

# **WEST POKOT COUNTY ANNUAL CAPACITY & PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT (ACPA) REPORT**

***From***

**27<sup>th</sup> June to 1<sup>st</sup> 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](mailto:customercare@matengogithae.com)

Website: [www.matengogithae.com](http://www.matengogithae.com)



## Table of Contents

ACRONYMS.....	1
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
1.0 METHODOLOGY, ASSESSMENT TEAM AND ACTIVITIES.....	6
1.1 Methodology.....	6
1.2 Time Plan.....	7
2.0 SUMMARY OF RESULTS.....	8
2.1 Minimum Access Conditions (MAC).....	8
2.2 Minimum Performance Conditions.....	11
2.3 Performance Conditions.....	30
3.0 SUMMARY OF CAPACITY BUILDING REQUIREMENTS.....	78
3.1: SUMMARY OF RESULTS.....	78
4.0 CHALLENGES IN THE ASSESSMENT.....	82
5.0 SPECIFIC AND GENERAL COMMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL ASPECTS OF THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....	83
5.1 MAC's.....	83
5.2 MPC's Issues.....	83
5.3 PMs.....	83
6.0 NOTIFICATION OF DISAGREEMENT.....	86
7.0 OVERVIEW OF THE 5 WEAKEST PERFORMANCE.....	87
APPENDIX 1: ENTRY MEETING MINUTES.....	88
APPENDIX 2: EXIT MEETING MINUTES.....	91

## ACRONYMS

ACPA	-	Annual Capacity and Performance Assessment
ADP	-	Annual Development Plans
CB	-	Capacity Building
CEC	-	County Executive Committee
CFAR	-	County Financial and Accounting Report
CGWP	-	County Government of West Pokot
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 West Pokot County Government and County Assembly Officials, senior management and staff who participated in the Annual Capacity and Performance Assessment.

The assessment team notes with a lot of appreciation the key roles played by **Mr. Kennedy Tegeret** who is the KDSP County Focal Person for all entry arrangements, staff mobilization and arranging for assessment sessions and also chairing the Entry Meeting on Tue 27<sup>th</sup> June 2017. Further the team acknowledges the overall leadership in the process, participation and involvement of the Acting County Secretary **Mr. Jackson Pengat Kariwonyang** who also chaired the Exit Meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> June 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. It may not be possible to mention all of you by names but kindly accept our acknowledgements.

We acknowledge participatory, valuable contributions and insights by the staff from NEMA West Pokot County Coordination Office.

## 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 from FY 2016/17) to fund county executed capacity building and to increase the incentives for counties to proactively invest in their own capacity.

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

This report documents the key issues that arose during the pilot assessment of West Pokot 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	County has met 5 MPCs: MPC 5-Adherence to Investment Menu is not applicable as investment funds are yet to be released; The county has not met MPCs 3 on Audit Opinion, MPC 6 on procurement plan and MPC 9 on citizen participation.

ACPA Measures	Outcome	Score
PM	KRA 1: Public Financial Management	13
	KRA 2: Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	16
	KRA 3: Human Resource Management	7
	KRA 4: Civic Education and Participation	10
	KRA 5: Investment implementation & Social and environmental performance	0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>46</b>

### Achievement

The county had the following achievements:

1. A working framework and proper systems for financial management;
2. Having core persons/skills in place, having skills and competence framework and operationalization and evaluation of performance contracting;
3. Secure storage facilities for its documents; and
4. Public participation in budgeting forums and consultations outside budget forum.

### Weakness

The following were areas of weakness:

1. County yet to Adopt the IFMIS Hyperion Module;
2. Lack of in year reports (monthly/quarterly) reporting on accounting and budget monitoring to ensure accountability and manage programmes in a more efficient manner and address any adverse trends;
3. Procurement file management lacks completeness of all documentation and sign off;
4. Internal Audit Committee not operationalized;
5. County does not have M&E Bill/policy;
6. County M&E Committee is not established;
7. Performance Appraisal systems not operationalized;
8. Service delivery re-engineering not initiated;
9. RRI's not launched;
10. There is no policy, bill, guidelines or framework to enhance communication;
11. No structured citizens' complaints/grievance systems and feedback mechanisms;

12. Screening of investments for EIAs/EAs against social safeguard and environmental management systems not complied with;
13. Establishing a County Environment Committee; and
14. No budget allocation for maintenance to match additional incremental level of investments (infrastructure, plant and equipment).

## **Challenges**

Challenges included the following:

1. Lack of necessary documents in some areas of assessment.
2. Delays to provide documents. and
3. Making photocopy of documents was hampered by power shortages and inadequate photocopying facilities.

## **Areas of Improvement**

The following are areas of proposed improvements:

1. The County to Adopt the IFMIS Hyperion Module;
2. The County to prepare monthly and quarterly reporting on accounting and budget monitoring to ensure; accountability and manage programmes in a more efficient manner and address any adverse trends;
3. Ensure every procurement file has complete documentation and sign off;
4. Operationalize the Internal Audit Committee;
5. Finalize and approve M&E policy and guidelines;
6. Establish and strengthen County M&E Committee;
7. Operationalize staff appraisal and performance management systems;
8. The County to prioritize and select area(s) to initiate service delivery re-engineering and also to launch RRI;
9. The County to finalize and approve policy, bill, guidelines or framework to enhance communication;
10. The County develop and operationalize structured citizens' complaints/grievance systems and feedback mechanisms;
11. The County to ensure screening of investments for EIAs/EAs against social safeguard and environmental management systems is complied with, including implementation and monitoring compliances with EMPs;
12. The County to gazette and induct County Environment Committee;
13. The County to make deliberate effort and commitments on budget allocation for maintenance to match additional incremental level of 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 27<sup>th</sup> June, 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 West Pokot 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 West Pokot County team to share key issues identified in the assessment on 27<sup>th</sup> June, 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	27 <sup>th</sup> June 2017	28 <sup>th</sup> June 2017	29 <sup>th</sup> June 2017	30 <sup>th</sup> June 2017	1 <sup>st</sup> 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.	<b>Met</b>	The signed Participation agreement was availed to the assessment team. A copy of the same was retained as evidence. The signed agreement is dated 15/06/2016
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	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.	<b>Met</b>	Capacity building plan for 2016/17 was developed in February 2016 according to the format in POM/Grant Manual

MACs and PG (level 1)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment	Detailed Assessment Finding
		format in the POM /Grant Manual (annex).			
3. Compliance with investment menu of the grant	Important to ensure quality of the CB support and targeting of the activities.	<p>Compliance with investment menu (eligible expenditure) of the Capacity and Performance Grant) documented in progress reports.</p> <p>MoV: Review of grant and utilization – progress reports. Reporting for the use of CB grants for previous FYs in accordance with the Investment menu</p>		N/A	Funds had not been disbursed
4. Implementation of CB plan	Ensure actual implementation.	<p>Minimum level (70% of FY 16/17 plan, 75% of FY 17/18 plan, 80% of subsequent plans) of implementation of planned CB activities by end of FY.</p> <p>MoV: Review financial statements and use of CB + narrative of activities (quarterly reports and per the Grant Manual).</p>		N/A	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
<b>Minimum Access Conditions complied with</b>					
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	<b>Met</b>	Signed agreements and capacity building plans in place. Copies retained as evidence, except for the areas awaiting fulfillment of grant disbursements.
<b>Financial Management</b>					
2. Financial statements submitted	To reduce fiduciary risks	Financial Statements with letter on documentation submitted to the Kenya National Audit Office by <b>30<sup>th</sup> September</b> 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 statements are submitted for	3 months after closure of the FY (30 <sup>th</sup> of September).  Complied with if the county is submitting individual department statements: 3 months after end of FY for department statements and 4	<b>Met</b>	Consolidated and Individual Financial statements are available for year ended June 30 <sup>th</sup> 2016. Submission done 3 months after FY end. Financial Statements for 2015/16 submitted to the Kenya National Audit office by 30 <sup>th</sup> September 2016 as evidenced by approval stamp and 30 <sup>th</sup> October 2016.

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		<p>each department, the county must also submit consolidated statements by 31<sup>st</sup>October. The FS has to be in an auditable format.</p> <p>MoV: Annual financial statements (FSs), submission letters to Office of the Auditor General (OAG) + records in OAG.</p>	<p>months after end of FY for consolidated statement. If the council is only submitting consolidated statement: Deadline is 3 months after end of FY.</p>		<p>Financial Statements produced and signed off by Chief officer- Finance and Economic planning and Head of Treasury</p>
<p>3. Audit opinion does not carry an adverse opinion, or a disclaimer on any substantive issue</p>	<p>To reduce fiduciary risks</p>	<p>The opinion in the audit report of the financial statements for county legislature and executive of the previous fiscal year cannot be adverse or carry a disclaimer on any substantive issue.</p> <p>MoV: Audit reports from Office of the Auditor General.</p> <p><b>Transitional arrangements:</b> Transitional arrangements are in place as audit report may be disclaimed due to balance sheet issues.</p>	<p>Note. This will be last trigger for release as report is not yet there upon time for the ACPA.</p> <p><b>Transitional arrangements:</b> First ACPA where MPCs are applied i.e. in the 2016 ACPA: Issues are defined for the core issues, which disqualify counties</p>	<p><b>Not Met</b></p>	<p>Audited financial statements for the year ended 30<sup>th</sup> June 2016 for the County Executive was issued with a Disclaimer of Opinion while the County Assembly had a Qualified Opinion.</p> <p>Basis of Disclaimer of opinion for the County Executive were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There were inaccuracies in the financial statements</li> <li>2. Assets from former</li> </ol>

