

**KITUI COUNTY  
ANNUAL CAPACITY & PERFORMANCE  
ASSESSMENT (ACPA) REPORT**

***From***

**3<sup>rd</sup> July 2017 to 7<sup>th</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.....	10
2.3 Performance Conditions.....	26
3.0 SUMMARY OF CAPACITY BUILDING REQUIREMENTS.....	82
3.1 Summary of Results.....	82
4.0 CHALLENGES IN THE ASSESSMENT.....	86
5.0 SPECIFIC AND GENERAL COMMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL ASPECTS OF THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS ...	87
5.1 MAC's.....	87
5.2 MPC's Issues.....	87
5.3 PMs .....	87
6.0 NOTIFICATION OF DISAGREEMENT WITH THE OUTCOME OF .....	89
THE ASSESSMENT ALREADY NOTED DURING THE FIELD-TRIP .....	89
7.0 OVERVIEW OF THE 5 WEAKEST PERFORMANCES .....	90
ANNEX 1: ENTRANCE MEETING.....	92
ANNEX 2: EXIT MEETING .....	94

## ACRONYMS

ACPA	-	Annual Capacity and Performance Assessment
ADP	-	Annual Development Plans
CB	-	Capacity Building
CEC	-	County Executive Committee
CFAR	-	County Financial and Accounting Report
CGK	-	County Government of Kitui
CIDP	-	County Integrated Development Plan
CO	-	Chief Officer
CPG	-	County Performance Grants
CRA	-	Commission on Revenue Allocation
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 all Kitui County Government and County Assembly Officials, Senior Management and staff who participated in the Annual Capacity and Performance Assessment. The officials made valuable contributions throughout the assessment and document review processes and provided useful information and insights to the assessors.

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

We sincerely acknowledge the contribution made by Patricia Mbisi, The Assistant County Secretary and the focal point, who presided over the assessment entry meeting and set the tone for the superb cooperation and coordinated support that we received from all the County Government and County Assembly Officials, senior management and staff we interacted with during the assessment. Mr. Michael Mwangangi was the tireless coordinator of the assessment exercise on behalf of the County Government and County Assembly of Kitui.

Finally, we want to acknowledge the County Secretary, Mr. Alex Kimanzi who presided over the exit meeting and assured the consulting team that the Annual Capacity and Performance Assessment program is welcome and its output will help the Kitui County to continuously improve its performance and service to the County at large.

## 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.

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 2016/2017) 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 final assessment of Kitui County Government spanning the methodology used for the assessment, time plan and the overall process, summary of the results, summary of capacity building requirements and the need for follow – up, challenges in the assessment in general and the training methods.

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

ACPA Measures	Outcome
MAC	Have complied with all MACs except for item 3 and 4 - which have not been implemented
MPC	Have met 7 MPCs. MPC 5-Adherence to investment menu are not applicable in this assessment. The county has not met MPC 3 on audit opinion.

ACPA Measures	Outcome	Score
PM	KRA 1: Public Financial Management	13
	KRA 2: Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	15
	KRA 3: Human Resources Management	4
	KRA 4: Civic Education and Participation	12
	KRA 5: Investment implementation & Social And environmental performance	4
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>48</b>

### Achievements

The County performed well in the area of civic education and public participation with the County having the key staff and budgets in place to undertake the activities of civic education and public participation.

The area of planning, monitoring and evaluation did very well with the county having focal point persons in planning and M & E in all the departments, having county planning systems and functions established and a county annual report in place.

The county has made considerable gains in Public Financial Management by adhering to the budget calendar as set out in the public financial management act and having submitted the relevant reports in time to the relevant authorities like COB for the financial reports.

### Weaknesses

Key areas of weakness were found in the area of human resources management where there were no staffing plans and annual targets; skills competency frameworks had not been developed and no service re-engineering and rapid results initiatives had not been undertaken.

### Challenges

The main challenges faced during the assessment include:

- The IFMIS system was experiencing a downtime during this period hence getting some reports from the system was difficult;
- Some of the tools required to be in place for verification purposes were not presented;
- Some of the procurement records for the sampled procurements were not easily retrievable for review due poor filing system.

## Areas of Improvement

Kitui County should improve on the following areas:

- Training budgeting staff on the use of IFMIS Hyperion module in budget preparation;
- Putting in place and training the audit committee to be effective;
- Acquiring an automated revenue collection system and sensitizing staff on its operation;
- Putting in place HR policy and approved staffing plans;
- Adoption of C-ARPs for the county;
- Developing a skills and competency framework;
- Putting in place proper monitoring and evaluation systems for project implementation;
- Training and sensitizing County Assembly's Public Finance and Investment Committee to scrutinize external audit reports in a timely manner;
- Publishing and sharing county core financial materials and performance assessments reports;
- Training on project management to ensure of projects implementation within the budget estimates
- Providing of sufficient budget for maintenance of projects after their completion
- Build capacity of staff in the environmental and social safeguards department in terms of resources, skills and approve environmental policy documents to undertake their work effectively.

## 1.0 METHODOLOGY, ASSESSMENT TEAM AND ACTIVITIES

### 1.1 Methodology

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

#### a) Entrance Meeting

The consultants held an entrance meeting with the top County Officials. The purpose was to provide the County Management with the opportunity to appreciate the purpose and objective of the exercise and to point out the need to support the exercise since its outcome would assist counties to strengthen their programmes 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 Kitui 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 entire Kitui County team that also comprised members of county assembly to share the outcome of the assessment process. This was meant to iron out issues and any differences arising from the assessment process, and agree on the said issues if any in order to reduce any potential conflict on the outcome of the results, by explaining the basis for outcome.

The debriefing meeting agenda comprised of the following:

- Preliminary key findings and outcomes of the assessments;
- Sharing of the final results;
- The level of information availed and the expectation from the manual; and
- The final scoring of the results.



## 1.2 Time Plan

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

**Table 2: Activity Work Plan**

Activity	3 <sup>rd</sup> July 2017	4 <sup>th</sup> July 2017	5 <sup>th</sup> June 2017	6 <sup>th</sup> July 2017	2 <sup>nd</sup> July 2017
Inception meeting					
Assessing the Minimum Access Conditions					
Assessing minimum Performance Measures					
Assessing Performance Measures					
Visit to County Projects					
Exit Meeting					
Preparing Report					

## 2.0 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

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

### 2.1 Minimum Access Conditions (MAC)

Table 3: Summary of results for Minimum Access Conditions

Minimum Conditions for Capacity and Performance Grants (level 1)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification (MoV)	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Finding
1. County signed participation agreement	To ensure that there is ownership and interest from the county to be involved in the Program, and to allow access to information for the AC&PA teams.	Signed confirmation letter/expression of interest in being involved in the Program  MoV: Review the confirmation letter against the format provided by MoDP/in the Program Operational Manual (POM).	First ACPA.	<b>Met</b>	The signed participation agreement by H.E. Governor dated 24/6/2016 was availed for review.
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	<b>Met</b>	CB Plan for 2016/2017 developed in June 2016 according to the format in POM/Grant Manual.  CB Plan for 2017/2018 developed in June 2017 in draft form.

