,4,17,18,20,21,22,23,24,25,26 and 27. PPRA reports are submitted on a quarterly basis. Procurement threshold as prescribed in first

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			IFMIS procurement process adhered with. b) County has submitted required procurement reports to PPRA on time. c) Adherence with procurement thresholds and procurement methods for type/size of procurement in a sample of procurements. d) Secure storage space with adequate filing space designated and utilized – for a sample of 10 procurements, single files	Review reports submitted. Check reports from tender committees and procurement units. Check a sample of 5 procurement and review adherence with thresholds and procurement methods and evaluation reports. Check for secure storage space and filing space, and for a random sample of 10 procurements of various sizes, review contents of files.	PPRA (both annual reports plus all reports for procurements above proscribed thresholds): **1 point** c) Adherence with procurement thresholds and procurement methods for type/size of procurement in a sample of procurements: **1 point**. d) Storage space and single complete files for sample of		schedule class "A" are observed for goods, works and services. Restricted -Special groups required minimum level of 1.5M and with no maximum. Request for quotation required minimum 30k maximum 2M per item. Direct method-No minimum or maximum with proper justification. Files are shelved in procurement offices, which are not secure. Facilities used are NOT secure as accessibility observed was easily accessible by any staff member.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			containing all relevant documentation in one place are stored in this secure storage space (1 point) 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 5 large procurements (2 points)		procurements: **1 point** e) Evaluation reports: **1 point**		Evaluation reports are incomplete missing signatures of evaluation committee members on evaluation reports.
	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	a) Planning and M&E units (may be integrated in one) established.	Review staffing structure and organogram. Clearly identifiable	**Maximum 3 points**	2	County M&E system and framework is developed and functioning. The

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
		in place.	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.	budget for planning and M&E functions in the budget.	The scoring is one point per measure Nos. a-c complied with.		assessment team verified the following: a) County Planning M&E Unit is established and a provision in the organization structure for "Division of Planning/ M&E and Reporting" in the Department of Finance and Economic Planning; a photo copy retained by the assessment team. b) Mr Felix Kipngetich is designated Planning and M&E Officer by letter EMC/EPD/S1/18 of 24/9/2014. Departments, Sub Counties and Wards have NOT formally nominated/appointed focal persons for Planning and M&E.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							This requirement is therefore NOT MET c) The county has Planning and M&E budget of FY 2015/16 Kshs 1.7 million and 16/17 Kshs 2.1 million budget
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.	**1**	County M&E Committee is in place and is functioning. The assessment team verified the Committee meets on quarterly basis. No minutes provided. An Internal Memo communication (M&E and Budget Process Activity Calendar) was availed and reviewed. This notifies members of M&E meetings on or about 15th day of the following month after end of a quarter

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							to prepare reports. Output of these meetings are quarterly progress reports and C-APR. Copies of reports presented to assessment teams.
2.3	County Planning systems and functions established	CIDP formulated and up-dated according to guidelines	a) CIDP: adheres to guideline structure of CIDP guidelines, b) CIDP has clear objectives, priorities and outcomes, reporting mechanism, result matrix, key performance indicators included; and c) Annual financing requirement for full implementation of CIDP does not exceed 200% of	CIDP submitted in required format (as contained in the CIDP guidelines published by MoDP). See County Act, Art. 108, Art 113 and Art. 149. CIDP guidelines, 2013, chapter 7.	**Maximum: 3 points** 1 point for compliance with each of the issues: a, b and c.	**3**	a) CIDP developed adhered to guideline structure of CIDP guidelines and contains the following aspects as prescribed: • County Background Information • County Development Analysis • County Spatial Framework • Linkage With other Plans • Implementation Matrix • Resource Mobilization

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			the previous FY total county revenue.				Framework • Development Priority Programmes and Projects • Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation b) County has outlined its objectives, priorities and outcomes, reporting mechanism are also detailed in the plans and key performance indicators tabulated in the CIDP 2013/17. c) Annual financing requirement for full implementation of CIDP s increased at 12% evidenced by the plans of 2014/2015(3,288,478, 784) &

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							2015/2016(3,687,367, 374) of the previous FY total county revenue to implement the CIDP.
2.4		ADP submitted on time and conforms to guidelines	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). b) ADP contains issues mentioned in the PFM Act 126,1, number A-H	Review version of ADP approved by County Assembly for structure, and approval procedures and timing, against the PFM Act, Art 126, 1.	**Maximum: 4 points** Compliance a): 1 point. b) All issues from A-H in PFM Act Art 126,1: 3 points 5-7 issues: 2 points 3-4 issues: 1 point, see Annex.	**4**	a) ADP submitted to County assembly by the 01/09/2014 with structures as detailed in the PFM Act 126:1 b) All issues from A-H in PFM Act are captured in the APD. The issues include: • Strategic priorities for the medium term that reflect the county government's priorities and plans; • A description of how the county government is responding to changes in the

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							financial and economic environment; • Programmes to be delivered with details for each programme of (iii) measurable indicators of performance where feasible; and (iv) the budget allocated to the programme; • Payments to be made on behalf of the county government, including details of any grants, benefits and subsidies that are to be paid; • A description of significant capital developments;

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							• A detailed description of proposals with respect to the development of physical, intellectual, human and other resources of the county, including measurable indicators where those are feasible; • A summary budget in the format required by regulations; • Such other matters as may be required by the Constitution or this Act.
2.5		Linkage between CIDP, ADP and Budget	Linkages between the ADP and CIDP and the budget in terms of costing and activities. (costing	Review the three documents: CIDP, ADP and the budget. The budget should be consistent with the CIDP	**Maximum: 2 points** Linkages and within the	**2**	ADP Budget-3,687,367,374. Final budget allocation-3,850,303,971.00