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		<p>First year where the Minimum Performance Conditions are applied (i.e. 2<sup>nd</sup> AC&amp;PA starting in September 2016) the conditions are as follows:</p> <p>Audit report shows that the county has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided documentation of revenue and expenditures (without significant issues leading to adverse opinion);</li> <li>• No cases of substantial mismanagement (which in itself would lead to adverse audit opinion) and fraud;</li> <li>• Spending within budget and revised budget;</li> <li>• Quarterly reports submitted in last FY to Cob;</li> <li>• Books of accounts (cashbooks) posted with bank reconciliations up-to-date.</li> </ul>	as per audit reports, see previous column.		<p>local authorities are not included in the financial statements</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. There was no explanation why the county failed to meet revenue target</li> <li>4. There was no approved work plan for funds received from KRB</li> <li>5. There were unauthorized expenditures amounting to KES 173,290,011</li> <li>6. Land valued at KES 11,920, acquired during the year had no title deeds</li> <li>7. There was no authority from the Attorney general to pay legal fees to private legal firms</li> <li>8. There were huge un presented cheques of KES 131,322,039 and</li> </ol>

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assets register for new assets in place</li> </ul>			<p>i=unbanked receipts of KES 97,589,429</p> <p>The basis of Qualified opinion for the Assembly were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was no fixed asset register</li> <li>Receipts in the financial statements and that of the controller of budget had a variance</li> <li>Perdiem of KES 3,425,460 was paid for a trip that never took place</li> <li>There was an over expenditure on domestic travel above the budget limit,</li> <li>There was unsupported payment of tax amounting to KES 12,642,542</li> <li>There were cases</li> </ol>

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					<p>of delay in implementation of projects</p> <p><b>7.</b> There was improper management of imprest</p> <p><b>8.</b> Car loans of KES 58,320,000 were not supported</p> <p><b>9.</b> Unbanked receipts of KES 2,481,005 were not supported</p>
<p><b>4.</b> Annual planning documents in place</p>	<p>To demonstrate a minimum level of capacity to plan and manage funds</p>	<p>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)).</p> <p>MoV: CIDP, ADP, and budget approval documentation, minutes from council meetings and review of county web-site.</p>	<p>At the point of time of the ACPA, which will take place in Sep-Nov, the plans for current year are reviewed.</p>	<p><b>Met</b></p>	<p>Approved CIDP, ADP and Budgets are all uploaded in the county website. Dates of approval 23/06/2015 for plans and 30 /06/2015 for budgets. Approval documents presented and reviewed by the assessment team.</p> <p><a href="http://www.westpoko.t.go.ke/index/php/aboutthecounty/reports-publications/general-">http://www.westpoko.t.go.ke/index/php/aboutthecounty/reports-publications/general-</a></p>

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					<a href="#">downloads</a>
<b>Use of funds in accordance with Investment menu</b>					
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.  <u>MoV</u> : Review financial statements against the grant guidelines. Check up on use of funds from the CPG through the source of funding in the chart of accounts (if possible through the general reporting system with Source of Funding codes) or special manual system of reporting as defined in the Capacity and Performance Grant Manual)  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.
<b>Procurement</b>					
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)	Not Met	Detailed separate procurement plans (County assembly and executive) are in place

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
	<p>coordinated from the central procurement unit instead at departmental , and to ensure sufficient capacity to handle discretionary funds.</p>	<p><u>MoV</u>: 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.</p> <p>The procurement plan(s) will have to be up-dated if/and when there are budget revisions, which require changes in the procurement process.</p> <p>Note that there is need to check both the consolidated procurement plan for 1) the assembly and 2) the executive, and whether it is revised when budget revisions are made.</p>			<p>and used to inform actual procurement activities for the planned FY2015-2016. Revised procurement plans-fy2015/2016, at the time of our assessment was not availed despite revised budgets being available to inform revision of the procurement plans.</p>
<b>Core Staffing in Place</b>					
7. County Core staff in	To ensure	Core staff in place as per	At the point of	<b>Met</b>	Yes, the core staff are

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
place	minimum capacity in staffing	<p>below list (see also County Government Act Art. 44). The following staff positions should be in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The country secretary</li> <li>• Chief officer of finance,</li> <li>• Planning officer,</li> <li>• Internal auditor,</li> <li>• Procurement officer</li> <li>• Accountant</li> <li>• Focal Environmental and Social Officer designated to oversee environmental and social safeguards for all sub projects</li> <li>• M&amp;E officer</li> </ul> <p><u>MoV</u>: Staff organogram, schemes of service to review the qualifications against requirements (hence the staff needs to be substantive compared to the schemes of service), sample check salary payments, job descriptions, interview and sample checks. Staff <b>acting</b> in positions may</p>	time for the ACPA.		<p>in place and the respective positions are provided for in the organization structure which was approved on 4/3/2015 by letter WPC/CS/CARPS/1/14. The assessment team interacted/interviewed many of the core persons as evidenced in minutes of entry and exit meetings (Annex 1 and 2). The assessment team verified the following:</p> <p>CS is Mr Jackson Pengat Kariwonyang was appointed in acting position letter from the CPSB ref: WPC/CPSB/AG/2/17 of 15/2/2017. The appointment letter communicates a description of duties</p>

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		also fulfill the conditions if they comply with the qualifications required in the schemes of service.			<p>and responsibilities. He is a university graduate and he meets qualifications and requirements of County Govt. Act art 44.</p> <p>COF is Mr Jackson Pengat Kariwonyang recruited by CPSB and appointed by letter ref: WPC/ADM/CO.01/14 of 13/3/2014. He is a graduate and meets qualifications and requirements of County Govt. Act art 45. His salary structure and allowances are guided by with SRC Circular SRC/TS/CGOVT/3/61(84) of 31/7/2014;</p> <p>Planning Officer is Mr.</p>

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					<p>Kennedy Kiplagat Tegeret. He was recruited and appointed by letter ref WPC/HRM/133/14 of 4.3.14. He holds a B.A. (Economics) and meets qualification, scheme of service for Economists and Statisticians from national government. His salary structure and allowances are in line with national government civil service.</p> <p>Internal Auditor Mr. Thomas Pkemoi Kapel was recruited by CPSB and appointed by letter ref: WPC/HRM/105 of 29/1/2014 meets qualifications and scheme of service for</p>

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					<p>Accountants for national government. His pay structure and allowances are guided by the scheme of service for civil servants in national government;</p> <p>Procurement Officer is Mr. Stephen Pkeich Kapel was recruited and appointed by letter WPC/HRM/113 of 29.1.2014 meets qualifications and scheme of service from national government;</p> <p>Head of Treasury (Accountant) Mr. Charles M Kahono was recruited by CPSB and appointed by letter WPC/CPSB/APT/1/17 of 24.1.14 meets</p>

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					<p>qualifications and requirements of the scheme of service for supply chain management personnel for the national government. His salary structure and allowances are guided by the same scheme of service.</p> <p>Environment Focal Person, M/s Carren Nasiaki Kirungu is appointed through a letter of open reference dated 29/11/2017 while Kennedy Pkew Cheptuimot is appointed Social Safeguard officer by an open letter dated 29<sup>th</sup> Nov 2017 – the letters were presented after 27<sup>th</sup> Nov 2017. More</p>

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					<p>details on skills, capacity, experience etc. for these officers has not been availed</p> <p>M&amp;E officer is Mr. Issac Yeko Ritakou. He was appointed by CPSB by letter WP/CPSB/APT/2/16 of 5/8/2016. He holds a B.A. (Economics) and meets requirements of the scheme of service for Economists and Statisticians for the national government. His salary structure is guided by the same scheme of service</p> <p>The county all the 8 (in view of the Environmental and Social Safeguard Officer) and therefore is assessed MET</p>

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
<b>Environmental and Social Safeguards</b>					
<p>8. Functional and Operational Environmental and Social Safeguards Systems (i.e. screening/vetting, clearance/ approval, enforcement &amp; compliance monitoring, grievance redress mechanisms, documentation &amp; reporting) in place.</p>	<p>To ensure that there is a mechanism and capacity to screen environmental and social risks of the planning process prior to implementation, and to monitor safeguard during implementation.</p> <p>To avoid significant adverse environmental and social impacts</p>	<p>1. Counties endorse and ratify the environmental and social management system to <b>guide investments</b> (from the ACPA starting September 2016).</p> <p>2) All proposed investments <b>screened*</b> against set of environmental and social criteria/checklist, safeguards instruments prepared. (Sample 5-10 projects). (From the second AC&amp;PA, Sept. 2016).</p> <p>3) Prepare relevant <b>RAP for all investments with any displacement. Project Reports for investments for submission to NEMA.</b> (From the 3<sup>rd</sup> AC&amp;PA, Sept. 2017). Sample 5-10 projects.</p> <p>4. Establishment of County Environment Committee.</p> <p><u>MoV</u>: Review endorsements from NEMA, ratification,</p>	<p>Note that the first installment of the expanded CPG investment menu covering sectoral investments starts from July 2017 (FY 2017/18).</p> <p>Hence some of the conditions will be reviewed in the ACPA prior to this release to ascertain that capacity is in place at county level, and other MPCs will review performance in the year after start on the utilization of the expanded grant menu (i.e. in the 3<sup>rd</sup> AC&amp;PA, see the previous</p>	<p><b>Met</b></p>	<p>1. No Environmental bill or policy or a framework to manage and enforce compliances with devolved functions under EMCA (Amendment) Act 2015 for excessive noise and vibrations for the County.</p> <p>2. The county has not undertaken an investment that was screened against set environmental and social criteria/checklist.</p> <p>NEMA office on 11/2/2016, NEMA/CDE/WPC/9/Vol 1/2/02/2016 has listed 36 investments that do not comply against set</p>