Minimum Conditions for Capacity and Performance Grants (level 1)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification (MoV)	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Finding
		format in the POM /Grant Manual (annex).	FY.		
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 for this.
4. Implementation of CB plan	Ensure actual implementation.	<p>Minimum level (70% of FY 16/17 plan, 75% of FY 17/18 plan, and 80% of subsequent plans) of implementation of planned CB activities by end of FY.</p> <p>MoV: Review financial statements and use of CB + narrative of activities (quarterly reports and per the Grant Manual).</p>		N/A	There has been a delay in the program implementation and funding is yet to be given.

## 2.2 Minimum Performance Conditions

Table 4: Summary of results for Minimum Performance Conditions

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
<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>	The signed Participation agreement by H.E. Governor dated 24 <sup>th</sup> June 2016 was availed to consulting team.  CB Plan for 2016/2017 developed in June 2016 according to the format in POM/Grant Manual.  CB Plan for 2017/18 developed in June 2017 in draft form.
<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	3 months after closure of the FY (30 <sup>th</sup> of September).  Complied with if the county is submitting	<b>Met</b>	Financial Statements for 2015/2016 2016 for both the Executive and the County Assembly submitted to the Kenya National Audit office by 30 <sup>th</sup> September 2016 as evidenced by approval stamp dated 30 <sup>th</sup> September 2016.

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		<p>Art.116 and Art. 164 (4). This can be either individual submissions from each department, or consolidated statement for the whole county. If individual statements are submitted for each department, the county must also submit consolidated statements by 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>individual department statements: 3 months after end of FY for department statements and 4 months after end of FY for consolidated statement.</p> <p>If the council is only submitting consolidated statement: Deadline is 3 months after end of FY.</p>		<p>The consolidated financial statements for the FY 2015/2016 were submitted to the National Treasury, Controller of Budgets and the Office of the Auditor General on 28 October 2016, as evidenced by the submission letters.</p> <p>The financial statements are signed as required and are in accordance with the IPSAS template provided by the PSASB.</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>Note. This will be last trigger for release as report is not yet there upon time for the ACPA.</p> <p><i>Transitional arrangements:</i></p>	<p><b>Not Met</b></p>	<p>The County Executive's audited financial statements for the FY 2015/2016 carry a disclaimer opinion based on the following grounds:</p> <p>i)Accuracy of financial statement as at 30 June 2016 could not be ascertained due to an</p>

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		<p><b>Transitional arrangements:</b> Transitional arrangements are in place as audit report may be disclaimed due to balance sheet issues. 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</li> </ul>	<p>First ACPA where MPCs are applied i.e. in the 2016 ACPA: Issues are defined for the core issues, which disqualify counties as per audit reports, see previous column.</p>		<p>understatement and overstatement of four and two items by Kshs 393,278,402 and Kshs 205,765,438 respectively.</p> <p>ii)The accuracy of cash and cash equivalent balance of Kshs 1,993,196,056 could not be ascertained.</p> <p>iii)The County Executive did not comply with PFM Act 2012 regarding opening of 12 bank accounts that were opened contrary to Section 82(1) b of the PFM (County Regulations) 2015 that stipulate that all bank accounts should be opened at the Central Bank of Kenya except for imprest accounts for petty cash.</p> <p>iv)Outstanding imprest amount of Ksh 4,046,940 which had been outstanding for 11 months and the County made no efforts to effect the recoveries.</p>

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		<p>submitted in last FY to Cob;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Books of accounts (cashbooks) posted with bank reconciliations up-to-date.</li> <li>• Assets register for new assets in place</li> </ul>			<p>v)There were unsupported receipts amounting to Kshs 22,816,736.</p> <p>vi)Failure to surrender accountable documents(Counter receipts books) worth Kshs 7,321,200.</p> <p>vii)There were uncollected property rates amounting to Kshs 116,043,892.</p> <p>viii)There were accumulated and uncollected arrears amounting to Kshs 216,032,512.</p> <p>ix)There were non-reconciling revenue collections from Kitui District Hospital amounting to Kshs 44,501,145.</p> <p>x)There was financial fraud perpetuated by fraudsters for Kshs 29,343,501.</p> <p>xi)The validity and accuracy of fixed assets additions for Kshs 3,374,965,465 could not be</p>

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					<p>ascertained.</p> <p>The County Assembly's audited financial statements for the same financial year carry an adverse opinion based on the following grounds:</p> <p>i)The presentation and disclosure of financial statements for the year ended 30 June 2015 could not be confirmed.</p> <p>ii)The propriety of the cash and cash equivalent balance of Kshs 6,262,512 as at 30 June 2016 could not be confirmed.</p> <p>iii)The accuracy, valuation, completeness and security of the fixed assets balance of Kshs 166,395,696 as at 30 June 2016 could not be confirmed.</p> <p>iv)There were irregularities in the Car and House mortgage loan scheme and therefore it was not possible to ascertain whether Kshs 36,395,000 was a</p>



MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					<p>proper charge to Public Funds and the unsecured loan was advanced to 11 members.</p> <p>v)There were irregular foreign travel costs amounting to Kshs 8,597,265.</p> <p>vi)It was not possible to ascertain whether the procurement of air tickets for trips to Brazil, Egypt and Israel amounting to Kshs 6,896,025was fair, equitable, transparent, competitive and cost effective.</p> <p>vii) The propriety and value for money for Kshs 8,597,265 spent on trips to Uganda, South Africa and Britain could not be ascertained.</p> <p>viii)The propriety of expenditure of Kshs 42,407,122 on sitting allowances could not be confirmed.</p> <p>ix)There were irregularities in</p>

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					<p>the procurement of hospitality, supplies and services amounting to Kshs 41,457,700.</p> <p>x)There was irregular payment of salary to ward staff amounting to Kshs 18,624,200.</p> <p>xi)There was irregular engagement of casuals amounting to Kshs 1,873,517.</p> <p>x) Administration of ward operating expenses amounting to Kshs 20,800,000 as at 30 June 2016 could not be confirmed.</p> <p>xi)The propriety and value for money on expenditure amounting to Kshs 151,198,572 n renovation County Assembly chambers could not be confirmed.</p>
4. Annual planning documents in place	To demonstrate a minimum level of	CIDP, Annual Development Plan and budget approved and published (on-line). (Note: The approved versions have to	At the point of time of the ACPA, which will take place in Sep-	<b>Met</b>	CIDP for the year 2013-2017 developed in July 2014 and was published on the county website. The hard copy was

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
	capacity to plan and manage funds	<p>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>	Nov, the plans for current year are reviewed.		<p>availed.</p> <p>CIDP has been subjected to mid-term and end term review (May and June 2017).</p> <p>The ADP for the FY 2015/2016 was published on the county website</p> <p>ADP 2016/2017 in place and was presented to the County Assembly on 1/9/2016.</p> <p>Budget for the FY 2016/2017 was approved by the county assembly on the 8/7/2016 as per the submission letter.</p> <p>The ADP for the FY 2015/2016 was aligned to the budget for the FY 2015/2016.</p> <p>The ADP 2015/16, approved budget 2015/2016 were published on the County website.</p>
<b>Use of funds in accordance with Investment menu</b>					
5. Adherence with the investment menu	To ensure compliance	Adherence with the investment menu (eligible expenditures) as	In 2016 ACPA (Q3 2016) this	N/A	The investment menu relates to the actual capacity building