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			of ADP is within +/- 10 % of final budget allocation)	and ADP priorities. The costing of the ADP is within +/- 10% of final budget allocation. Sample 10 projects and check that they are consistent between the two documents.	ceiling: 2 points.		Costing difference stands at 4%.
2.6	Monitoring and Evaluation systems in place and used, with feedback to plans	Production of County Annual Progress Report	a) County C-APR produced; b) Produced timely by September 1 and c) C-APR includes clear performance progress against CIDP indicator targets and within result matrix for results and implementation. (Ad b) Compliance if produced within	Check contents of C-APR and ensure that it clearly link s with the CIDP indicators. Verify that the indicators have been sent to the CoG.	**Maximum: 5 points.** a) C-APR produced = 2 points b) C-APR produced by end of September. 1 point. c) C-APR includes performance against CIDP	**a) 2** **b) 1** **c) 1**	M&E systems are in place and in use. These systems are also used to inform planning and for feedback to citizens. The assessment team verified the following: a) County produces C-APR. Copies of C-APR for 2015/16 and 2016/17 were presented to assessment team for verification.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			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 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)		b) The C-APR 2015/16 was produced on time and submitted to County Executive Committee from Dept. of Finance and Economic Planning before Sept 1, 2016. The assessment team verified this was on 26/08/2016 c) This is a process and documentation at different level were provided to verify this. C-APR is presented to the public – Ward specific activities extracted from C-APR and also from ADP and presented to the public to verify e.g. a report for Endo-Talai Ward on 24/08/2016. Forum reviews presentations by various sector

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							departments (which include activities, progress, performance indicators, targets etc) and deliberates on status of C-APR on progress of ADP which are also reviewed on proposals that were entered in CIDP.
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.	1	The County provided reports by FYs on Progress Status Reports for CIDP projects conducted on an annual basis which are arranged on departments and wards. The reports include performance indicators (for the year), interventions, achievements, challenges and proposed plan(s) for the years ahead, if any. The proposed

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							plan on way forward is a feedback from the citizens in the presentation forum with technical input from department. A report for June 2017 was presented to the assessment team and a copy retained as evidence.
2.8		Feedback from Annual Progress Report to Annual Development Plan	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 point.	1	County provided various reports to verify that ADP and budget are informed by the previous C-APR. This is part of Public Participation and Department of Finance and Economic Planning extracts ward specific budgets, ADP activities and C-APR activities for the previous year; and following Elgeyo Marakwet County

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							Equitable Development Act 2014, every ward is allocated a resource envelope. The process starts with a presentation of previous budgets and ADP activities, followed by findings from C-APR which are debated at ward forum and departments provide explanations to issues raised in the forum. From that point the forum agrees on next year's activities (new and on-going). This is done in groups and after plenary presentations by groups, a priority list is drawn for activities. The forum then debates and allocates

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							budget (from Ward resource envelop) to various sector activities. This then feeds into the new ADP activities and budgets at Ward level. All these are consolidated from all the Wards to compile Annual ADP and Budgets. Copies of relevant documents, reports, outputs attendance list etc to track this process for Tambach Ward provided to the assessment team
	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	a) Does the county have an approved staffing plan in place, with annual targets? b) Is there clear	Staffing plan Capacity Building Assessment / CARPS report Documentation	**Maximum 3 points:** First AC&PA: a = 2 points, b = 1 point c= NA.	1	a) County has staffing plan but this is not approved. b) Staffing plan informed by a capacity assessment and staff

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			evidence that the staffing plan was informed by a Capacity Building assessment / functional and organizational assessment and approved organizational structure? c) Have the annual targets in the staffing plan been met?	evidencing hiring, training, promotion, rationalization, etc. 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).	Future AC&PAs: a=1 point, b = 1 point, c = 1 point		rationalization study (CARPS) conducted by Enrst & Young which was presented to the county and departments gave inputs. The report has organization structure (for the county and for individual departments); existing staffing levels by category and identified gaps by departments etc A report was availed and reviewed by the assessment team. c) Annual targets in the staffing plan are not met due to resource constraints. County satisfies only 1 (item b) milestone out of the 3 and is

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							awarded 1 point
3.2	Job descriptions, including skills and competence requirements	Job descriptions, specifications and competency framework	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)) 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) c) Accurate recruitment, appointment and	Job descriptions Skills and competency frameworks. Appointment, recruitment and promotion records	**Maximum score: 4 points** All a, b and c: 4 points. Two of a-c: 2 points One of a-c: 1 point	**2**	a) Job description exist. SRC the supported county to come up with job descriptions (for cadres not in mainstream civil service e.g. Ward Admin which are now used by the county. b) It was reported county does not have skills and competency framework. c) There is accurate recruitments, promotions and appointments. This starts from departments and is consolidated by HR function for review by County Human Resource Management and Advisory Committee in meetings and recommendations are forwarded to County

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			promotion records available				Public Service Board (CPSB) for approvals, e.g. a request letter/report on promotions and recruitment ref; CMC/HR/CPSB/P/1 of 25/09/2015 and approval granted through letter ref: EMC/PSB/PM/15/15 of 21/10/2015. On the basis of the above going, County meets 2 items (a and c) out of 3 and is awarded 2 marks
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	a) 0 b) 2	a) County has staff appraisal systems but are not operationalized. These are designed but county has not taken initiative to have them approved and operationalized

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

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
				covering at least one service RRI Reports for at least one 100 day period	Contracts in place for CEC Members 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/up scaled: 1 point		b) Performance contracts are operationalized, records for 2015/16 made available for CEC Members and COs and also for Directors in departments.
			c) service re-engineering undertaken			c) 0	
			d) RRI undertaken			d) 0	c) County has not undertaken service delivery re-engineering; d) The County has not initiated or launched Rapid Results Initiatives. On the basis of above going county only meets PCs for CEC Members and COs and secondly for the level below, i.e. Directors and is therefore