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
	<p>To promote environmental and social benefits and ensure sustainability</p> <p>To provide opportunity for public participation and consultation in safeguards process (free, prior and informed consultations – FPIC)</p>	<p>screening materials and documentation, and contracts. Evidence that all projects are reviewed, coordinated and screened against checklist in Program Operating Manual. Various departments may conduct screening, but there is a need to provide an overview and evidence that all projects are screened.</p> <p>* In cases where the county has clear agreement with NEMA that it does the screening and that all projects are screened, this condition is also seen to be fulfilled.</p>	<p>column for details).</p>		<p>environmental and social criteria/checklist. For example constructions of sub county offices at Sigor, Alale, Chepareria and Kapenguria; construction of youth empowerment centre and library at Kapenguria; construction of a blood bank, store for drugs and casualty wing at Kapenguria Hospital</p> <p>3. N/A. Reports are that county has not implemented a project involving RAP.</p> <p>4. CEC is yet established in accordance to EMCA (Amendment) Act 2015.</p>

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					<p>NEMA in collaboration with county/national govt. departments has a County Environmental Technical (sub) Committee (CETC) which is a stop gap measure to make things happen before the county has CEC formally on gazette. Minutes of some meetings for of CETC were availed to assessment team</p> <p>The fact that County has not been screening investment projects and the issue severally raised by NEMA the assessment criteria and therefore NOT MET</p>

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.	At point of time for the ACPA.	<b>Not Met</b>	Complains handling system is fragmented and operates more on ad hoc basis. County does not have a framework, systems, procedures etc. to comprehensively handle  a). A complaints and grievance committee is established as per open letter dated 20 <sup>th</sup> Nov 2017.  b) A designated Focal Point Officer is nominated and provided with a letter WPC/CS/STAFF/VOL. I/017 of 20.5.2016 allocating duties amongst other duties.  c) County has developed simple

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		<p><u>MoV</u>: Review county policy, availability of the focal office (recruitment files, salary payments, job description for focal point, and evidence for operations, etc. + members of grievance committee, minutes from meetings, various channels for lodging complaints, official and up to date record of complaints etc. <i>See also County Government Act Art. 15 and 88 (1)</i></p>			<p>form/template designed and available to the public. These were presented after 27<sup>th</sup> Nov 2017.</p> <p>d). There are channels of receiving complaints such as telephone landline 0532014000 but no records to verify that all calls are systematically recorded, monitored, acted upon and feedback given.</p> <p>e. County has developed simple records of complaints and framework to manage complaints; and has no designated budgets for this purpose which were presented after 27<sup>th</sup></p>

MPCs for CPG (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					<p>Nov 2017</p> <p>In summary, the county has a weak framework, systems processes, procedures etc. to manage and act on citizen's complaints, grievances and feedback as envisaged in the provisions of the County Government Act 2012 Art. 185 and 88.</p>

## 2.3 Performance Conditions

Table 5: The summary of results for Performance Conditions

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
<b>KRA 1: Public Financial Management</b> <b>Max score: Maximum 30 points.</b>							
<i>Strengthened budget formulation, resource mobilization and allocation</i>							
1.1	Program Based Budget prepared using IFMIS and SCOA	Budget format and quality	<p>The annual budget approved by the County Assembly is:</p> <p>a) Program Based Budget format.</p> <p>b) Budget developed using the IFMIS Hyperion module.</p>	<p>Review county budget document, IFMIS uploads, the CPAR, 2015.</p> <p>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).</p>	<p><b>Maximum 2 points.</b></p> <p>2 milestones (a &amp; b) met: 2 points</p> <p>1 of the 2 milestones met: 1 point</p>	1	<p>The annual budget approved by the county assembly is in PBB format.</p> <p>Hyperion is not utilized by the budgets team.</p> <p>These are prepared in excel worksheets and forwarded to IFMIs team to support upload to the system.</p>
1.2		Budget process follows	Clear budget calendar with the following key	PFM Act, art 128, 129, 131.	<p><b>Max. 3 points</b></p> <p>If all 5</p>	3	Budget development process follows a calendar that is

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
		clear budget calendar	<p>milestones achieved:</p> <p>a) Prior to end of August the CEC member for finance has issued a circular to the county government entities with guidelines to be followed;</p> <p>b) County Budget review and outlook paper – submission by 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</p>	Review budget calendar, minutes from meetings (also from assembly resolutions) circular submission letters, county outlook paper, minutes from meetings and Financial Statements.	<p>milestones (a-e) achieved: 3 points</p> <p>If 3-4 items: 2 points</p> <p>If 2 items: 1 point</p> <p>If 1 or 0 items: 0 points.</p>		<p>issued through a circular by CEC.</p> <p>a) CEC-Finance issued a circular detailing the processes and dates of the budget review process; calendar provided for assessment had <b>no date appended to it as to when it was released.</b></p> <p>b) The county budget review and outlook paper was submitted to county treasury by 30/09/2015 and further submitted to county assembly on 14/10/2015 after CEC approval.</p> <p>c) CFSP was</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			<p>15<sup>th</sup> October.</p> <p>c) County fiscal strategy paper (FSP) – submission (by county treasury) of county strategy paper to county executive committee by 28<sup>th</sup> Feb, County Treasury to submit to county assembly by 15<sup>th</sup> of march and county assembly to discuss within two weeks after mission.</p> <p>d) CEC member for finance submits budget estimates to county assembly by 30<sup>th</sup> April latest.</p> <p>e) County</p>				<p>submitted to the county executive committee by the 27/02/2015. It was further submitted to the county assembly by the 14/03/2015.</p> <p>d) Budget estimates were submitted to the County assembly on 30/04/2015, by a forwarding letter No minutes were provided</p> <p>e) County assembly passed the budgets on 30/6/2015 without amendments. Hansards reviewed to verify this.</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			assembly passes a budget with or without amendments by 30 <sup>th</sup> June latest.				
1.3		Credibility of budget	<p>a) Aggregate expenditure out-turns compared to original approved budget.</p> <p>b) Expenditure composition for each sector matches budget allocations (average across sectors).</p>	Review the <b>original</b> budget and the annual financial statements, budget progress reports, audit reports, etc. Use figures from IFMIS (general ledger report at department (sub-vote) level).	<p><b>Max. 4 points.</b></p> <p><u>Ad a):</u> If expenditure deviation between total budgeted expenditures and total exp. in final account is less than 10 % then 2 points.</p> <p>If 10-20 % then 1 point. More than 20 %: 0 point.</p> <p><u>Ad b):</u> If average deviation of</p>	<b>2</b>	<p>a) Aggregate Expenditure out turn deviation is 6% as per consolidated Financial Statement of 2015/2016. Total budget 9,208,497,571. Aggregate expenditure 8,619,010,849.</p> <p>b) Expenditure composition for each sector versus budget was <b>NOT</b> furnished.</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
					expenditures across sectors is less than 10 % then 2 points. If 10-20 % then 1 point. More than 20 %: 0 point.		
<b>Revenue Enhancement</b>							
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.	<b>Max: 2 points.</b> Over 80% = 2 points Over 60% = 1 point	<b>0</b>	Automation started in March 2016. No data was available to do comparative analysis for 2015/2016. The automation in current FY is functional and the staff was able to demonstrate its functionalities. Currently FY2017 automated and manually collected revenues bankings done on a daily

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							basis. Banking slips and user details were provided for assessment.
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.).	<b>Max. 1 point.</b>  If increase is more than 10 %: 1 point.	<b>0</b>	A decrease in OSR was noted in revenue collection between the periods FY2014/2015(103,899,328) and FY2015/2016(98,257,713). A decrease of 5.4% was registered.
<b><i>Enhanced capacity of counties on execution (including procurement), accounting and reporting</i></b>							
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	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	<b>Max. 2 points.</b>  (a &b) Submitted on time and published: 2 points.  (a only): Submitted on time only: 1	<b>0</b>	a) No evidence in form of reports, letters, minutes of meeting etc to verify that quarterly reports were submitted to the County Assembly, controller of budget, national treasury and

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			<p>county assembly with copies to the controller of budget, National Treasury and CRA.</p> <p>b) Summary revenue, expenditure and progress report is published in the local media/web-page.</p>	evidence of publication of summary revenue and expenditure outturns.	point.		<p>CRA.</p> <p>b)Summary revenue, expenditure and progress report is <b>NOT</b> published in the local media/web-page</p>
1.7		Quality of financial statements.	<p>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</p>	<p>Review annual financial statements, bank conciliations and related documents and appendixes to the FS, date and receipts (from CoB and NT).</p> <p>Check against the PFM Act, Art. 166 and the IPSAS format.</p> <p>CFAR, Section 8.</p>	<p><b>Max. 1 point.</b></p> <p>Quality as defined by APA team or NT assessment (excellent/satisfactory): 1 point</p>	1	<p>Satisfactory Annual financial statements with relevant appendices are compiled and Formats of financial statements adopted those provided according to IPSAS. Bank reconciliations are executed every month. Fixed assets schedules are also</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			outstanding payments, appendix with fixed assets register.	Check against requirements.  If possible review ranking of FS by NT (using the County Government checklist for in-year and annual report), and if classified as excellent or satisfactory, conditions are also complied with.			attached.
1.8		Monthly reporting and up-date of accounts, including:	The monthly reporting shall include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Income and expenditure statements;</li> <li>2. Budget execution report,</li> <li>3. Financial statement including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Details of</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Review monthly reports.  See also the PFM Manual, p. 82 of which some of the measures are drawn from.	<b>Max. 2 points.</b>  If all milestones (1-3): 2 points  If 1 or 2: 1 point  If none: 0 points.	<b>1</b>	No monthly reports are produced for the County. Items 1 to 3d are not generated by the County.  Bank reconciliations are done on a monthly basis.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			<p>income and revenue</p> <p><b>b.</b> Summary of expenditures</p> <p><b>c.</b> Schedule of imprest and advances;</p> <p><b>d.</b> Schedule of debtors and creditors;</p> <p><b>e.</b> Bank reconciliations and post in general ledger.</p>				
1.9		Asset registers up-to-date and inventory	Assets registers are up-to date and independent physical inspection and verification of	Review assets register, and sample a few assets. PFM Act. Art 149.  Checkup-dates.	<b>Max. 1 point.</b> Registers are up-to-date: 1 point.	<b>1</b>	Asset registers in place and up to date The asset register contains the following details;