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
	with the environmental and social safeguards and ensure efficiency in spending.	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.	MPC will not be measured as the level 2 grant starts only from FY 2017/18.		grant which is yet to be given
<b>Procurement</b>					
6. Consolidated Procurement plans in place.	To ensure procurement planning is properly coordinated from the central procurement unit instead at departmental,	Up-dated consolidated procurement plan for executive and for assembly (or combined plan for both). <u>MoV</u> : Review procurement plan of each procurement entity and county consolidated procurement plan and check up against the budget whether	At point of the ACPA (for current year)	<b>Met</b>	Consolidated procurement plan for the year 2016/2017 both for the Executive and the County Assembly were in place and was aligned to the budget. Procurement plan for FY 2016/2017 uploaded on the National Treasury's website.  The plans were uploaded in

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
	and to ensure sufficient capacity to handle discretionary funds.	<p>it encompass the needed projects and adherence with procurement procedures. The procurement plan(s) will have to be up-dated if/and when there are budget revisions, which require changes in the procurement process.</p> <p>Note that there is need to check both the consolidated procurement plan for 1) the assembly and 2) the executive, and whether it is revised when budget revisions are made.</p>			IFMIS.
<b>Core Staffing in Place</b>					
7. County Core staff in place	To ensure minimum capacity in staffing	<p>Core staff in place as per below list (see also County Government Act Art. 44).</p> <p>The following staff positions should be in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The country secretary</li> <li>• Chief officer of finance,</li> <li>• Planning officer,</li> <li>• Internal auditor,</li> </ul>	At the point of time for the ACPA.	<b>Met</b>	<p>All core county positions are filled including those of county secretary and chief Officer finance that are filled on acting capacities by the duly qualified Deputy secretary and Chief finance officer respectively.</p> <p>The availed county's most recent staff organogram in use</p>

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 acting in positions may also fulfill the conditions if they comply with the qualifications required in the schemes of service.</p>			<p>was developed during the CARPs program.</p> <p>The other arm of the county, the assembly, is similarly substantially staffed with core staff vide an Assembly Clerk(AC), a Principal finance officer as head of finance, Fiscal Analyst(FA) as head of planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, an Internal Auditor(IA), a Principal Procurement officer(PPO) as head of procurement and a Senior Accountant(SA) in charge of accounts department.</p> <p>The national Public Service Commission (PSC) schemes of service are employed in the county though challenges exist in internalization and harmonization of previously non-existent positions such as those within county environment management.</p>

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
					A County Human Resource advisory Committee chaired by the County Secretary and with the Head of Human resources as it's Secretary that meets monthly to deal matters of human resources from promotions, discipline, resignations, and confirmations. Minutes of the committee are submitted to the County Public Service Board.
<b>Environmental and Social Safeguards</b>					
8. Functional and Operational Environmental and Social Safeguards Systems (i.e. screening/vetting, clearance/ approval, enforcement & compliance monitoring, grievance redress mechanisms, documentation &	To ensure that there is a mechanism and capacity to screen environmental and social risks of the planning process prior to implementation, and to	<p>a) Counties endorse and ratify the environmental and social management system to <b>guide investments</b> (from the ACPA starting September 2016).</p> <p>b) 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>	Note that the first installment of the expanded CPG investment menu covering sectoral investments starts from July 2017 (FY 2017/18). Hence some of the conditions will be reviewed in the ACPA	<b>Met</b>	<p>While the county has only enacted one environmental law, (that on charcoal,) it endorses the provisions of EMCA and strongly supports and co-operates with the NEMA to guide investments through its screening /EIA process.</p> <p>The county projects falling under the second schedule of EMCA have project reports (six reports were sampled)</p>

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
reporting) in place.	<p>monitor safeguard during implementation.</p> <p>To avoid significant adverse environmental and social impacts</p> <p>To promote environmental and social benefits and ensure sustainability</p> <p>To provide opportunity for public participation and consultation in safeguards</p>	<p><b>c) Prepare relevant 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><b>d) Establishment of County Environment Committee.</b></p> <p><u>MoV:</u> Review endorsements from NEMA, ratification, screening materials and documentation, and contracts. Evidence that all projects are reviewed, coordinated and screened against checklist in Program Operating Manual. Screening may be conducted by various departments, but there is a need to provide an overview and evidence that all projects are screened.</p> <p><b>* In cases where the county has clear agreement with NEMA</b></p>	<p>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 column for details).</p>		<p>prepared and screened through this environment impact assessment process and approved Vide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PR;NEMA /Kitui/407-ICT /Trade offices perimeter Wall</li> <li>• PR;NEMA/KTU/EIA/415 Construction of Outpatient Wing at Kitui District Hospital</li> <li>• PR:NEMA /KTU/EIA/390 Landscaping of the Kitui Town Public Park</li> <li>• NEMA/KTU/EIA/503/Nzeeu River drift construction, Kisasi Ward.</li> <li>• NEMA/KTU/EIA/486/Ministry of Education Block in Kitui Town</li> <li>• NEMA/KTU/EIA/516/Installation of street lighting along Syongila junction to Unyaa Primary School.</li> </ul> <p>The reports were adequately prepared by NEMA pre-</p>



MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
	<p>process (free, prior and informed consultations – FPIC)</p>	<p>that it does the screening and that all projects are screened, this condition is also seen to be fulfilled.</p>			<p>qualified Lead experts and each contained social and environment safeguards in its project environment management plan (EMP).</p> <p>The County Environmental Committee is in place and was gazetted through a gazette notice number 11631 and environment focal point person is a member of the same committee.</p>

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
9. Citizens' Complaint system in place	To ensure sufficient level of governance and reduce risks for mismanagement.	<p>Established an operational Complaints Handling System, including a:</p> <p><b>a)</b> complaints/grievance committee to handle complaints pertaining to fiduciary, environmental and social systems.</p> <p><b>b)</b> A designated a Focal Point Officer to receive, sort, forward, monitor complaints</p> <p><b>c)</b> simple complaints form/template designed and available to the public</p> <p><b>d)</b> Multiple channels for receiving complaints e.g. email, telephone, anti-corruption boxes, websites etc.)</p> <p><b>e)</b> Up to date and serialized record of complaints coordinate implementation of the Framework and a grievance committee is in place.</p> <p><u>MoV:</u> Review county policy, availability of the focal office (recruitment files, salary</p>	At point of time for the ACPA.	<b>Met</b>	<p>a) There is a complaints handling committee in place. Evidence of meetings minutes for September 2016, December 2016 and February 2017</p> <p>b) The head of customer relations has by default become the focal point to receive, sort forward and monitor complaints.</p> <p>c) Templates forms designed for use with the suggestion boxes are no longer available to the public but a sample was availed to the ACPA team on request</p> <p>d) A complaints and suggestions capturing system comprising of suggestion box (not opened regularly) and the customer relations desk, telephone and email are used.</p> <p>e) Quarterly records of reported complaints cases, though not serialized, are maintained</p>

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		<p>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>			