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							awarded 2 points.
	Key Result Area 4: Civic Education and Participation - *A citizenry that more actively participated in county governance affairs of the society* **Max score: 18 points**						
4.1	Counties establish functional Civic education	CEU established	Civic Education Units established and functioning: (a) Formation of CE units (b) Dedicated staffing and (c) Budget, (d) Programs planned, including curriculum, activities etc. and (e) Tools and methods for CE outlined.	County Act, Art 99-100.	**Maximum 3 points.** CEU fully established with all milestones (a) - (e) complied with: 3 points. 2-4 out of the five milestones (a-e): 2 points Only one: 1 point.	**0**	The County has not established functional Civic Education to the envisaged under the County Government Act 2012, Art 99-100. The assessment team verified the following: a) Civic Education units are not formed. b) County stated there are no dedicated staff for civic education c) County does not have a budget for civic education; d) County has neither programmes nor curriculum for civic education. e) County has no structured methods or

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							tools for civic education. It was explained that civic education rides on public participation but this does not make the county to fulfil requirements of County Government Act 2012 Art. 100 (2) and (3). On the basis of the above going, county has not met any of the milestones herein and is therefore not awarded any point.
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 a roll out of civic education activities and/or engagements with NGOs to enhance civic education activities. The county does not therefore comply with provisions of County Government Act 2012 Art. 100(4)

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							County does not meet this assessment and therefore is not awarded any point.
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 operational.	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 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.)	**Maximum 2 points.** a) Compliance: 1 point. b) Compliance: 1 point.	0	a) The county has a **draft** bill on communication which is yet to be approved and therefore county does not comply with provisions of Art. 96(3) of the County Government Act 2012. County uses public notice boards and web page for communication to citizens; produces a quarterly bulletin, produces "popular" versions (simplified) of key documents such as CIPD which are shared with public. b) County does not

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							have a designated an officer. On the basis of the above going, county has not met any of the milestones herein and is therefore not awarded any point.
4.4		Participatory planning and budget forums held	a) Participatory planning and budget forums held in previous FY before the plans were completed for on-going FY. b) Mandatory citizen engagement /consultations held beyond the budget forum, (i.e. additional consultations) c) Representation: meets requirements	PFM Act, Art. 137. County Act, 91, 106 (4), Art. 115. Invitations Minutes from meetings in the forums. List of attendances, Meetings at ward levels, Link between minutes and actual plans. List of suggestions from citizens, e.g. use of templates for this and	**Maximum 3 points.** All issues met (a-f): 3 points. 4-5 met: 2 points. 1-3 met: 1 point.	3	County conducts public participation for planning and budget forums and the assessment team verified the following: a) Participatory planning and budget forums are in happening and guided by an annual framework on programme of milestones and achievements. e.g. at Ward levels: Tambach on 9/4/2014; Emsoo on 10/4/2014;

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			of PFMA (section 137) and stakeholder mapping in public participation guidelines issued by MoDP. d) Evidence that forums are structured (not just unstructured discussions) e) Evidence of input from the citizens to the plans, e.g. through minutes or other documentation f) Feed-back to citizens on how proposals have been handled.	reporting back. Feedback reports / minutes of meetings where feedback provided to citizens			Kaptarakwa on 11/4/2014; Metkei on 14/4/2014. Reports and records were made available to show public advertisement, venue, date, agenda, report on proceedings and recommendations. b) Citizens engagement and consultations beyond the budget forum is taking place during County Dialogue Forum @ Ward Open Forum where citizens are taken through county devolution experiences – (from a compiled report by county government) on topical issues such as Public Service Management, Wage

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							Bill, automation of services, citizen engagements and public participation process etc. Issues discussed include plans and achievements; challenges and feedback from the forum. This happens once a year in every ward; Metkei Ward on 23/2/2017 and 293 citizens participated; Tambach Ward on 28/2/2017 and 374 citizens participated; Arror Ward on 2/12/2016 and 188 citizens participated; A copy of a report was shown to the assessment team. c) Invitation notices are open and sent out to be placed in public

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							places, local vernacular FM Radio, newspapers of wide circulation, local Elgeyo Marakwet Bulletin (produced in collaboration with The Standard Newspaper). Copies of notices were shown to the assessment teams. Further, county departments follow up invitations to focus groups such as Ward Development Committees; Farmers Groups, Water Users Associations, Participatory Forest Management Groups etc. However, from the attendance list for members of the public, it is not explicitly expressed the stakeholder they represent.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							d) Forums are structured. The county presented an copy of engagement framework and guiding notes which include plenary presentations and discussions; sessions before group work; group work engagements; plenary approvals. e) Input from citizens feeds into plans. County provided reports for review and to verify this happens, e.g. in Endo Talai Ward on 24/8/2016 – the assessment team reviewed various documents and reports such as a template on presentation of status

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							and progress of projects implemented; notes group brainstorming on proposed projects by sector (new and on-going) on a designed template; plenary prioritizations by all groups and recommendations recorded on a designed template; priority listings of projects (new and ongoing) by sector and location in the ward which are signed by members of the group; budget allocations from the budget envelope ceilings for the ward; agreed list and priorities to feed in ADP; signed documents for every