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			assets should be performed once a year.		<p>Transitional arrangements:</p> <p><u>First year:</u> Assets register need only to contain assets acquired by county governments since their establishment.</p> <p><u>Second year onwards:</u> register must include all assets, including those inherited from Local Authorities and National Ministries</p>		<p>item description, brand/model, purchasing department, general location, purchase value and purchase date It is further recommended to include specific locality of the assets where they reside, serial numbers of items identifiable by the same and asset tags to be used to completely secure and identify each individual assets and specific locality of the asset to be captured in the asset register.</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
<b>Audit</b>							
1.10.	<b>Internal audit</b>	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	<b>Max. 1 point.</b>  4 quarterly audit reports submitted in previous FY: 1 point.	<b>0</b>	Internal Audit is in existence and staffed with 6 persons and headed by a Head of County Internal Audit.  No quarterly reports produced.
1.11		Effective and efficient internal audit committee.	IA/Audit committee established and review of reports and follow-up.	Review composition of IA/Audit Committee, minutes etc. for evidence of review of internal audit reports. Review evidence of follow-up, i.e. evidence that there is an ongoing process to address the issues raised from last FY, e.g. control systems in place, etc. (evidence from follow-up meetings in the Committee). PFM Act Art 155.	<b>Max. 1 point.</b> IA/Audit Committee established and reports reviewed by Committee and evidence of follow-up: 1 point.	<b>0</b>	Internal Audit Committee not established though plans are underway to put in place the IAC. Letters of intent has been drawn and advertisement placed for recruitment of the committee through the Public service Commission. This letters have been retained as evidence

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							of work in progress.
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.	<b>Max. 2 points</b>  Value of queries <1% of total expenditures: 2 points  <5% of total expenditure: 1 point	<b>0</b>	The Value of Audit queries for the county amounted to Kes.14.954B which translates to <b>299%</b> (14.954B/4.999B) of the total expenditure of Kes.4.999B
1.13		Reduction of audit queries	The county has reduced the value of the audit queries (fiscal size of the area of which the query is raised).	Review audit reports from KENAO from the last two audits.	<b>Max. 1 point.</b> Audit queries (in terms of value) have reduced from last year but one to last year or if there is no audit queries: 1 point.	<b>1</b>	FY2015/16 value of Audit queries (Kes.84.811M) for County Assembly reduced by <b>80%</b> ((1-(84.811/426.438)) compared to FY2014/15 Audit queries of Kes.426.438M
1.14		Legislative scrutiny of audit reports and	Greater and more timely legislative scrutiny of external audit reports	Minutes from meetings, review of previous audit reports.	<b>Max. 1 point.</b>  Tabling of audit report	<b>0</b>	The County does not conduct legislative scrutiny of audit reports and

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
		follow-up	within required period and evidence that audit queries are addressed		and evidence of follow-up: 1 point.		follow up.
<b>Procurement</b>							
1.15	<b>Improved procurement procedures</b>	Improved procurement procedures including use of IFMIs, record keeping, adherence to procurement thresholds and tender evaluation.	Note: When PPRA develop a standard assessment tool, APA will switch to using the score from the PPRA assessment as the PM (PfR may incentivize PPRA to do this in DLI 1 or 3). a) 25 steps in the IFMIS procurement process adhered with. b) County has submitted required procurement reports to PPRA	Annual procurement assessment and audit by PPRA and OAG Sample 5 procurements (different size) and review steps complied with in the IFMIS guidelines.  Calculate average steps complied with in the sample.  Review reports submitted.  Check reports from tender committees and procurement units.	<b>Max. 6 points.</b> a) IFMIS Steps: <15steps=0 points; 15-23=1 point; 24-25=2 points  b) Timely submission of quarterly reports to PPRA (both annual reports plus all reports for procurements above proscribed	a)1 b)0 c)1 d)1 e)0	a) 16 steps are executed through IFMIS, while 11 steps are manually executed. The other function of suppliers receiving information of their payments through the supplier portal is not done as county suppliers are not registered in the portal.  b) Quarterly procurement reports not prepared and submitted to PPRA. They are nonexistent

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			<p>on time.</p> <p>c) Adherence with procurement thresholds and procurement methods for type/size of procurement in a sample of procurements.</p> <p>d) Secure storage space with adequate filing space designated and utilized – for a sample of 10 procurements, single files containing all relevant documentation in one place are stored in this secure storage</p>	<p>Check a sample of 5 procurement and review adherence with thresholds and procurement methods and evaluation reports.</p> <p>Check for secure storage space and filing space, and for a random sample of 10 procurements of various sizes, review contents of files.</p>	<p>thresholds): <b>1 point</b></p> <p>c) Adherence with procurement thresholds and procurement methods for type/size of procurement in a sample of procurements: <b>1 point.</b></p> <p>d) Storage space and single complete files for sample of procurements: <b>1 point</b></p> <p>e) Evaluation reports: <b>1 point</b></p>		<p>at the county level.</p> <p>c) Thresholds matrixes are observed of the procurement of goods and services according the procurement and disposal act 2006Act. The threshold amounts vary according to the budgeted amounts of goods, works and services in the respective class C category</p> <p>d) Bulk storage Cabinets for single files do exist in the procurement offices. Tender documents are kept separately from other documents under</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			<p>space (1 point)</p> <p>e) Completed evaluation reports, including individual evaluator scoring against pre-defined documented evaluation criteria and signed by each member of the evaluation team, available for a sample of 5 large procurements (2 points)</p>				<p>secure key bulk files storage at the basement of the West Pokot county national treasury building.</p> <p>e) Evaluation reports are filed and in place for several files of large projects reviewed.</p> <p>Files are incomplete in terms of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evaluation report not signed off by all evaluation team members.</li> <li>2. Interim evaluation reports not approved.</li> <li>3. Advertisement of tender not complete for 2 wide circulated</li> </ol>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							newspaper. Ref WPC/T/347/2015/10 -Improvement and maintenance works TarTar Parpello Box Culvert Project.
<b>Key Result Area 2: Planning and M&amp;E</b> <b>Max score: (tentative 20 points)</b>							
2.1	County M&E system and frameworks developed	County M&E/Planning unit and frameworks in place.	a) Planning and M&E units (may be integrated in one) established.  b) There are designated planning and M&E officer and each line ministry has a focal point for planning and one for M&E  c) Budget is dedicated for both planning and M&E.	Review staffing structure and organogram.  Clearly identifiable budget for planning and M&E functions in the budget.	<b>Maximum 3 points</b>  The scoring is one point per measure Nos. a-c complied with.	a) 1  b) 0  c) 1	a) A combined Planning and M&E unit is formed in the organization structure for Finance and Economic Planning Department. There are 4 officers (Economists, Statisticians and M&E background) in the department who are assigned to coordinate Planning and M&E activities in other departments, sub counties and

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							wards.  b) M&E Officer is designated by letter WP/CPSB/APT/2/16 of 5/08/2016 and has taken up responsibilities. CEC Fin & Economic Planning has asked county depts./ministries to nominate officers in a letter of 14.9.2015 ref WPC/F&EP/5/VI(1) reviewed by the assessment team. No formal response or nominations  FY 2015/16 – Kshs 1.4m; FY 2016/17 – Kshs 4.5m
2.2		County M&E	County M&E Committee meets	Review minutes of the quarterly meeting in the	<b>Maximum: 1 point</b>		The County has not inaugurated an M&E

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
		Committee in place and functioning	at least quarterly and reviews the quarterly performance reports. (I.e. it is not sufficient to have hoc meetings).	County M&E Committee.	Compliance: 1 point.	0	Committee and this is expected to be undertaken after a Draft Policy on M&E is approved. As such no meetings are held.
2.3	County Planning systems and functions established	CIDP formulated and updated according to guidelines	<p>a) CIDP: adheres to guideline structure of CIDP guidelines,</p> <p>b) CIDP has clear objectives, priorities and outcomes, reporting mechanism, result matrix, key performance indicators included; and</p> <p>c) Annual financing requirement for</p>	<p>CIDP submitted in required format (as contained in the CIDP guidelines published by MoDP).</p> <p>See County Act, Art. 108, Art 113 and Art. 149.</p> <p>CIDP guidelines, 2013, chapter 7.</p>	<p><b>Maximum: 3 points</b></p> <p>1 point for compliance with each of the issues: a, b and c.</p>	<p>a) 1</p> <p>b) 1</p> <p>c) 1</p>	<p>a) CIDP for West Pokot was presented and reviewed by the assessment team. It is verified that CIDP adheres to guidelines and structure as is required by relevant provisions of County Government Act 2012, Art. 108 1nd 113 as explained more in the following item (b), below.</p> <p>b) CIDP has clear goals and objectives</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			full implementation of CIDP does not exceed 200% of the previous FY total county revenue.				also stated at sector level and links to other plans such as Vision 2030 and MTPs, is prepared within framework of other relevant laws and draws priorities for development and actions; has described institutional framework, M&E and resource mobilizations.  c) % increase from base year 2014/15 and 2015/16 computed to be 10.565%
2.4		ADP submitted on time and conforms	a) Annual development plan submitted to Assembly by September 1st in	Review version of ADP approved by County Assembly for structure, and approval procedures and timing,	<b>Maximum: 4 points</b>  Compliance a): 1 point.	4	ADP is submitted within the prescribed date to the County assembly.  Specific date of