## 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> Max score: Maximum 30 points.							
<i>Strengthened budget formulation, resource mobilization and allocation</i>							
1.1	Program Based Budget prepared using IFMIS and SCOA	Budget format and quality	The annual budget approved by the County Assembly is: <b>a)</b> Program Based Budget format.  <b>b)</b> Budget developed using the IFMIS Hyperion module.	Review county budget document, IFMIS uploads, the CPAR, 2015.  Check use of Hyperion Module: all budget submissions include a PBB version printed from Hyperion (submissions may also include line item budgets prepared using other means, but these must match the PBB budget – spot check figures between different versions).	<b>Maximum 2 points.</b>  2 milestones (a & b) met: 2 points  1 of the 2 milestones met: 1 point	<b>a)1</b>  <b>b)0</b>	<b>a)</b> The county budget is programme based and has been duly approved. Various sector specific programmes are clearly defined. Programme based budget for 2015/2016 was availed.  <b>b)</b> Budget is not developed using IFMIS Hyperion module. The budget is prepared through excel and then uploaded to IFMIS.
1.2		Budget process follows clear	Clear budget calendar with the following key milestones achieved:	PFM Act, art 128, 129, 131.	<b>Max. 3 points</b>  If all 5 milestones	<b>3</b>	<b>a)</b> CEC Treasury & Economic Planning issued a budget process

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
		budget calendar	<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 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</p>	Review budget calendar, minutes from meetings (also from assembly resolutions) circular submission letters, county outlook paper, minutes from meetings and Financial Statements.	<p>(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>circular no 1/2014/2015 for budget of 2015/2016 on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2014 was availed.</p> <p>b) County Budget Review and Outlook paper for financial year 2015/2016 prepared and submitted to County Assembly on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2014. The County Budget Review and Outlook paper posted to the website.</p> <p>c) County Fiscal Strategy Paper 2015/2016 was submitted to the County Assembly on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2015 as per submission letter.</p> <p>d) County budget for year 2015/16 was submitted by CEC Member Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning to the County</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>march and county assembly to discuss within two weeks after mission.</p> <p><b>d)</b> CEC member for finance submits budget estimates to county assembly by 30<sup>th</sup> April latest.</p> <p><b>e)</b> County assembly passes a budget with or without amendments by 30<sup>th</sup> June latest.</p>				<p>Assembly on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2015 as evidenced by the submission letter reviewed.</p> <p>e) County Assembly passed budget for the year 2015/2016 on 29<sup>th</sup> June 2015 as evidence by a forwarding letter for approved County</p>
1.3		Credibility of budget	<p><b>a)</b> Aggregate expenditure out-turns compared to original approved budget.</p> <p><b>b)</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><b>Ad a):</b> 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</p>	<b>a)0</b>	<p>a)Actual Expenditure for FY 2015/2016 was Kshs. 7,996,978,914.04 versus overall original budget of Kshs. 10,099,989,531 which was 79.1%. This translates to positive variance of 20.82%</p> <p>b)As per the CBROP produced in September 2016, the actual expenditure FY</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>point. More than 20 %: 0 point.</p> <p><b>Ad b):</b> If average deviation of expenditures across sectors is less than 10 % then 2 points. If 10-20 % then 1 point. More than 20 %: 0 point.</p>	<b>b)0</b>	<p>2015/2016 was Kshs. 7,935,032,079 against an allocation of Kshs. 10,114,349,368. Translating to an average deviation of expenditure across sectors for the FY 2015/2016 of 21.55% as is illustrated below:</p> <p><b>i)</b>Office of the Governor - 16.05%</p> <p><b>ii)</b>Administration &amp; Coordination – 16.8%</p> <p><b>iii)</b> Agriculture, Water &amp; Irrigation – 15.55%</p> <p><b>iv)</b> Basic Education, Training &amp; skills development – 11.85%</p> <p><b>v)</b> Land, Infrastructure &amp; Urban Development – 2.45%</p> <p><b>vi)</b>Health &amp; sanitation – 41.2% <b>vii)</b> Trade, Industry &amp;</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
							Cooperatives – 20.1% <b>viii)</b> Culture, Youth, sports & social services - 23.85% <b>ix)</b> Environment, Energy & Minerals Investment Development – 23.85% <b>x)</b> Natural Resources & Tourism – 26.45% <b>xi)</b> Finance & Economic Planning - 31.15% <b>xii)</b> County Public Service Board – 6.3% <b>xiii)</b> County Assembly – 22.5% <b>xiv)</b> Kitui Town Administration – 58.75% <b>xv)</b> Mwingi Town Administration – 45.6%  Budget allocation FY 2015/2016 Kshs.10,114,349,370



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
							versus expenditure composition for each sector Kshs.7,870,624,670 This translates to an average positive deviation of expenditure of 12.2%
<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>	There is no revenue automation system in place.
1.5	n	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>1</b>	Own sources for the financial year 2014/2015 was Kshs. 322,409,233 compared to financial year 2015/2016 of Kshs. 409,731,687 represents an increase of 27.1%
<b>Enhanced capacity of counties on execution (including procurement), accounting and reporting</b>							
1.6	Reporting and accounting in accordance with PSASB	Timeliness of in-year budget reports (quarterly to	a) Quarterly reports submitted no later than one month after the quarter (consolidated progress and	Review quarterly reports, date and receipts (from CoB).  Check against the PFM	<b>Max. 2 points.</b>  (a &b) Submitted on time and published: 2	<b>0</b>	The financial reports for the 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> quarter for the financial year 2015/16 were submitted as follows:

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
	guidelines	Controller of Budget).	<p>expenditure reports) as per format in CFAR, submitted to the 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>	<p>Act, Art. 166.</p> <p>CFAR, Section 8.</p> <p>Review website and copies of local media for evidence of publication of summary revenue and expenditure outturns.</p>	<p>points.</p> <p>(a only): Submitted on time only: 1 point.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14<sup>th</sup> October, 2015</li> <li>• 18<sup>th</sup> January 2016</li> <li>• 15<sup>th</sup> April 2016</li> <li>• 9<sup>th</sup> August 2016 which was late</li> </ul> <p>Summary of revenue, expenditure and progress reports FY 2015/2016 were not published on the website.</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 outstanding payments, and appendix with fixed assets register.</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. Check against requirements.</p>	<p><b>Max. 1 point.</b> Quality as defined by APA team or NT assessment (excellent/satisfactory): 1 point</p>	1	<p>Financial statements for the year 2015/2016 were prepared in the formats in the PFM Act and standards templates issued by the PSASB. They include; notes to the accounts, list of pending bills, list of payroll deductions, fixed asset register for the periods 2013/2014, 2014/2015 and 2015/2016.</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
				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.			
1.8		Monthly reporting and up-date of accounts, including:	<p>The monthly reporting shall include:</p> <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 income and revenue</li> <li>b. Summary of expenditures</li> <li>c. Schedule of imprest and advances;</li> <li>d. Schedule of debtors and</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>Review monthly reports.</p> <p>See also the PFM Manual, p. 82 of which some of the measures are drawn from.</p>	<p><b>Max. 2 points.</b></p> <p>If all milestones (1-3): 2 points</p> <p>If 1 or 2: 1 point</p> <p>If none: 0 points.</p>	<b>0</b>	<p>As per performance measure no. 2, budget execution report seen for July 2015 to June 2016.</p> <p>As per the performance measure no.3, the monthly financial statements availed were:</p> <p>a)Details of income and revenue and summary of expenditure availed were for the months till July 2015 to June 2016. This was a consolidated position with monthly</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
			creditors; e. Bank reconciliations and post in general ledger.				status clearly indicated.  b)The bank reconciliations for 30 June 2015, 1 July 2015 to 30 June 2016 were availed.  Schedule of imprest and advances and pending bills as at 30 June 2016 were not seen as they were not accessible through IFMIS. The rest ((b) and (d)) were not availed.
1.9		Asset registers up-to-date and inventory	Assets registers are up-to date and independent physical inspection and verification of assets should be performed once a year.	Review assets register, and sample a few assets. PFM Act. Art 149.  Checkup-dates.	<b>Max. 1 point.</b> Registers are up-to-date: 1 point.  Transitional arrangements: <u>First year:</u> Assets register need only to contain assets acquired by county	1	Updated Fixed Asset register up to June 2016 was availed. The assets register details, the acquisition costs, suppliers' details, date of acquisition, class, sub-class, item, units, description and user department of the assets. The assets register included all 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
					governments since their establishment.  <u>Second year onwards</u> : register must include all assets, including those inherited from Local Authorities and National Ministries		completed capital projects implemented by the county's ministries. Assets include land, building and structures, transport equipment, office equipment, Furniture and Fittings, ICT equipment, software and other ICT, Other machinery and equipment, heritage and cultural assets and intangible assets.  The assets tags were not captured in the assets register. Sampled assets include: fridge, table, tv stand, book shelf and water tank located at the office of the governor and the ministry of finance.
	<b>Audit</b>						
1.10	Internal audit	Effective Internal audit	Internal audit in place with quarterly IA reports submitted to IA	Review audit reports.  Check against the PFM	<b>Max. 1 point.</b> 4 quarterly audit reports submitted	<b>1</b>	Internal audit function in place both at the County Assembly 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
		function	Committee (or if no IA committee, in place, then reports submitted to Governor)	Act Art 155	in previous FY: 1 point.		<p>the Executive.</p> <p>At the County Assembly the internal audit department reports functionally to the County Assembly Public Service Board and administratively to the Clerk of the County Assembly.</p> <p>County Assembly 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter audit reports dated 31/3/2016 and ward operations reports availed.</p> <p>At the Executive, the Internal Audit unit is in place and is headed by the Deputy director.</p> <p>The Internal Audit generates monthly reports.</p> <p>Post audit report on revenue collection for</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							<p>Kitui County availed.</p> <p>At the Executive, the Internal Audit functionally reports to the Governor and administratively the CEC Finance.</p> <p>Annual work plan 2016/2017 and internal audit activity charter were availed.</p> <p>There was no audit software in use.</p>
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	<b>Max. 1 point.</b> IA/Audit Committee established and reports reviewed by Committee and evidence of follow-up: 1 point.	<b>0</b>	There is no internal audit committee in place.

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
				in the Committee). PFM Act Art 155.			
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	1	The value of audit queries as a 121% of total expenditure for the County Executive was % based on the following: i) Outstanding imprests – Kshs 11,785,435 ii) Failure to surrender accountable documents – Kshs 7,321,200 iii) Uncollected property rates – Kshs 116,043,892 iv) Accumulated and undisclosed arrears Kshs 216,032,512 v) Non reconciling revenue collection – Kitui District Hospital Kshs 8,887,929 vi) Financial fraud – Kshs 48,750,164 vii) Fixed assets – Kshs 8,199,033,410 viii) Other irregular procurement – Kshs 16,865,896



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
							ix) Pending payable – Kshs 893,426,633 x) Reallocation of funds – foreign travel, accommodation and other transport – Kshs 4,484,581 xi) Voidable payments of fines and penalties by KRA – Kshs 108,230,996  <u>Value of audit queries = Kshs 9,630,862,648</u> Total expenditure = Kshs 7,990,926,452  The % value of the audit queries for the financial year 2015/2016 for the County Assembly out of the total expenditure was 66% i.e <u>Value of audit queries = Kshs 542,615,128</u> Total expenditure = Kshs 824,657,093.

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
							Therefore, the overall value of audit queries as a % of the consolidated expenditure was 93.5%
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.	1	The value of the audit queries for the financial year 2015/2016 was Kshs 8,533,541,580 while the value of audit queries was Kshs 10,538,897,821 for FY 2014/2015. Therefore, there was a reduction of audit queries between the two financial years.
1.14		Legislative scrutiny of audit reports and follow-up	Greater and more timely legislative scrutiny of external audit reports within required period and evidence that audit queries are addressed	Minutes from meetings, review of previous audit reports.	<b>Max. 1 point.</b> Tabling of audit report and evidence of follow-up: 1 point.	0	The Public Investments Committee and Public Accounts Committee of the County Assembly summoned the County management to respond to audit queries from for audited FS 2014/2015.  Evidence of the proceedings in the Hansard reports were

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
							not availed.  There was no evidence of tabling of audit report and evidence of 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 on time.  c) Adherence with procurement thresholds and procurement	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.  Check a sample of 5	<b>Max. 6 points.</b>  a) IFMIS Steps: <15steps=0 points; 15-23=1 point; 24-25= <b>2 points</b>  b) Timely submission of quarterly reports to PPRA (both annual reports plus all reports for procurements above proscribed thresholds): <b>1 point</b>  c) Adherence with procurement	<b>a)1</b>	<b>a)</b> 15 steps are adhered to in the IFMIS procurement process.  The following projects were sampled to test compliance with the said IFMIS procurement steps:  <b>i)</b> Construction of ICT Centre Mutomo by Solmuk investments (Citizen) – Kshs. 2,886,885, LPO. 1246210  <b>ii)</b> Construction of market shed at Miambani Kitui central by Damaje Enterprises