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							stage; list of attendants. f) Before presentations on extractions of relevant sections of the C-APR, County produces and shares popular versions of ADP and extracts relevant sections for the ward where C-APR/project status and progress forum is happening and participants are taken through the development projects they proposed (new and on-going), the resources they allocated to specific sector projects and then the status/progress; presentations during Participation Forum.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							These forums are held at Ward Open Forums; Town Hall Forum (twice in collaboration with Radio Citizen) clips in Elgeiyo Marakwet Bulletin, Ward Development Booklets (produced by County Government one for every 20 wards), 2000 copies per ward. Hard copy provided to assessment team. On the basis of the above going, county has met all the milestones (a-f) herein and is therefore awarded 3 marks.
4.5.		Citizens' feed back	Citizen's feedback on the findings from the C-APR/implementatio	Records of citizens engagement meetings on the findings of the C-APR. Review evidence	**Maximum points: 1** Compliance: 1	**1**	Copies of materials of presentations, feedback and reports including list of

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			n status report.	from how the inputs have been noted and adhered with and whether there is feed-back mechanism in place.	point.		participants, on findings of C-APR extracted for activities in the ward during initial stages of preparation of ADP, e.g. Lelan Ward on 21/8/2015, Moiben/Kuserwo on 24/8/2015, Metkei on 25/8/2015; Soy South on 26/8/2015. For example the assessment team reviewed a Public Participation Report in Tambach Ward where public proposed to build ECCD classrooms at Chebirei, Berese and Rimoi Primary Schools which are reflected on page 24 of CIDP
4.6		County core financial materials,	Publication (on county web-page, in addition to any	PFM Act Art 131. County Act, Art. 91. Review county web-	**Maximum points: 5 points**	**1**	Fiscal strategy paper was the only item uploaded in the

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
		budgets, plans, accounts, audit reports and performance assessments published and shared	other publication) of: i) County Budget Review and Outlook Paper ii) Fiscal Strategy Paper iii) Financial statements or annual budget 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	page. (N.B.) Publication of Budgets, County Integrated Development Plan and Annual Development Plan is covered in Minimum Performance Conditions)	9 issues: 5 points 7-8 issues: 4 points 5-6 issues: 3 points 3-4 issues: 2 points 1-2 issues: 1 point 0 issues: 0 point.		website at the time of assessment.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			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 the national and in county gazettes or county web-site, and similarly for the legislation passed.	County Act, Art. 23. Review gazetted bills and Acts, etc. Review county web-site.	**Maximum 2 points** Compliance: 2 points.	**2**	Assessment team verified that all Bills introduced in the County Assembly are published in Elgeyo Marakwet County Government (Supplement) and printed/published by the National Government Printer. The gazettes fulfill requirements of County Govt. Act 2012, art. 23 in that

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							they are identified by a title placed at the beginning of the Bill, their title include the subject matter of the statute to be enacted and are published by including the Bill as a supplement in the Elgeyo Marakwet County Gazette and Kenya Gazette; for example The Elgeyo Marakwet County: Charcoal Bill, 2017; Public Participation Act, 2014; Vocational Training Act, 2016; Education Fund Act, 2017 and County Assembly (Ward Offices) Act, 2014. County complies with this milestone and is therefore awarded 2 marks.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
	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 *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*	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 (6 points in the first two AC&PAs). 85-90 %: 3 points 75-84%: 2 points	0	There is no project completion register maintained. There are no alternative means in which the county tracks the completion projects other than contracts of performance entered into by the vendors as other means of tracking were requested but not provided.

[2]As 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	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			factored in. If there are more than 10 projects a sample of 10 larger projects is made, and weighted according to the size.	procurement progress reports, quarterly reports on projects, M&E reports etc.	65-74%: 1 point Less than 65 %: 0 point. If no information is available on completion of projects: 0 point will be awarded. An extra point will be awarded if the county maintains a comprehensive, accurate register of completed projects and status of all ongoing projects		

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
					(within the total max points available, i.e. the overall max is 4 points/6 respectively in the first two AC&PA).		
5.2	Projects implemented according to cost estimates	Implementation of projects and in accordance with the cost estimates	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, 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	**Maximum 4 points. (5 points in the first two AC&PAs).** More than 90 % of the projects are executed within +/5 of budgeted costs: 4 points (5 points in the first two AC&PAs)	**4**	10 Samples selected and details of the projects were provided from Water, Roads and Education. Samples checked include: • Kessum Kapchebit Water project. • ChepsigotKaptubei Water Project. • Koiman Tuiyobei Water Project • Rimoi ECDE • Grading of Kapchebau Primary school • Kiobatek Project

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
				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. Compare actual costs of completed project with original budgeted costs in the ADP/budget.	80-90%: 3 points 70-79%: 2 points 60-69%: 1 point Below 60%: 0 points.		• Installation of Culvert Sawaa Cheboen Road • Maintenance of Kamok Hossen Road • Toroch water project. Completion 0f sampled projects are within cost estimates.
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 maintenance budget allocations	Review budget and quarterly budget execution reports as well as financial statements. Randomly sample 5 larger projects, which have been completed 2-3 years ago. Review if maintenance is above 5 % of the capital budget and evidence	**Maximum 3 points (4 points in the first two AC&PAs).** Maintenance budget is more than 5 % of capital budget and sample projects catered for in	0	No Maintenance budgets allocations provided for within the county budgets.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			(sample of min. 5 larger projects).	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.	terms of maintenance allocations for 2-3 years after: 3 points (4 in the first two AC&PA). More than 5 % but only 3-4 of the projects are catered for: 2 points. More than 5 % but only 1-2 of the specific sampled projects are catered for: 1 point.		
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.	Maximum points: 2 points (3 points in the first two AC&PAs)	**2**	County Government presented reports for 10 investments qualifying to undergo screening and EIA. EIA reports have been prepared for all 10