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
		to guidelines	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, <u>number A-H</u>	against the PFM Act, Art 126, 1.	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.		submission is 23/06/5015.  b) All issues according to the PFM Act 126 A-H are observed in the development of the ADP.
2.5		Linkage between CIDP, ADP and Budget	Linkages between the ADP and CIDP and the budget in terms of costing and activities. (costing of ADP is within +/- 10 % of final budget allocation)	Review the three documents: CIDP, ADP and the budget. The budget should be consistent with the CIDP and ADP priorities.  The costing of the ADP is within +/- 10% of final budget allocation.  Sample 10 projects and check that they are	<b>Maximum: 2 points</b>  Linkages and within the ceiling: 2 points.	1	The budgets are consistent with the ADP and CIDP.  The costing of the APD is outside the parameters and stands at 14%  Final Budgets- 4,830,488,007  ADP Costings- 4,156,329,341

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
				consistent between the two documents.			
2.6	Monitoring and Evaluation systems in place and used, with feedback to plans	Production of County Annual Progress Report	<p>a) County C-APR produced;</p> <p>b) Produced timely by September 1 and</p> <p>c) C-APR includes clear performance progress against CIDP indicator targets and within result matrix for results and implementation.</p> <p>(Ad b) Compliance if produced within 3 months of the closure of a FY and sent to Council of Governors for information. This will be done in</p>	<p>Check contents of C-APR and ensure that it clearly link s with the CIDP indicators.</p> <p>Verify that the indicators have been sent to the CoG.</p>	<p><b>Maximum: 5 points.</b></p> <p>a) C-APR produced = 2 points</p> <p>b) C-APR produced by end of September. 1 point.</p> <p>c) C-APR includes performance against CIDP performance indicators and targets and with result matrix for results and implementatio</p>	<p>a) 2</p> <p>b) 1</p> <p>c) 2</p>	<p>C-APR for FY 2015/16 produced and is available in website</p> <p><a href="http://www.westpokot.go.ke/index.php/aboutthecounty/reports-publications/reports">http://www.westpokot.go.ke/index.php/aboutthecounty/reports-publications/reports</a></p> <p>C-APR for the year 2015/16 has performance against CIDP performance indicators and targets and with result matrix for results and implementation</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			reference with the County Integrated M&E System Guidelines.		n: 2 points.  (N.B. if results matrix is published separately, not as part of the C-ADP, the county still qualifies for these points)		
2.7		Evaluation of CIDP projects	Evaluation of completion of major CIDP projects conducted on an annual basis.	Review completed project and evaluations (sample 5 large projects).	<b>Maximum: 1 point.</b>  Evaluation done: 1 point.	<b>1</b>	Evaluation of Projects is done. Evaluation report on the various projects produced by the County. Report retained as evidence of major projects completed.
2.8		Feedback from Annual Progress Report to Annual	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	<b>Maximum: 1 point.</b>  Compliance: 1 point.	<b>0</b>	There is no evidence in form of a report, document etc presented by the county to verify that C-APR informs the

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
		Development Plan					ADP and budgets.
<b>Key Result Area 3: Human Resource Management</b> <b>Max score: 12 points.</b>							
3.1	Staffing plans based on functional and organization assessments	Organizational structures and staffing plans	<p>a) Does the county have an approved staffing plan in place, with annual targets?</p> <p>b) Is there clear evidence that the staffing plan was informed by a Capacity Building assessment / functional and organizational assessment and approved organizational structure?</p> <p>c) Have the annual targets in the staffing plan been</p>	<p>Staffing plan</p> <p>Capacity Building Assessment / CARPS report</p> <p>Documentation evidencing hiring, training, promotion, rationalization, etc.</p> <p>In future years (after first AC&amp;PA), there has to be evidence that CB/skills assessments are conducted annually to get points on (b). Targets within (+/- 10 % variations).</p>	<p><b>Maximum 3 points:</b></p> <p>First AC&amp;PA: a = 2 points, b = 1 point c = NA.</p> <p>Future AC&amp;PAs: a=1 point, b = 1 point, c = 1 point</p>	<p>a) 1</p> <p>b) 1</p> <p>c) 0</p>	<p>County has an approved staffing plan in place and annual targets for employment to meet desired numbers of staff. Approval. A copy of the report was presented to the assessment team for review.</p> <p>b) Draft Staffing Plan arrived after a study by Ernst &amp; Young commissioned by MODP. County departments then reviewed emerging plans and have come up with revised structure and</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			met?				<p>optimum staffing levels basing on functionality &amp; service delivery. Request to County PSB to give approval for the revisions are dated 4.03.2015 ref: WPC/CSCARPS/1/14 by the Executive</p> <p>c) Annual target in the staffing plan are not met due to inadequate budgets. This criteria is not met.</p>
3.2	Job descriptions, including skills and competence requirements	Job descriptions, specifications and competency	a) Job descriptions in place and qualifications met (AC&PA 1: Chief officers / heads of departments; 2nd AC&PA: all heads	Job descriptions  Skills and competency frameworks.  Appointment, recruitment and	<b>Maximum score: 4 points</b>  All a, b and c: 4 points.  Two of a-c: 2	<b>4</b>	a) All key staff and staff from national government have job details and responsibilities in their respective letters of

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
		framework	<p>of units; future AC&amp;PAs: all staff (sample check))</p> <p>b) Skills and competency frameworks and Job descriptions adhere to these (AC&amp;PA 1: Chief officers / heads of departments; 2nd AC&amp;PA: all heads of units; future AC&amp;PAs: all staff (sample check)</p> <p>c) Accurate recruitment, appointment and promotion records available</p>	promotion records	<p>points</p> <p>One of a-c: 1 point</p>		<p>appointments, secondment etc. The assessment team reviewed files for CS, CO F, Planning Officer, Internal Auditor and Procurement Officer and verified they all have their job descriptions.</p> <p>b) The county has skills and competence framework (developed with support from SRC and for job evaluations). Copies were presented to the assessment team for review.</p> <p>c) The county maintains updated</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							records in personal files for recruitment, appointment and promotion which are communicated presented to county PSB for directions. A copy of a report for promotions, internal recruitments in 2016 was availed to the assessment team for review.
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 covering at least one	<b>Maximum score: 5 points.</b> <sup>1</sup> a) Staff appraisal for all staff in place: 1 point. (If staff appraisal for b) Performance Contracts in place for CEC	a) 0 b) 1 c) 0	a) County has not developed staff appraisal and performance management process/systems. b) County has developed PC contracts and are used for CECs, CS and COs for 2014/15

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

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			<p>c) service re-engineering undertaken</p> <p>d) RRI undertaken</p>	<p>service</p> <p>RRI Reports for at least one 100 day period</p>	<p>Members and Chief Officers: 1 point</p> <p>Performance Contracts in place for the level below Chief Officers: 1 point</p> <p>c) Service delivery processes re-engineered in counties: 1 point</p> <p>d) Rapid Results Initiatives-RRIs launched/upscaled: 1 point</p>	d) 0	<p>and 2015/16. Sample of PC presented to the assessment team. An evaluation report for 2015/16 revealed capacity gap in administration of PCs and county has now trained two HR staff (Benedict K Mekanyang' and Hellen Loling'ang) to enhance PC administration.</p> <p>c) County has not initiated delivery processes re-engineering. It was reported county lacks necessary skills to do so.</p> <p>d) County has not launched any RRIs initiative. It was</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							reported that County lacks skills in RRI's.
<b>Key Result Area 4: Civic Education and Participation - <i>A citizenry that more actively participated in county governance affairs of the society</i></b> <b>Max score: 18 points</b>							
4.1	Counties establish functional Civic education Units	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.	<b>Maximum 3 points.</b>  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.	<b>2</b>	a) Civic Education Unit established by letter ref: WPC/CS/STAFF/Vol. 1/107 of 20 <sup>th</sup> May 2016.  b) The Head of unit nominated and issued with letter for duty allocations: WPC/CS/STAFF/Vol. 1/107 of 20 <sup>th</sup> May 2016 and has with 25 staff (4 each at sub county and 20 each at ward levels).  c) The County has a budget for civic

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							<p>education which is held under Public Service Management but this is not quantified as no evidence to tell how much.</p> <p>d) The County has no evidence of planned civic education programmes that meets requirements of County Govt. Act 2012 Art. 98.</p> <p>e) The County has made adaptation from Public Participation in Kenya – Civic Education Curriculum by MODP. There are structured tools:</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							<p>these include public advertisement formats; programme for the event; structured agenda; list to register attendants; template for official report on the event including emerging issues and feedback from citizens. All these were presented as evidence.</p> <p>West Pokot county satisfies 3 (a, b and e) out of 5 items under this category and is therefore awarded 2 points.</p>
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	<b>Maximum 2 points.</b>  Roll out of minimum 5	<b>0</b>	County does not have evidence in form of reports, minutes of meetings etc. of engagements