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>methods for type/size of procurement in a sample of procurements.</p> <p>d) Secure storage space with adequate filing space designated and utilized – for a sample of 10 procurements, single files containing all relevant documentation in one place are stored in this secure storage space (1 point)</p> <p>e) Completed evaluation reports, including individual evaluator scoring against pre-defined documented evaluation criteria and signed by each member of the evaluation team, available for a sample of 5 large procurements (2 points)</p>	<p>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 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>(Citizen) – Kshs. 1,196,192, LPO.124792</p> <p>iii) Supply and delivery of Gravel to Kitui Stadium by Gameco Construction and General Supplies (Youth)– Kshs.3,966,400.33,LPO. 2,629,616.</p> <p>iv) Market shed at Kamutei market by Centkim Enterprises (Women) - Kshs. 2,477,696.2 LPO. 1,246,204</p> <p>v) Electrical works installation at Ikutha Maternity Theatre by Kamwando Enterprises (People with Disabilities) – Kshs. 2,321,500 LPO.1,224,570.</p> <p>It was not possible to</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
						b)0	<p>review the IFMIS steps complied with for the above procurements as the system was shut on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2017 for end of year closure procedures.</p> <p><b>b)</b> The 4th Quarterly procurement reports for the FY 2015/2016 were submitted to PPRA on 11/1/2017 as evidenced by a copy of the delivery note. Report was for all the 30% public procurement preference and reservations.</p> <p>Status report on contracts for the financial year 2016/17 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> quarter availed. Reports for other quarters not seen.</p> <p>c)Sampled procurement adhered to the</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>c)1</p> <p>d)0</p>	<p>thresholds.</p> <p>Open tender was used for procurements above 4million, restricted tendering up to 4 million and quotations; works- up to 4 million and goods and services – up to 2 million.</p> <p>d) Storage facilities for records are not adequate for the procurement files. No proper filing and archival mechanisms in place.</p> <p>e) Evaluation reports were availed where the evaluation team signed with individual evaluator’s scores.</p> <p>Procurement sampled at the County assembly, adhered to the requirement of having</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
						e)1	signed individual evaluator's scores.
<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.	<p>a) Planning and M&amp;E units (may be integrated in one) established</p> <p>b) There are designated planning and M&amp;E officer and each line ministry has a focal point for planning and one for M&amp;E</p> <p>c) Budget is dedicated for both planning and M&amp;E.</p>	<p>Review staffing structure and organogram.</p> <p>Clearly identifiable budget for planning and M&amp;E functions in the budget.</p>	<p><b>Maximum 3 points</b></p> <p>The scoring is one point per measure Nos. a-c complied with.</p>	<p>a)1</p> <p>b)1</p> <p>c)1</p>	<p>a) There is Planning and Monitoring and Evaluation unit established under the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning</p> <p>b) There are 10 dedicated focal M&amp;E officers at each line ministry (department) who track and generate reports of the projects being implemented.</p> <p>c) The ministry of Finance has a fully fledged section for project tracking with a budget allocation.</p> <p>The Department of Administration &amp; Coordination of County</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>Affairs has a fully section for project tracking. Budget estimates FY2016/2017: M &amp; E Kshs. 43,873,606.</p> <p>All the departments have vote line for M&amp;E (Research and feasibility studies budget line).</p> <p>There is no M &amp; E framework in place.</p>
2.2		County M&E Committee in place and functioning	County M&E Committee meets at least quarterly and reviews the quarterly performance reports. (I.e. it is not sufficient to have hoc meetings).	Review minutes of the quarterly meeting in the County M&E Committee.	<p><b>Maximum: 1 point</b></p> <p>Compliance: 1 point.</p>	<b>0</b>	<p>There is an M&amp;E committee in place.</p> <p>The Governor appointed all Chief Officers as the M &amp; E committee members. Their mandate is to oversee the production of the devolution scorecard booklets by the Focal M&amp;E team.</p> <p>Minutes for the meetings held not availed.</p>
2.3	County	CIDP	a) CIDP: adheres to	CIDP submitted in	<b>Maximum: 3</b>	<b>a)1</b>	CIDP 2013-2017 was



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
	Planning systems and functions established	formulated and updated according to guidelines	<p>guideline structure of CIDP guidelines,</p> <p><b>b) CIDP has clear objectives, priorities and outcomes, reporting mechanism, result matrix, key performance indicators included; and</b></p> <p><b>c) Annual financing requirement for full implementation of CIDP does not exceed 200% of the previous FY total county revenue.</b></p>	<p>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>points</b></p> <p>1 point for compliance with each of the issues: a, b and c.</p>	<p><b>b)1</b></p> <p><b>c)1</b></p>	<p>prepared according to the required format (as contained in the CIDP guidelines).</p> <p>CIDP has clear objectives, priorities and outcomes, reporting mechanism, result matrix, key performance indicators included.</p> <p>ADP 2015/2016 financing requirement for proposed project is Ksh.3,490,042,561</p> <p>FY 2014/2015 total county revenue was Kshs 6,961,807,904. This represents 50.1% of the previous FY total county revenue.</p>
<b>2.4</b>		ADP submitted on time and conforms to guidelines	a) Annual development plan submitted to Assembly by September 1st in accordance with required format &	Review version of ADP approved by County Assembly for structure, and approval procedures and timing,	<p><b>Maximum: 4 points</b></p> <p>Compliance <b>a): 1 point.</b></p>	<b>a)1</b>	ADP for 2015/2016 submitted to County Assembly on 1 <sup>st</sup> June, 2015 and for 2017/2018 submitted to County

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>contents (Law says that once submitted if they are silent on it then it is assumed to be passed).</p> <p>b) ADP contains issues mentioned in the PFM Act 126,1, <u>number A-H</u></p>	against the PFM Act, Art 126, 1.	<p><b>b)</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.</p>	<b>b)2</b>	<p>Assembly on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2016.</p> <p>b) Individual ADP for FY2015/2016 and 2016/2017 were availed.</p> <p>It contains only 5 of the issues in PFMA and lacks the following issues:</p> <p><b>i)</b> payments to be made on behalf of the county governments, including details of any grants, benefits and subsidies that are applied;</p> <p><b>ii)</b> Detailed description of proposals with respect to the development of physical, intellectual, human and other resources of the county, including measurable indicators where feasible.</p> <p><b>iii)</b> A summary budget in</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
							the format required by regulations; and (h) such other matters as may be required by the Constitution or this Act.
2.5		Linkage between CIDP, ADP and Budget	Linkages between the ADP and CIDP and the budget in terms of costing and activities. (costing 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 consistent between the two documents.	<b>Maximum: 2 points</b>  Linkages and within the ceiling: 2 points.	<b>0</b>	The projects in the ADP are aligned to specific programmes in the CIDP, however, there is a difference in costing between the ADP, CFSP and the final budget. In addition the activities in the ADP are not costed, only a listing of the projects is included In the ADP. Sampled projects include: <b>i)</b> Construction of ICT Centre Mutomo implemented at Kshs. 2,886,885. <b>ii)</b> Construction of market shed at Miambani Kitui implemented at Kshs. 1,196,192

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>iii) Market shed at Kamutei market implemented at Kshs. 2,477,696.2 .</p> <p>iv) Electrical works installation at Ikutha Maternity Theatre implemented at Kshs. 2,321,500.</p>
2.6	Monitoring and Evaluation systems in place and used, with feedback to plans	Production of County Annual Progress Report	<p>a) County C-APR produced;</p> <p>b) Produced timely by September 1 and</p> <p>c) C-APR includes clear performance progress against CIDP indicator targets and within result matrix for results and implementation.</p> <p>(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</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</p>	a)2	<p>a) The County Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Report (CAMER) was deemed to be the C-APR. The implementation status and effectiveness of programmes of political, social and economic development at the community level i.e. from the grass-root to the county level. The report centers on resource flows towards major development activities from key county departments/agencies.</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
			done in reference with the County Integrated M&E System Guidelines.		<p>results and implementation: 2 points.</p> <p>(N.B. if results matrix is published separately, not as part of the C-ADP, the county still qualifies for these points)</p>	b)0	<p>CAMER for the FY 2015/2016 produced on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2017 availed.</p> <p>Community Level Infrastructure Programmes (CLIDP) report produced in June 2015 (after 3 and 4 years of implementation) was also deemed internal and external M &amp; E reports.</p> <p><b>b)</b> There were no proper timelines when the CAMER (C-APR) was to be prepared. CAMER for the FY 2015/2016 produced on 6<sup>th</sup> April,2017 Hence non compliance with the 1<sup>st</sup> September 2016 timeline.</p> <p><b>c)</b> The report included clear performance</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
						c)2	progress against CIDP indicator targets and within result matrix for results and implementation.
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.	1	The County carries out project-specific evaluation after which Impact Evaluation reports are generated.  County Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Report (CAMER) FY2015/2016 was availed to evidence annual evaluation carried out in this year.
2.8		Feedback from Annual Progress Report to Annual Development Plan	Evidence that the ADP and budget are informed by the previous C-APR.	Review the two documents for evidence of C-APR informing ADP and budget	<b>Maximum: 1 point.</b>  Compliance: 1 point.	1	The ADP is informed by the County Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Reports since the county is able to identify the progress made on implementation of various county projects. The budget is aligned to