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
					All 100 % of sample done in accordance with framework for all projects: 2 points (3 points in the first two AC&PAs) 80-99 % of projects: 1 points		investments. The investment projects are registered by NEMA as follows: NEMA/PR/EMT/5/2: then specific projects references are: 1 0070 – Proposed Wildlife Restocking for Rimoi Reserve; 2 0050 – Proposed Improvements to Kamariny Stadium; 3 0065 – Proposed Tomato Processing Plant at Kibendo Emsoo; 4 0064 – Proposed Potato Cold Storage at Kipyego; 5 0058 – Proposed Residence for the Governor at Iten Town; 6 0088 – Proposed Extensions/renewal

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							s for Kamariny Stadium; 7 0094 – Proposed Chesewen-Mogil Access Road (gravel); 8 0097 – Proposed Maro-Wewei-Mungwo (gravel) Access Road; 9 0096 – Proposed Rehabilitation of Iten Health Facility; and 10 Proposed Passion Fruit Processing Plant at Kipkabus is undergoing review by NEMA
5.5	EIA /EMP procedures	EIA/EMP procedures from the Act followed.	Relevant **safeguards instruments Prepared:** Environmental and Social Management Plans, Environmental Impact Assessment,	Sample 5-10 projects	All 100 % of sample done in accordance with framework for all projects: 2 points	**2**	Out of the 10 projects, all 10 projects have EMP measures and mitigation measures for harmful impacts to the environment, as is provided for under the regulations.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			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 ESIAs /ESMPs have been prepared and approved safeguards provisions from part of the contract.		80-99 % of projects: 1 points		Implementation of 8 projects is approved and therefore licenced by NEMA (these are gen ref NEMA/PR/EMT/5/2: then specific projects references are: 1 0070 – Proposed Wildlife Restocking for Rimoi Reserve (licence ref no 28679); 2 0050 – Proposed Improvements to Kamariny Stadium licence ref no 28673); 3 0065 – Proposed Tomato Processing Plant at Kibendo Emsoo licence ref no 28682); 4 0064 – Proposed Potato Cold Storage at Kipyego licence ref no.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							28681); 5 0058 – Proposed Residence for the Governor at Iten Town licence ref no. 28676); 6 0094 – Proposed Chesewen-Mogil Access Road (gravel) (licence ref no. 41572); 7 0097 – Proposed Maro-Wewei-Mungwo (gravel) Access Road (licence ref no. 41560); and 8 0096 – Proposed Rehabilitation of Iten Health Facility (licence ref no. 41575).
5.6	Value for the Money (from the 3rd AC&PA).	Value for the money.	Percentage (%) of projects implemented with a satisfactory level of value for the	To be included from the **3rd AC&PA only.** A sample of minimum 5 projects will be reviewed.	**Maximum 5 points.** To be developed		Not applicable

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	PM (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			money, calibrated in the value for the money assessment tool.	The methodology will be developed at a later date, prior to the 3rd AC&PA. **Note** that a sample will 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.	during implementation based on the TOR for the VfM. Points: maximum 5, calibration between 0-5 points. E.g. more than 90 % of projects Satisfactory: 5 points, more than 85 % 4 points, etc.		
					Total Maximum Score: 100 points.	47	

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	Met
2. Capacity Building plan developed	Met
3. Compliance with investment menu of the grant	N/A
4. Implementation of CB plan	N/A

Table 7: Summary of Results Minimum Performance Conditions

#	MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Assessment Met/ Not Met
1	Minimum Access Conditions Complied with Compliance with Minimum access conditions	To ensure minimum capacity and linkage between CB and Investments	Met
2	Financial Management Financial statements submitted	To reduce fiduciary risks	Met
3	Audit Opinion does not carry an adverse opinion or a disclaimer on any substantive issue	To reduce Fiduciary risks	Not Met
4	Planning Annual planning documents in place	To demonstrate a minimum level of capacity to plan and manage funds	Met
5	Use of funds in accordance with Investment menu	To ensure compliance with the environmental and social safeguards and ensure efficiency in spending.	N/A
6	Procurement	To ensure	Met

	Consolidated procurement plans in place	procurement planning is properly coordinated from the central procurement unit	
7	County Core staff in place	Core staff in place as per County Government Act	Met
8	Environmental and social safeguards	To ensure that there is a mechanism and capacity to screen environmental and social risks	Met
9	Citizens' Complaint System in place	To ensure sufficient level of governance and reduce risks for mismanagement	Met

Table 8: Summary of Results for Performance Measures

Key Result Area	Results /Score
KRA 1: Public Financial Management	9
KRA 2: Planning and Monitoring and Evaluation	18
KRA 3:Human Resources Management	5
KRA 4: Civic Education and Participation	7
KRA 5:Investment implementation & Social and environmental performance	8
Total Score	47

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.

KRA 1: Public Finance Management

The following are identified areas for capacity support:

1. Records and contracts management training in the department of procurement.
2. Training of Internal auditors on the requirements of the PFM Act to ensure regulations and reports are churned as required.

3. Training Internal auditors to enable them perform audits around the financial system in place i.e. IFMIS
4. Training of additional staff within the Budgets unit to manage the IFMIS Hyperion module,

KRA 2: Planning and Monitoring & Evaluation

The following are identified areas for capacity support:

1. Support to finalization M&E policy/guidelines followed by sensitizations (and induction training where necessary) for the legislative, executive, management and operational staff for goodwill and necessary support;
2. Facilitate development of a framework and harmonization of indicators to enhance collaborations on planning, M&E, data and reporting among agencies from national government, county government, semi-autonomous government agents (parastatals, corporations etc), NGOs and other key players;
3. Training and skills improvements on M&E and report writing for staff in departments and sub county offices;
4. Sensitization and induction training on Participatory M&E for Ward Development Committee Members and community resource persons;
5. ICT based M&E systems for data and information capture, generation of generic reports;
6. Logistical support (laptops, cameras, projectors, screens etc) to enhance production and dissemination of reports and findings;
7. Support a framework for reviews and feedback on planning and M&E process and outputs.