No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			officer is operational.	evidencing activities of the designated officer (e.g. reports written, minutes of meetings attended etc.)			b) The Head of unit nominated and issued with letter for duty allocations: WPC/CS/STAFF/Vol. 1/107 of 20 <sup>th</sup> May 2016
4.4		Participatory planning and budget forums held	<p>a) Participatory planning and budget forums held in previous FY before the plans were completed for on-going FY.</p> <p>b) Mandatory citizen engagement /consultations held beyond the budget forum, (i.e. additional consultations)</p> <p>c) Representation: meets requirements of</p>	<p>PFM Act, Art. 137.</p> <p>County Act, 91, 106 (4), Art. 115.</p> <p>Invitations</p> <p>Minutes from meetings in the forums.</p> <p>List of attendances, Meetings at ward levels,</p> <p>Link between minutes and actual plans.</p> <p>List of suggestions from citizens, e.g. use of templates for this and reporting back.</p>	<p><b>Maximum 3 points.</b></p> <p>All issues met (a-f): 3 points.</p> <p>4-5 met: 2 points.</p> <p>1-3 met: 1 point.</p>	1	<p>a) Participatory planning and budget forums take place in the county. For example, evidence of the following provided to <u>the assessment team</u>:</p> <p>Examples-</p> <p>i. Pokot North- 2/3/2015</p> <p>ii. Pokot Central- 6/3/2015</p> <p>iii. West Pokot – 12/3/2015</p> <p>iv. Pokot South – 10/3/2015</p> <p>These are organized</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			<p>PFMA (section 137) and stakeholder mapping in public participation guidelines issued by MoDP.</p> <p>d) Evidence that forums are structured (not just unstructured discussions)</p> <p>e) Evidence of input from the citizens to the plans, e.g. through minutes or other documentation</p> <p>f) Feed-back to citizens on how proposals have been handled.</p>	<p>Feedback reports / minutes of meetings where feedback provided to citizens</p>			<p>ward level in centres, chiefs' offices, schools etc. Other available records/reports are memorandum for preparations; invitation adverts; minutes from meetings in the forums; list of attendances for meetings held at ward levels,</p> <p>b) County holds citizen consultations and engagements beyond the budget forum, e.g. reports were presented for review of the assessment team planning for project activities such as selection of locations</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							<p>for installation of lightening arresters; planning for protection measures against landslides and protection on soil erosion.</p> <p>c) From lists of attendants it is not obvious the stakeholder the participants represent.</p> <p>d) Public participation forums are structured and county provided for review by the assessment team evidence in form of reports, documents etc. which included advertisements in newspapers (and</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							<p>informed similar announcements are aired through local FM Radio, Kalya), agenda and programme for the forum; printout of budgets etc.</p> <p>e) County did not provide evidence in form of reports, minutes etc. to demonstrate inputs from citizens feed into plans.</p> <p>f) No evidence in form of feedback reports, communication etc. to citizens on how their feedback has been handled.</p> <p>In this assessment county meets 3</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							(items a, b and d) out of 5 milestones
4.5.		Citizens' feed back	Citizen's feedback on the findings from the C-APR/implementation status report.	Records of citizens engagement meetings on the findings of the C-APR. Review evidence from how the inputs have been noted and adhered with and whether there is feedback mechanism in place.	<b>Maximum points: 1</b>  Compliance: 1 point.	<b>0</b>	There is no documentary evidence provided to verify citizen engagement meetings on C-APR, or inputs are noted and adhered with or whether there is feedback mechanism in place this.
4.6		County core financial materials, budgets, plans, accounts, audit reports and performance assessments	Publication (on county web-page, in addition to any other publication) of: <b>i)</b> County Budget Review and Outlook Paper <b>ii)</b> Fiscal Strategy Paper	PFM Act Art 131. County Act, Art. 91. Review county web-page.  (N.B.) Publication of Budgets, County Integrated Development Plan and Annual Development Plan is covered in Minimum Performance Conditions)	<b>Maximum points: 5 points</b>  9 issues: 5 points  7-8 issues: 4 points  5-6 issues: 3 points	<b>4</b>	County has a website <a href="http://www.westpokot.go.ke/index.php/aboutthecounty/reports-publications/reports">http://www.westpokot.go.ke/index.php/aboutthecounty/reports-publications/reports</a> has the following reports and publications: County Budget Review and Outlook

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
		published and shared	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii) Financial statements or annual budget execution report</li> <li>iv) Audit reports of financial statements</li> <li>v) Quarterly budget progress reports or other report documenting project implementation and budget execution during each quarter</li> <li>vi) Annual progress reports (C-APR) with core county indicators</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3-4 issues: 2 points</li> <li>1-2 issues: 1 point</li> <li>0 issues: 0 point.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper</li> <li>i) Fiscal Strategy Paper</li> <li>ii) Annual budgets</li> <li>iii) Annual progress reports (C-APR) with core county indicators</li> <li>iv) Procurement plans and rewards of contracts</li> <li>v) Tenders, pre qualifications</li> <li>vi) Bursaries</li> <li>vii) Public Participation</li> </ul>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			<p>vii) Procurement plans and rewards of contracts</p> <p>viii) Annual Capacity &amp; Performance Assessment results</p> <p>ix) County citizens' budget</p>				
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.	<p>County Act, Art. 23.</p> <p>Review gazetted bills and Acts, etc.</p> <p>Review county web-site.</p>	<p><b>Maximum 2 points</b></p> <p>Compliance: 2 points.</p>	<b>2</b>	<p>A sample of 3 Bills published in national and county gazettes and websites:</p> <p>The West Pokot County Biashara Mashinani Fund Act, 2016 of 14<sup>th</sup> July 2016;</p> <p>The West Pokot County Roads Maintenance Act, 2017 of 5<sup>th</sup> June</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							2017;  The West Pokot County Village Units Delineation Act, 2017 of 26 <sup>th</sup> April 2017;
<b>Result Area 5. Investment implementation &amp; social and environmental performance</b> <b>Max score: 20 points.</b>							
5.1	Output against plan – measures of levels of implementation	Physical targets as included in the annual development plan implement	The % of planned projects (in the ADP) implemented in last FY according to completion register	Sample min 10 larger projects from minimum 3 Departments/sectors.  Points are only provided with 100 % completion	<b>Maximum 4 points (6 points in the first two AC&amp;PAs).<sup>2</sup></b>  More than 90 %	<b>0</b>	No information available for the various projects with available contract prices and individual project budget costs.

<sup>2</sup>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	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
		ed	<p>of projects</p> <p><i>Note: Assessment is done for projects planned in the Annual Development Plan for that FY and the final contract prices should be used in the calculation. Weighted measure where the size of the projects is factored in. If there are more than 10 projects a sample of 10 larger projects is made, and weighted according to the size.</i></p>	<p>against the plan for each project.</p> <p>If a project is multi-year, the progress is reviewed against the expected level of completion by end of last FY.</p> <p>Use all available documents in assessment, including: CoB reports, procurement progress reports, quarterly reports on projects, M&amp;E reports etc.</p>	<p>implemented: 4 points (<u>6 points</u> in the first two AC&amp;PAs).</p> <p>85-90 %: 3 points</p> <p>75-84%: 2 points</p> <p>65-74%: 1 point</p> <p>Less than 65 %: 0 point.</p> <p>If no information is available on completion of projects: 0 point will be awarded.</p>		

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
					An extra point will be awarded if the county maintains a comprehensive , accurate register of completed projects and status of all ongoing projects (within the total max points available, i.e. the overall max is 4 points/6 respectively in the first two AC&PA).		
5.2	Projects implemented according to	Implementation of projects	Percentage (%) of projects implemented	Sample of projects: a sample of 10 larger projects of various size	<b>Maximum 4 points. (5 points in the</b>	<b>0</b>	No Information was provided for the completed projects

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
	cost estimates	and in accordance with the cost estimates	within <b>budget</b> estimates (i.e. +/- 10 % of estimates).	<p>from a minimum of 3 departments/ sectors.</p> <p>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 conflicts between figures, the original budgeted project figure will be applied).  Review completion reports, quarterly reports, payment records, quarterly progress reports, etc.  Review M&amp;E reports.</p> <p>Compare actual costs of</p>	<p><b>first two AC&amp;PAs).</b></p> <p>More than 90 % of the projects are executed within +/-5 of budgeted costs: 4 points (5 points in the first two AC&amp;PAs)</p> <p>80-90%: 3 points</p> <p>70-79%: 2 points</p> <p>60-69%: 1 point</p> <p>Below 60%: 0 points.</p>		and there relevant budgeted and actual costs.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
				completed project with original budgeted costs in the ADP/budget.			
5.3	Maintenance	Maintenance budget to ensure sustainability	Maintenance cost in the last FY (actuals) was <b>minimum 5 % of the total capital budgeted evidence in selected larger projects</b> (projects which have been completed 2-3 years ago) have been sustained with actual maintenance budget allocations (sample of min. 5 larger projects).	<p>Review budget and quarterly budget execution reports as well as financial statements.</p> <p>Randomly sample 5 larger projects, which have been completed 2-3 years ago.</p> <p>Review if maintenance is above 5 % of the capital budget and evidence that budget allocations have been made for projects completed 2-3 years ago and evidence that funds have actually been provided for maintenance of these investments.</p>	<p><b>Maximum 3 points (4 points in the first two AC&amp;PAs).</b></p> <p>Maintenance budget is more than 5 % of capital budget and sample projects catered for in terms of maintenance allocations for 2-3 years after: 3 points (4 in the first two AC&amp;PA).</p> <p>More than 5 % but only 3-4 of</p>	0	No budgets provision for Maintenance costs for any projects.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
					the 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 <b>Audits/reports for EIA /EMP</b> 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)  All 100 % of sample done in accordance with framework for all projects: 2 points (3 points in the first two	<b>0</b>	No reports on investments provided to the assessment team to verify that EIAs have been undertaken.  NEMA office on 11/2/2016, NEMA/CDE/WPC/9/ Vol 1/2/02/2016 has listed 36 investments that were candidates for screening for EIAs against set environmental and

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
					AC&PAs) 80-99 % of projects: 1 points		social criteria/checklist but that did not happen, for example constructions of sub county offices at Sigor, Alale, Chepareria and Kapenguria; construction of youth empowerment centre and library at Kapenguria; construction of a blood bank, store for drugs and casualty wing at Kapenguria Hospital
5.5	EIA /EMP procedures	EIA/EMP procedures from the Act followed.	Relevant <b>safeguards instruments Prepared:</b> Environmental and Social Management	Sample 5-10 projects	All 100 % of sample done in accordance with framework for all projects: 2 points	<b>0</b>	County has not complied with the requirement that investments that qualify to have EMPs are prepared accordingly.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			Plans, Environmental Impact Assessment, RAP, etc. consulted upon, cleared/approved by NEMA and disclosed prior to commencement of civil works <b>in case where screening has indicated that this is required.</b> All building & civil works investments <b>contracts</b> contain <b>ESMP implementation provisions</b> (counties are expected to ensure their works contracts for which ESIA's /ESMPs have been prepared and approved		80-99 % of projects: 1 points		NEMA office on 11/2/2016, NEMA/CDE/WPC/9/Vol 1/2/02/2016 has listed 36 investments were candidates for EMPs to mitigate against potential negative impacts on environment and socially but that was not complied with. Examples of the projects are example constructions of sub county offices at Sigor, Alale, Chepareria and Kapenguria; construction of youth empowerment centre and library at Kapenguria; construction of a