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 proposed projects in the ADP and the projects that were not competed in the previous year as highlighted in the CAMER.
<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 met?</p>	<p>Staffing plan</p> <p>Capacity Building Assessment / CARPS report</p> <p>Documentation evidencing hiring, training, promotion, rationalization, etc.</p> <p>In future years (after first AC&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)0</p> <p>b)0</p>	<p>a) No staffing plans are in place with recruitment mainly addressing attrition from transfers and death.</p> <p>b) CARPS report for the County seen, however its use in the County is yet to be initiated</p> <p>NB. The commission on revenue allocation (CRA) has developed a staffing plan that uses the number of wards to come up with an optimal assembly staffing plan. All position</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
						c)0	are filled in Kitui and no annual targets are hence set  c)No staffing plan is in place, hence no annual targets to be met.
3.2	Job descriptions, including skills and competence requirements	Job descriptions, specifications and competency framework	<p>a) Job descriptions in place and qualifications met (AC&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>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>Job descriptions</p> <p>Skills and competency frameworks.</p> <p>Appointment, recruitment and promotion records</p>	<p><b>Maximum score: 4 points</b></p> <p>All a, b and c: 4 points.</p> <p>Two of a-c: 2 points</p> <p>One of a-c: 1 point</p>	<p>a)1</p> <p>b)0</p> <p>c)1</p>	<p>a)Job descriptions are adopted from PSC and availed on personal files for all Chief officers / heads of departments(Core staff)</p> <p>b) Skills and competency framework not developed but expected to be derived from the National CARP program.</p> <p>c)An accurate recruitment, appointment and promotion process and records system is in place</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
			c) Accurate recruitment, appointment and promotion records available				and was availed. This was mainly in the form of personnel files and staff promotions and recruitment analysis reports forwarded to the Kitui Public Service board. A County Human Resource Advisory Committee chaired by the County Secretary and with the Head of Human resources as it's Secretary that meets monthly to deal matters of human resources from promotions, discipline, resignations, and confirmations. Minutes of the committee are submitted to the County Public Service Board.
<b>3.3</b>	Staff appraisal and	Staff appraisals	a) Staff appraisal and performance	Review staff appraisals. County Act, Art 47 (1).	<b>Maximum score: 5 points.<sup>1</sup></b>	a)1	There is an appraisal performance tool for all

<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
	performance management operationalized in counties	and performance management	<p>management process developed and operationalized.</p> <p><b>b)</b> Performance contracts developed and operationalized</p> <p><b>c)</b> service re-engineering undertaken</p> <p><b>d)</b> RRI undertaken</p>	<p>Country Public Service Board Records.</p> <p>Staff assessment reports.</p> <p>Re-engineering reports covering at least one service</p> <p>RRI Reports for at least one 100 day period</p>	<p><b>a)</b> Staff appraisal for all staff in place: 1 point. (If staff appraisal for</p> <p><b>b)</b> Performance Contracts in place for CEC Members and Chief Officers: 1 point</p> <p>Performance Contracts in place for the level below Chief Officers: 1 point</p> <p><b>c)</b> Service delivery processes re-engineered in counties: 1 point</p> <p><b>d)</b> Rapid Results Initiatives-RRIs launched/upscaled : 1 point</p>		<p>staff in place adopted from Public Service Commission.</p> <p>Evidence of staff appraisal was seen in the following sampled personnel files:</p> <p><b>i)</b> P/No 2010042656, P/A 2013/2014, 2014/2015 and 2015/2016.</p> <p><b>ii)</b> P/No-2004006503 P/A 2015/2016, 2014/2015 and 2013/2014.</p> <p><b>iii)</b>, P/No 1989115523 P/A 2016/2015, 2014/2015 and 2013/2014.</p> <p><b>iv)</b> P/No 1993039844, P/A 2015/2016, 2014/2015and 2013/2014.</p> <p><b>V)</b> P/No-1987052355, P/A 2015/2016, 2014/2015, 2013/2014.</p> <p><b>vi)</b>, P/No 1985045467,</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
						<p>b)1</p> <p>c)0</p> <p>d)0</p>	<p>P/A, 2015/2016, 2014/2015, 2013/2014.</p> <p>b) Annual Performance Contracts (PC) in place are signed between the Governor and the CEC's and later signed by the Chief Officers. From FY 2015/16 Performance Contract were cascaded down to Directors and Assistant Directors and are up to date for the financial year 2016/2017.</p> <p>c) No service re-engineering has been carried out by the county.</p> <p>c) No rapid results initiatives are undertaken in the county.</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>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: <b>a)</b> Formation of CE units <b>b)</b> Dedicated staffing and <b>c)</b> Budget, <b>d)</b> Programs planned, including curriculum, activities etc. and <b>e)</b> 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.	3	<b>a)</b> The Ministry of Administration and Coordination of County Affairs has functional responsibility for civic education and public participation  <b>b)</b> There are dedicated staff through its duly designated Assistant Director Civic Education and the numerous jurisdictions administrative officers who double up as Civic Education Officers (CEO) (as contained in their Performance contracts cascaded to sub county administrators all the way to the Village headman level).  <b>c)</b> The Administrative

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>officers/ Civic Education Officers have budgets to execute civic education activities such as barazas in their respective jurisdictions.</p> <p><b>d)</b> There is an outlined procedure which is followed on how Civic Education is conducted including notification to the citizens, the agenda, minutes, feedback and attendance lists.</p> <p><b>e)</b> Materials for use are derived from Assistant Director Public relations and various stakeholders such as National Government and donor programs such as those on HIV-AIDs, Tree planting, climate change, URAIA and county departments e.g health, environment and county</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>affairs.</p> <p>The administrative officers distribute and refer to materials from the Assistant Director Public Relations and Communications office who prepare Documentaries, press releases and adverts that are put in the Media (radio &amp; TV), and also prepares Newsletters, Booklets, Magazines, Calendars, and pamphlets for mass distribution in scheduled public Barazas and on commemorative days such as world Aids day and World environmental day etc.</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 civic	<b>0</b>	Evidence of civic education roll out availed included: a) Engagements with national organizations

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
				on training of citizens etc. Needs to be clearly described and documented in report(s) as a condition for availing points on this.	education activities: 2 points.		<p>such as the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), Kenya Forest Service, for supplemental sectoral civic education materials.</p> <p>-commemoration of international day of forest in Kitui County 21<sup>st</sup> March 2017</p> <p>-commemoration of world day to combat desertification 17<sup>th</sup> June 2017</p> <p>b) Undertake exhibitions at agricultural trade fairs, world commemorative events such as world HIV-AIDS, and Environment day.</p>
<b>4.3</b>	Counties set up institutional structures systems &	Communication framework and engagement	<b>a) System for Access to information/ Communication framework in place, operationalized and</b>	County Act, Art. 96.  Review approved (final) policy / procedure documents describing	<b>Maximum 2 points.</b>  <b>a) Compliance: 1 point.</b>	<b>2</b>	a), Kitui county provides for information and communication through its public relations office charged with availing