KRA 3: Human Resource Management

The following are identified areas for capacity support:

1. Development of HR policy and strategy;
2. Training needs assessments and support to training and capacity building across all staff;
3. Establish ICT based Human Resource Information Systems;
4. Support staff performance appraisals, preparation of annual staffing plans and targets;
5. Preparation of skills and competency framework;
6. Support undertaking service re-engineering and launching IRRs;
7. Establishing modern staff registry and bulk storage facilities for staff records.

KRA 4: Civic Educations and Participation

The following are identified areas for capacity support:

1. Support development for citizens' grievance/complaints and feedback policy/guidelines followed by sensitizations for general public and county government staff;
2. Support to establish citizen complaints/grievances and feedback systems;
3. Civic education methods, development of relevant tools and collaborations with NGO;
4. Training and capacity building on customers focused service delivery;
5. Support periodical reviews and audits for civic education and public participation as well as citizens' complaints/grievances and feedback systems and processes;
6. Support establishing of a Radio Station (in collaboration with Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources); bulk SMS platform for data and feedback; development of county open data portal;

7. Support production of audio visual clips, interactive radio/TV sessions and socio media communication platform.

KRA 5 Investments Implementation, Social Safeguards and Environment Performance

The following are areas identified for capacity support:

1. Support establishment of relevant county policies and guidelines on EMCA regulations, specifically on noise and excessive vibrations;
2. Support logistics, training and capacity development for the county to monitor performance/compliances and enforce regulations relating to noise and excessive vibrations;
3. Support sensitization and induction programme for County Environment Committee (after this is gazzetted)
4. Support sensitizations programmes for county government (Executive and Legislation) and general public on EMCA law, regulations and compliances by county government;
5. Support collaboration mechanisms with NGOs and civil society organizations to increase outreach and sensitizations for general public and focus groups on environmental issues;
6. Support establishment and strengthening county focal environmental units and representative focal persons in departments and in sub counties to coordinate and steer environmental and social safeguard issues w.r.t. county government;

4.0 CHALLENGES IN THE ASSESSMENT

The challenges faced during the easements include:

1. Lack of documents and delays to access verification documents;
2. Poor and unreliable Internet Connectivity;
3. Unreliability of the IFMIS system hence getting some reports from the system was a major challenge; and
4. The input of the County Assembly was rather minimal only to the extent of the bills and acts passed and financial statement;

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 documents were availed except for items 3 and 4 which have not been implemented.

5.2 MPC's Issues

The following issues were observed:

1. County does not have a framework/guide civic education;
2. County Environment Committee not in gazetted in accordance to EMCA laws;
3. Citizens' complaints/grievance committee is not established while appropriate process and procedures are inadequate;
4. Procurement plans are not updated/reviewed when budgets are adjusted.
5. Consolidated financial reports not presented for assessment

5.3 PMs

KRA 1: Public Finance Management

The following observations were made:

1. Contracts/Projects register not in place.
2. Budgets staff relied heavily on the NT to remotely upload their County budgets.
3. Financial reports are mostly done on an annual basis and in year reports are not produced frequently or consistently.
4. Procurement documents not in a secure storage facility.

KRA 2: Planning and Monitoring & Evaluation

It was observed that the

1. county has not formally appointed M&E focal persons in county departments as well as in sub county and ward offices.
2. No register of projects completed are maintained.

KRA 3: Human Resource Management

The following key issues were observed:

1. Organization structure is not approved;
2. Performance appraisals for staff not operationalized;
3. Annual staffing plans and targets not prepared;
4. No skills and competency framework;
5. Service re-engineering not undertaken and IRRs not launched;

KRA 4: Civic Educations and Participation

The following key issues were observed:

1. Civic education methods are not well defined and tools do not exist;
2. No roll out plan or defined engagements with NGOs to enhance civic education activities to comply with provisions of County Government Act 2012 Art. 100(4)
3. No legislation or policy or developed guidelines to describe access to information and communication as provided for in Art. 96(3) of the County Government Act 2012
4. County does not have a well-structured system for citizen feedback and reporting;

KRA 5 Investments Implementation, Social Safeguards and Environment Performance

1. It was observed the county does not have a framework to monitor and enforce compliance with noise and excessive vibrations

6.0 NOTIFICATION OF DISAGREEMENT

There was no notice of disagreement noted or expressed as the assessment team gave an overview of their experience during the assessment and a highlight of the weak areas that needed improvement in the assessment process including during the Exit Meeting.

In addition there was no issue of Quality Assurance that arose during the assessment process.

7.0 OVERVIEW OF THE 5 WEAKEST PERFORMANCE

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

KRA	Performance Measure	Issues
KRA 1	Public Finance Management	1. Procurement was weak in terms of records storage, report production and managing of completed contracts register. 2. None use of Hyperion to load budgets.
KRA 2	Planning & M&E	1. County has not formally appoint/nominate Planning, M&E focal persons at departments, sub counties and ward levels;
KRA 3	Human Resource Management	1. Organization structure not approved; 2. County has not operationalized staff appraisal and performance management systems 3. County does not have skills and competency framework; 4. Annual staffing levels not met 5. Not undertaking service re-engineering, initiating RRIs
KRA 4	Civic Education and Participation	1. Citizens' complaints/grievance committee is not established while appropriate process and procedures are inadequate; 2. No policy, guidelines, systems and framework to conduct civic education and on communication with citizens and stakeholders;
KRA 5	Investment implementation & social and environmental performance	1. No policy, guidelines or framework to guide management and enforcement compliance with environmental and social safeguards regulations; 2. County Environment Committee not established 3. No budgets to support maintenance for additional investments (infrastructure, plant and equipment). 4. No project register to monitor progress and costs.