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			safeguards provisions from part of the contract.				blood bank, store for drugs and casualty wing at Kapenguria Hospital
5.6	Value for the Money (from the 3 <sup>rd</sup> AC&PA).	Value for the money.	Percentage (%) of projects implemented with a satisfactory level of value for the money, calibrated in the value for the money assessment tool.	<p>To be included from the <b>3<sup>rd</sup> AC&amp;PA only.</b> A sample of minimum 5 projects will be reviewed.</p> <p>The methodology will be developed at a later date, prior to the 3<sup>rd</sup> AC&amp;PA.</p> <p><b>Note</b> 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</p>	<p><b>Maximum 5 points.</b></p> <p>To be developed during implementation based on the TOR for the VfM.</p> <p>Points: maximum 5, calibration between 0-5 points.</p> <p>E.g. more than 90 % of projects Satisfactory: 5</p>		Not applicable

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
				i.e. 80 % satisfactory projects= XX points, 70 % = XX points.	points, more than 85 % 4 points, etc.		
					<b>Total Maximum Score: 100 points.</b>	<b>46</b>	

### 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 Consolidated procurement plans in place	To ensure procurement planning is properly coordinated from the central procurement unit	Not Met
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	Not Met

**Table 8: Summary of Results for Performance Measures**

Key Result Area	Results /Score
KRA 1: Public Financial Management	13
KRA 2: Planning and Monitoring and Evaluation	16
KRA 3: Human Resources Management	7
KRA 4: Civic Education and Participation	10
KRA 5: Investment implementation & Social and environmental performance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>46</b>

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

**a) Public Finance management**

1. Training on budget development and upload to IFMIS using Hyperion.
2. Induction training on compliances to the Internal Audit team to produce reports to be geared towards providing appropriate action to county ministries against approved program based

budgets and development activities. Internal audit committee to be fully operationalized and induction training to be done for both the staff and the committee.

3. Training on proper filing of procurement documents, completeness and signing off of all reports.
4. Asset register to be redesigned and updated to show all assets purchased with additional information such as serial numbers, specific location and asset tagging for ease of identification and securing of the county assets.

#### **b) Human Resources**

1. Support development of West Pokot County HR Policy, schemes of service, Code of Regulations as well as sensitization and disseminations;
2. Installations of computerized Human Resource Information System
3. Training needs assessment, preparation of training plans and support to implementation of training and capacity building activities;
4. Capacity development of evaluation of trainings, managing/supportive environment to enhance benefits of training and transfer of skills at places of work;
5. Development of skills and competency frameworks;
6. Sensitizations and induction trainings for Performance Contracts for CECs, COs, Directors and HR staff supporting Performance Contracts;
7. Sensitizations and induction trainings for Performance Appraisals and RRIs across board and coaching skills to HR staff supporting Performance Appraisals;
8. Support culture change/management turnaround and shared visions for all staff (inherited from national government, defunct local authorities and direct employees)

#### **c) Environment and Social Safeguards**

1. Support development of West Pokot County Bill/Policy;
2. Sensitizations and induction trainings on EMCA law and compliance with regulations (devolved functions – Noise, excessive vibrations, refuse collections, EIAs/EAs, CECs, compliances etc.) for members of County Assembly (relevant committees), relevant departmental heads and key staff;
3. Staff training and capacity building on EIAs/EAs, support to enhance professional and capacity to evaluate EIAs/EAs reports in the Directorate;
4. Sensitizations and induction trainings on EMCA law and compliance with regulations; mandates and responsibilities; facilitation skills for County Environmental Committee after it is gazette.

#### **d) Monitoring and Evaluation**

1. Technical Advice support to development of West Pokot County M&E Bill/Policy ;
2. Sensitizations, induction trainings for Heads of Departments;
3. Training and capacity development for M&E unit members;

4. Support to development of reporting indicators and harmonized templates for data and information gathering;
5. ICT based software for M&E of activities and generation of relevant reports;

**e) Civic Education & Participation**

1. Support training and capacity building for Civic Education Unit and Complaints/grievance Committee;
2. Support establishment of structured citizen complaint systems and feedback mechanisms

#### **4.0 CHALLENGES IN THE ASSESSMENT**

1. There was lack of necessary documents;
2. There were delays to provide documents partly due to power outage making provision of photocopies challenging.

## 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

### 5.2 MPC's Issues

1. Audited accounts were not available for the financial year 2015/16 as the office of the Auditor General was yet to release the same.
2. Other issues are provided in details under PMs as per respective KRAs as in section 5.3 below
3. The county does not have a well-structured and responsive citizens complaints/grievance systems and feedback mechanisms;

### 5.3 PMs

#### KRA 1: Public Finance Management

The following observations were made:

- IFMIS is not fully adopted and there is a need to automate the system fully
- Revenue enhancement systems- Automation started in March 2016 and the audited financial statements for the year 2015/16 were not available. Need to bring all revenue collection through the automation system as single business permit revenues are done manually.
- Monthly reporting of accounts and budgets not produced.
- Assets Register for the County offices was in form of a basic assets list
- Internal Audit Committee not in place
- Procurement: the IFMIS system not fully utilized only 16 steps.

## **KRA 2: Planning and Monitoring & Evaluation**

The following was observed:

1. West Pokot County is yet to finalize development and approval of M&E Bill/policy;
2. County departments are yet to formally nominate/appoint focal persons for M&E to strengthen M&E Unit
3. County M&E Committee is not established

## **KRA 3: Human Resource**

1. The County does not have a HR policy
2. The county does not have harmonized/customized schemes of services, job descriptions for three categories of staff – inherited from national government, defunct local authorities and direct employees;
3. County has not operationalized staff performance appraisals;
4. County has not undertaken service delivery re-engineering; has not initiated RRI

## **KRA 4: Civic Educations and Participation**

1. County is yet to formally appoint members of Civic Education Units;
2. There is no exclusive budget for civic education programmes and activities;
3. No planned civic education programmes that meets requirements of County Govt. Act 2012 Art. 98;
4. County has not rolled out plans for civic education that incorporates collaborations with NGOs
5. There is no policy, bill, guidelines or framework to enhance communication;
6. There was no evidence on communication to citizens about how their agenda/feedback was handled;
7. No dissemination and engagements on C-APRs to the citizens;

## **KRA 5 Investments and Social Environment Performance**

1. County does not have a bill/policy to manage and enforce compliance with environmental and social safeguard issues, especially on excessive noise and vibrations;
2. There is a provision for a Directorate of Environment in the organization structure but the position is vacant and the staff deployed require relevant training and capacity building to execute their roles and mandates efficiently;
3. No explicit budget for the county to manage and enforce compliances with environmental and social safeguards for investments and programmes;

4. County to comply with requirements of EMCA laws and regulations specifically in relation screening investments for EIAs/EAs and performance compliance and monitoring on implementations of EMPs;
5. The county has not gazette County Environmental Committee. This is late and overdue;
6. County to allocate sufficient budget allocations followed by timely release of funds to facilitate maintenance of investments (infrastructure, plant and equipment)

## **6.0 NOTIFICATION OF DISAGREEMENT**

During the entire process of field assessment and in the exit meeting with the County Officials under the leadership of the Acting County Secretary Mr. Jackson Peng'at Kariwonyang', there was no issue of concern nor a disagreement with the outcome of the assessment were raised.

## 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The County is yet to adopt the IFMIS Hyperion Module;</li> <li>2. Lack of monthly and quarterly reporting on accounting and budget monitoring to ensure accountability and manage programmes in a more efficient manner and address any adverse trends;</li> <li>3. Procurement file management lacks completeness of all documentation and sign off; and</li> <li>4. Internal Audit Committee not operationalized.</li> </ol>
KRA 2	Planning &M&E	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The County does not have M&amp;E Bill/policy;</li> <li>2. The County departments are yet to formally nominate/appoint focal persons for M&amp;E to strengthen M&amp;E Unit; and</li> <li>3. County M&amp;E Committee is not established</li> </ol>
KRA 3	Human Resource Management	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Performance Appraisal systems not operationalized;</li> <li>2. Service delivery re-engineering not undertaken; and</li> <li>3. RRI's not initiated.</li> </ol>
KRA 4	Civic Education and Participation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is no exclusive budget for civic education programmes and activities;</li> <li>2. No planned civic education programmes that meets requirements of County Govt. Act 2012 Art. 98;</li> <li>3. County has not rolled out plans for civic education that incorporates collaborations with NGOs</li> <li>4. There is no policy, bill, guidelines or framework to enhance communication; and</li> <li>5. Structured citizens' complaints/grievance systems and feedback mechanisms.</li> </ol>
KRA 5	Investment implementation & social and environmental performance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Screening of investments for EIAs/EAs against social safeguard and environmental management systems;</li> <li>2. Implementation and compliances to outlined EMPs for investments; and</li> <li>3. Establishing a County Environment Committee.</li> </ol>

## **APPENDIX 1: ENTRY MEETING MINUTES**

Minutes of Meeting Held on Tue 27<sup>th</sup> June 2017 at Boardroom, Finance Block in Kapenguria

List of attendants:

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Designation</u>
1	Kennedy Tegeret	Head of Economic Planning
2	Roselyne M Tomeyan	Ag C D HRM
3	Felix Puonyang	Chief HRM Officer
4	Lucia Chenanga	Head of Budget/County Assembly
5	Priscillah Mungo	Head of Budget/CGWP
6	Alice Chepkosgei	Supply Chain Mngt Officer
7	Stephen Eriton	Chief Accountant
8	Rehema Chebet	Internal Auditor
9	Zablon Pokar	Internal Auditor
10	Margaret Osilli	Assistant Director, MODP
11	Kathleen Lopokoiyot	M&E Officer
12	Dennis P Rotich	P.F.O
13	Timothy Mulatya	Matengo Githae & Associates
14	Norman M Muchori	Matengo Githae & Associates
15	Kennedy Pkew	County MEWNR
16	Julius K Lopoonyang	Ag Director Administration
17	Ritakou Yeko Issac	M&E

### **Agenda for the meeting**

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

### **Minute 1: Welcome and introductions**

The chair for the meeting was Mr. Kennedy Tegret, Head of Economic Planning and also the County KDSP Focal Person.