APPENDIX 1: ENTRY MEETING MINUTES

Minutes of Meeting held on Monday 17th July 2017 in the Boardroom, CGEM Offices

List of attendants:

	Name	Designation
1	Paul Chemuttut	County Secretary
2	Ishmael Cheranga	Chief Officer, ICT/Public Service Mgt.
3	Robert K Chelagat	Director SCM
4	Paul Mutua	Head of Internal Audit
5	John Keen Murken	Director of Budget
6	Vincent Barto	Director Public Communication
7	Jesephen Koech	Director Revenue
8	Rael Rotich	Principal HR Officer
9	Titus Kosgei	Economist/M&E
10	Charles Chelimo Suter	Director of Environment
11	David Chebii	Accountant - Financial Reporting
12	Timothy Mulatya	Matengo Githae & Associates
13	Norman M Muchori	Matengo Githae & Associates
14	Felix Kipng'etich	Planning Officer (Social Sector)
15	Duncan Kiplagat	Planning Officer Productive Sector)
16	John Maritim	Direcort of Economic Planning
17	Patrick Maiyo	Director of Human Resources

Agenda for the meeting

1. Brief introduction of team
2. ACPA assessment process and timelines
3. Address form the Chair
4. A.O.B

The assessment team was first received by **Mr John Maritim** who is the **KDSP Elgeyo Markwet County Focal Person** and escorted for a courtesy call to the office of the County Secretary **Mr. Paul Chemuttut** early Monday morning on 17th July 2017 before proceeding to the Entry Meeting.

Minute 1: Welcome and introductions

The chair for the meeting was chaired by Mr Paul Chemuttut, the County Secretary.

1. The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 10.15 am; started with a prayer and self-introductions
2. Mr John Maritim gave a brief of KDSP activities and participation of County Government of Elgeyo Marakwet in the programme activities, and briefed the chair on ACPA level II.
3. The Chairman welcomed all participants to the meeting.

Minute 2: ACPA assessment process and way forward

The MG&A assessment team gave a brief on the assessment process as follows:

1. This is the second level of assessment and will be carried out for three days starting Mon. 17th – Wed. 19th July 2017. It is capacity and performance assessment and NOT AUDIT
2. Assessment will basically follow three tools, i.e. MAC, MPC and PM tools and will focus on evidence provided by the county. A general outline and attributes of the tools was explained for the meeting;
3. To conduct assessments, the team will meet and interview persons responsible for KRAs and other relevant staff and peruse various documents as communicated by a letter from MG&A to the County Government which is dated 22nd June 2017. The assessment team may ask to see other documents and also meet/interview other key persons not mentioned in the letter but will support verifications required under MAC, MPC and PM tool;
4. The assessment is based on DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE. All evidence must be provided within the three days of field assessment, failure to which it is considered they are not there/available. Where necessary, the assessment team will make photocopies of relevant documents that are assessed important to support achievement;
5. There will be an exit meeting and time for the meeting will be agreed with CGN but very likely scheduled for Wed. 12th July 2017 at 3.00pm; agenda for the meeting is to discuss ACPA progress, preliminary findings and emerging issues;
6. If time allows, the team will select project(s) to visit in the field;
7. Draft Report will be submitted for necessary quality assurance process and MODP will upload the draft report in website. Counties
8. There three levels of quality assurance: a) KDSP Secretariat who will join in field assessments as observers; b) Technical Committee; c) The World Bank;
9. The team asked to have a venue/office where to operate from and for ease of meeting with CGN staff;

Minute 3: Address from the Chair/KDSP Elgeyo Marakwet County Focal Person

In his address, the Chairperson had the following:

a. An office space has been identified and made available for the assessment team from where to hold meetings and review documents and reports;
b. The CGEM staff will be available to escort them to the selected projects, when the assessment team will pick the projects they wish to visit;
c. The Chairman expressed support to the ACPA process and stated his office will be accessible as and whenever will be required.

There being no other business, the meeting was closed to allow assessment to begin.

Minutes of meeting taken by: Norman M Muchori

Signature

For/behalf of County Government of Elgeyo Marakwet:

Name:……

Designation:…….. Date:…….

For/behalf of MG&A:

Name:……

Designation:…….. Date:…….

APPENDIX 2: EXIT MEETING MINUTES

Minutes of Meeting held on Wed 19th July 2017 at Boardroom CGEM Offices

List of attendants

	Name	Designation
1	Paul Chemuttut	County Secretary
2	Ishmael Cheranga	Chief Officer, ICT/Public Service Mgt.
3	Robert K Chelagat	Director SCM
4	Paul Mutua	Head of Internal Audit
5	John Keen Murken	Director of Budget
6	Philik K Seronei	Head of Treasury
7	Jesephen Koech	Director Revenue
8	Pius Cheserek	Chief Officer, Agriculture
9	Kosgei Titus	Economist/M&E
10	Charles Chelimo Suter	Director of Environment
11	David Chebii	Accountant - Financial Reporting
12	John Maritim	Direcort of Economic Planning
13	Timothy Mulatya	Matengo Githae & Associates
14	Norman M Muchori	Matengo Githae & Associates
15	Felix Kipng'etich	Planning Officer (Social Sector)
16	Duncan Kiplagat	Planning Officer Productive Sector)
17	Boaz Changach	Chief Officer, Education
18	Jeremiah Changwony	Chief Officer, Finance

Agenda for the meeting

1. ACPA assessment process preliminary findings
2. Feedback from the meeting
3. A.O.B

Minute 1: Welcome and introductions

The chair for the meeting was Mr Paul Chemuttur, County Secretary. He called the meeting to order at 12.20pm, welcomed to the meeting MG&A Assessment team and other participants from the county government.