1. The Chairman called the meeting to order at 10.30am, welcomed MG&A Assessment team and other participants from the county government.
2. He informed the meeting that the Acting CS, who would have chaired the Meeting was out on official duty and he hoped to have time to take MG&A assessment teak for a courtesy call to the CS when he is back. He further said that the CS is aware of the process and supports it fully;

3. After a short prayer, the meeting started with self-introductions by the team from West Pokot County followed by the team of consultants from Matengo Githae & Associates.
4. The Chairman gave a brief about KDSP and related county activities.

### **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 Tue 27<sup>th</sup> – Thur 29<sup>th</sup> June 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 22<sup>nd</sup> 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 CGWP but very likely scheduled for Thursday 29<sup>th</sup> June 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 CGWP staff;

### **Minute 3: Address from the Chairman**

In his address, the Chairman had the following:

- a. The county has received earlier communication on this ACPA from MODP and MG&A and is ready for ACPA assessment; KRA persons have been briefed accordingly; all relevant documents are ready and any additional requested will be availed.

- b. The Boardroom will be available for the assessment team from where to hold meetings and review documents and reports;
- c. When that time comes, the assessment team will pick the projects they wish to visit and the CGWP will be available to escort them to the selected projects.

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

Minutes of meeting taken by: Norman M Muchori

**Signature**

For/belief of County Government of West Pokot:

Name:.....

Designation:..... Date:.....

For/belief of MG&A:

Name:.....

Designation:..... Date:.....

## **APPENDIX 2: EXIT MEETING MINUTES**

Minutes of Meeting Held on Tue 29<sup>th</sup> June 2017 at Boardroom, Finance Block in Kapenguria

### **List of attendants**

	<b><u>Name</u></b>	<b><u>Designation</u></b>
	Jackson Kariwonyang	
1	Pengat	Ag. County Secretary
2	Kennedy Tegeret	Head of Economic Planning
3	Felix Puonyang	Chief HRM Officer
4	Stephen Eriton	Chief Accountant
5	Alice Chepkosgei	Supply Chain Mngt Officer
6	Salome Chelagat	Budget Officer
7	Ritakou Yeko Issac	M&E
8	Zablon Pokor	Internal Auditor
9	Kennedy Pkew	County MEWNR
10	Roselyne M Tomeyan	Ag C D HRM
11	Julius K Lopusonyang	Ag Director Administration
12	Timothy Mulatya	Matengo Githae & Associates
13	Norman M Muchori	Matengo Githae & Associates

### **Agenda for the meeting**

1. ACPA assessment process preliminary findings
2. Address form the Chair
3. A.O.B

### **Minute 1: Welcome and introductions**

The chair for the meeting was Mr Jackson Pengat KARIwonyang, the Acting CS

- a. The Chairman called the meeting to order at 4.50pm, welcomed MG&A Assessment team and other participants from the county government.
- b. He informed the meeting he has been away on official duty and he was fully aware of the ACPA process and he received briefings and progress from his staff;
- c. After a short prayer, the meeting started with self-introductions by the team from West Pokot County followed by the team of consultants from Matengo Githae & Associates.

### **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. IFMIS are not fully adopted and there is a need to automate the system fully
2. Revenue enhancement systems- Automation started in March 2016 and the audited financial statements for the year 2015/16 were not available. Need to bring all revenue collection through the automation system as single business permit revenues are done manually.
3. Monthly reporting of accounts and budgets not produced.
4. Assets Register for the County offices was in form of a basic assets list
5. Internal Audit Committee not in place
6. Procurement: the IFMIS system not fully utilized only 16 steps.

### **KRA 2: Planning and Monitoring & Evaluation**

The following was observed:

1. West Pokot County is yet to finalize development and approval of M&E Bill/policy;
2. County departments are yet to formally nominate/appoint focal persons for M&E to strengthen M&E Unit
3. County M&E Committee is not established

### **KRA 3: Human Resource**

The following were observed:

1. County does not have a HR policy
2. The county does not have harmonized/customized schemes of services, job descriptions for three categories of staff – inherited from national government, defunct local authorities and direct employees;
3. County has not operationalized staff performance appraisals;
4. County has not undertaken service delivery re-engineering; has not initiated RRI

### **KRA 4: Civic Educations and Participation**

The following were observed:

1. County is yet to formally appoint members of Civic Education Units;
2. There is no exclusive budget for civic education programmes and activities;
3. No planned civic education programmes that meets requirements of County Govt. Act 2012 Art. 98;
4. County has not rolled out plans for civic education that incorporates collaborations with NGOs
5. There is no policy, bill, guidelines or framework to enhance communication;

6. There was no evidence on communication to citizens about how their agenda/feedback was handled;
7. No dissemination and engagements on C-APRs to the citizens;

### **KRA 5 Investments and Social Environment Performance**

The following were observed:

1. County does not have a bill/policy to manage and enforce compliance with environmental and social safeguard issues, especially on excessive noise and vibrations;
2. There is a provision for a Directorate of Environment in the organization structure but the position is vacant and the staff deployed require relevant training and capacity building to execute their roles and mandates efficiently;
3. No explicit budget for the county to manage and enforce compliances with environmental and social safeguards for investments and programmes;
4. County to comply with requirements of EMCA laws and regulations specifically in relation screening investments for EIAs/EAs and performance compliance and monitoring on implementations of EMPs;
5. The county has not gazette County Environmental Committee. This is late and overdue;
6. County to allocate sufficient budget allocations followed by timely release of funds to facilitate maintenance of investments (infrastructure, plant and equipment)

## **B) Areas of capacity building**

### **KRA 1: Public Finance management**

1. Training on budget development and feeding to IFMIS using Hyperion.
2. Induction training on production of internal audit reports to be geared towards providing appropriate action to county ministries against approved budgets and development activities. Internal audit committee to be fully operationalized and training to be done for both the staff and the committee.
3. Training on proper filing of procurement documents, completeness and signing off of all reports.
4. Asset register to be redesigned and updated to show all assets purchased with additional information such as serial numbers, specific location and asset tagging for ease of identification and securing of the county assets.

### **KRA 2: Planning Monitoring & Evaluation**

1. Technical Advice support to development of West Pokot County M&E Bill/Policy;
2. Sensitizations, induction trainings for Heads of Departments;
3. Training and capacity development for M&E unit members;

4. Support to development of reporting indicators and harmonized templates for data and information gathering;
5. ICT based software for M&E of activities and generation of relevant reports;

### **KRA 3: Human Resources**

1. Support development of West Pokot County HR Policy, schemes of service, Code of Regulations as well as sensitization and disseminations;
2. Installations of computerized Human Resource Information System
3. Training needs assessment, preparation of training plans and support to implementation of training and capacity building activities;
4. Capacity development of evaluation of trainings, managing/supportive environment to enhance benefits of training and transfer of skills at places of work;
5. Development of skills and competency frameworks;
6. Sensitizations and induction trainings for Performance Contracts for CECs, COs, Directors and HR staff supporting Performance Contracts;
7. Sensitizations and induction trainings for Performance Appraisals and RRIs across board and coaching skills to HR staff supporting Performance Appraisals;
8. Support to culture change/management turnaround and shared visions for all staff (inherited from national government, defunct local authorities and direct employees)

### **KRA 4: Environment and Social Safeguards**

1. Support development of West Pokot County Bill/Policy;
2. Sensitizations and induction trainings on EMCA law and compliance with regulations ( devolved functions – Noise, excessive vibrations, refuse collections, EIAs/EAs, CECs, compliances etc.) for members of County Assembly (relevant committees), relevant departmental heads and key staff;;
3. Staff training and capacity building on EIAs/EAs, support to enhance professional and capacity to evaluate EIAs/EAs reports in the Directorate;
4. Sensitizations and induction trainings on EMCA law and compliance with regulations; mandates and responsibilities; facilitation skills for County Environmental Committee after it is gazette.

### **KRA 5: Civic Education & Participation**

1. Support training and capacity building for Civic Education Unit and Complaints/grievance Committee;
2. Support establishment of structured citizen complaint systems and feedback mechanisms

**Minute 3: Address from the Chairman**

In his address, the Chairman had the following:

- a. The Chairman job descriptions for CEC, CS and CO is covered in County Governments Act 2017 but there are cadres that required schemes of service such as Sub County/Ward Administrators, some cadres from the defunct local authorities while other positions are similar to and therefore fit in well to the respective schemes of service for civil service at national governments.
- b. A key challenge for counties is inadequate of resources to fill all vacant positions;
- c. He thanked the assessment team and participating staff for the ACPA assessment and hoped the county will perform well. He also appreciated support from KDSP for strengthening the capacity and improving performance of counties.

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 West Pokot:**

**Name:.....**

**Designation:..... Date:.....**

**For/behalf of MG&A:**

**Name:.....**

**Designation:..... Date:.....**