Minute 2: ACPA assessment preliminary findings and areas of capacity improvements

The MG&A assessment team gave a brief preliminary findings and emerging issues following the KRAs:

A) Preliminary findings

KRA 1: Public Finance Management

The following observations were made:

1. Poor procurement storage facilities,
2. Delayed roll out of the automated revenue collection system.
3. Lack of adequate staff trained to utilize the IFMIS leading to delayed uploads and report production.
4. County not publishing her financial reports.
5. IFMIS not fully implemented at the county level, on AP module utilized while AR module not used.

KRA 2: Planning and Monitoring & Evaluation

It was observed that the county has not formally appointed M&E focal persons in county departments as well as in sub county and ward offices.

KRA 3: Human Resource Management

The following key issues were observed:

1. Organization structure is not approved;
2. Performance appraisals for staff not operationalized;
3. Annual staffing plans and targets not prepared;
4. No skills and competency framework;
5. Service re-engineering not undertaken and IRRs not launched;

KRA 4: Civic Educations and Participation

The following key issues were observed:

1. Civic education methods are not well defined and tools do not exist;
2. No roll out plan or defined engagements with NGOs to enhance civic education activities to comply with provisions of County Government Act 2012 Art. 100(4)
3. No legislation or policy or developed guidelines to describe access to information and communication as provided for in Art. 96(3) of the County Government Act 2012
4. County does not have a well-structured system for citizen feedback and reporting;

KRA 5 Investments Implementation, Social Safeguards and Environment Performance

It was observed the county does not have a framework to monitor and enforce compliance with noise and excessive vibrations

B) Areas of capacity building

KRA 1: Public Finance Management

The following are identified areas for capacity support:

1. Records keeping and contract management training
2. IFMIS refresher course and training of more staff use IFMIS by accounts and budgets staff.
3. Training of internal audit to be able to audit around financial systems and other county systems in place,

KRA 2: Planning and Monitoring & Evaluation

The following are identified areas for capacity support:

1. Support to undertake baseline surveys;
2. Support to finalization M&E policy/guidelines followed by sensitizations (and induction training where necessary) for the legislative, executive, management and operational staff for goodwill and necessary support;
3. Facilitate development of a framework and harmonization of indicators to enhance collaborations on planning, M&E, data and reporting among agencies from national government, county government, semi-autonomous government agents (parastatals, corporations etc), NGOs and other key players;
4. Training and skills improvements on M&E and report writing for staff in departments and sub county offices;
5. Sensitization and induction training on Participatory M&E for Ward Development Committee Members and community resource persons;
6. ICT based M&E systems for data and information capture, generation of generic reports;
7. Logistical support (laptops, cameras, projectors, screens etc) to enhance production and dissemination of reports and findings;
8. Support a framework for reviews and feedback on planning and M&E process and outputs.

KRA 3: Human Resource Management

The following are identified areas for capacity support:

1. Development of HR policy and strategy;
2. Training needs assessments and support to training and capacity building across all staff;
3. Establish ICT based Human Resource Information Systems;
4. Support staff performance appraisals, preparation of annual staffing plans and targets;
5. Preparation of skills and competency framework;
6. Support undertaking service re-engineering and launching IRRs;
7. Establishing modern staff registry and bulk storage facilities for staff records.

KRA 4: Civic Educations and Participation

The following are identified areas for capacity support:

1. Support development for citizens' grievance/complaints and feedback policy/guidelines followed by sensitizations for general public and county government staff;
2. Support to establish citizen complaints/grievances and feedback systems;
3. Civic education methods, development of relevant tools and collaborations with NGO;
4. Training and capacity building on customers focused service delivery;
5. Support periodical reviews and audits for civic education and public participation as well as citizens' complaints/grievances and feedback systems and processes;
6. Support establishing of a Radio Station (in collaboration with Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources); bulk SMS platform for data and feedback; development of county open data portal;

7. Support production of audio visual clips, interactive radio/TV sessions and socio media communication platform.

KRA 5 Investments Implementation, Social Safeguards and Environment Performance

The following are areas identified for capacity support:

1. Support establishment of relevant county policies and guidelines on EMCA regulations, specifically on noise and excessive vibrations;
2. Support logistics, training and capacity development for the county to monitor performance/compliances and enforce regulations relating to noise and excessive vibrations;
3. Support sensitization and induction programme for County Environment Committee (after this is gazzetted)
4. Support sensitizations programmes for county government (Executive and Legislation) and general public on EMCA law, regulations and compliances by county government;
5. Support collaboration mechanisms with NGOs and civil society organizations to increase outreach and sensitizations for general public and focus groups on environmental issues;
6. Support establishment and strengthening county focal environmental units and representative focal persons in departments and in sub counties to coordinate and steer environmental and social safeguard issues w.r.t. county government;

Minute 3: Feedback from the meeting

In his address, the Chairman had the following:

a. The county is proposing for necessary approvals and authorizations to allow 1% of development budget for use on M&E related activities.
b. Although some donor supported programmes are supporting training and staff development, there is need for the county to set aside resources to meet staff training and development needs in non-programme areas and sectors;
c. The county is
d. The issue of finalization of policies/guidelines is key to provide a framework for service delivery and guide activities within respective departments and functions;
e. The Chairman appreciated support from KDSP for strengthening the capacity and improving performance of counties and urged all departments to embrace this support. He reported that the county is anxiously expecting the first capacity building grant, hopefully when funds are released by September 2017;
f. The Chairman thanked the assessment team and participating staff for the ACPA assessment and hoped the county will perform well.

There being no other business, the meeting was closed with a prayer. Minutes of meeting taken by: Norman M Muchori

Signature

For/behalf of County Government of Elgeyo Marakwet:

Name:……

Designation:…….. Date:……

For/behalf of MG&A:

Name:……

Designation:…….. Date:……