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
	process for Public Participation	.	<p>public notices and user-friendly documents shared In advance of public forums (plans, budgets, etc.)</p> <p><b>b)</b> Counties have designated officer in place, and officer is operational.</p>	<p>access to information system and communication framework and review evidence of public notices and sharing of documents. Review job descriptions, pay-sheets and / or other relevant records to ascertain whether designated officer is in place; review documents evidencing activities of the designated officer (e.g. reports written, minutes of meetings attended etc.)</p>	<p><b>b)</b> Compliance: 1 point.</p>		<p>information to the public through public fora such as the county’s website, social media, newsletter, national newspapers, local media (radio), posters and press releases that include newspaper supplements, adverts on radio and TV stations. The information is meant to maintain a good image with the public and includes show casing of projects undertaken as well invitations to participate in bills and in the annual development planning.</p> <p>Publications include:</p> <p>a)Alternative dispute resolution;</p> <p>b)community health and sanitation</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>c)maintenance of cleanliness in market centres</p> <p>d)understanding county governments and their relationship with the national government</p> <p>e)citizen participation</p> <p><b>b) The assistant director Public Relations is the focal point for engagement with the public and he has under him several officers producing communication materials such as documentaries, newsletters, flyers press releases etc.</b></p> <p>The assistant director position is filled and so too are the buttressing assistant director of customer relations who operate a customer</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
							relations/front desk county operations.
4.4		Participatory planning and budget forums held	<p>a) Participatory planning and budget forums held in previous FY before the plans were completed for on-going FY.</p> <p>b) Mandatory citizen engagement /consultations held beyond the budget forum, (i.e. additional consultations)</p> <p>c) Representation: meets requirements of PFMA (section 137) and stakeholder mapping in public participation guidelines issued by MoDP.</p> <p>d) Evidence that forums are structured (not just unstructured discussions)</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>Feedback reports / minutes of meetings where feedback provided to citizens</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>	<b>3</b>	<p>a) Every year several participatory planning meetings are held for budget under the assembly that advertises scheduled public meetings in the website, newspaper and notices and provides secretarial services.</p> <p>b) Members of the County Assembly further lead the deliberations on the budget in other public engagements fora.</p> <p>c) The Kitui County Budget and Economic Forum is in place and members list and meetings minutes were availed. Membership comprises of: The Governor and his deputy (Chair), The ten</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>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>county executive committee members, and other stake holder representatives such as churches ( Catholic and ACK) SUPKEM, Kitui Local Urban Forum Maendeleo ya wanawake, Chamber of commerce, Person living with disability KUPPET, ICPAK, KNUT and a professionals representative.</p> <p>d) Advertises for meetings indicate a structured meeting with time, date, venue and agenda. The secretariat provides for written proposals to be submitted to the secretariat through the clerk.</p> <p>e) Minutes of the meetings provide indicate structured</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>meetings with agenda, plenary discussions and any other business opportunities. Participating public members are cited by names and the various interest groups they represent on the signed attendance lists.</p> <p>f) Feed-back to citizens on how proposals have been handled availed. Report on the public participation exercise on the Kitui Finance Bill, 2016 held at Mutomo Chief's Camp, AIC Zombe, Kitui Multipurpose Training Hall, Mwingi County Hall and Kyuso Market shade centres on was availed.</p>
4.5		Citizens' feed back	Citizen's feedback on the findings from the C-APR/implementation	Records of citizens engagement meetings on the findings of the C-	<b>Maximum points:</b> 1	1	C-APR FY 2015/2016 was prepared in the form of County Annual

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
			status report.	APR. Review evidence from how the inputs have been noted and adhered with and whether there is feedback mechanism in place.	Compliance: 1 point.		Monitoring and Evaluation Report (CAMER). CAMER is a tool used by the county Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning to report on the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) activities aimed at tracking the implementation of the County Integrated Development Plan and Kitui long term plan Kitui Vision 2025. The county integrated M&E system (CIMES) is an intrinsic component of itself that serves to provide feedback on the effectiveness of the implementation of the policies and programmes set out in there. CAMER is part of this integrated county M&E system and covers the 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
							implemented by Kitui county ministries during each financial year. In preparation of the report, short interviews were conducted with the key stakeholders. The stakeholders were briefed on the provisional findings of the draft report and their feedback was obtained before finalization of the CAMER. The views and comments made during this dissemination meeting were incorporated and the draft CAMER was revised to produce the final CAMER report. However, the minutes to evidence the sessions held with the stakeholders were not availed.
4.6		County core	Publication (on county	PFM Act Art 131. County	<b>Maximum points:</b>	<b>1</b>	The county published on

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
		financial materials, budgets, plans, accounts, audit reports and performance assessments published and shared	<p>web-page, in addition to any other publication) of:</p> <p><b>i)</b> County Budget Review and Outlook Paper</p> <p><b>ii)</b> Fiscal Strategy Paper</p> <p><b>iii)</b> Financial statements or annual budget execution report</p> <p><b>iv)</b> Audit reports of financial statements</p> <p><b>v)</b> Quarterly budget progress reports or other report documenting project implementation and budget execution during each quarter</p> <p><b>vi)</b> Annual progress reports (C-APR) with core county indicators</p> <p><b>vii)</b> Procurement plans and rewards of contracts</p> <p><b>viii)</b> Annual Capacity &amp; Performance</p>	<p>Act, Art. 91. Review county web-page.</p> <p>(N.B.) Publication of Budgets, County Integrated Development Plan and Annual Development Plan is covered in Minimum Performance Conditions)</p>	<p><b>5 points</b></p> <p>9 issues: 5 points</p> <p>7-8 issues: 4 points</p> <p>5-6 issues: 3 points</p> <p>3-4 issues: 2 points</p> <p>1-2 issues: 1 point</p> <p>0 issues: 0 point.</p>		<p>its website, the fiscal strategy paper and the county budget.</p> <p>The following were not published on the county website:</p> <p><b>i)</b> Financial statements or annual budget execution report</p> <p><b>ii)</b> County Budget Review and Outlook Paper</p> <p><b>iii)</b> Audit reports of financial statements</p> <p><b>iv)</b> Quarterly budget progress reports</p> <p><b>v)</b> Annual progress reports (C-APR) with core county indicators</p> <p><b>vi)</b> Procurement plans and rewards of contracts</p> <p><b>vii)</b> Annual Capacity &amp; Performance Assessment results</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
			Assessment results ix) County citizens' budget				
4.7		Publication of bills	All bills introduced by the county assembly have been published in the national and in county gazettes or county web-site, and similarly for the legislation passed.	County Act, Art. 23.  Review gazetted bills and Acts, etc.  Review county web-site.	<b>Maximum 2 points</b>  Compliance: 2 points.	<b>2</b>	The County Assembly of Kitui passed 26 bills and the following 19 bills have been published in the County gazettes and county website: <b>i)</b> Kitui County Finance Bill, 2013 <b>ii)</b> Kitui County Abattoirs Bill,2014 <b>iii)</b> Kitui County Sorghum Bill, 2014 <b>iv)</b> Kitui County Business Licensing Bill, 2014 <b>v)</b> Kitui County Markets and Farm Produce Trade Bill, 2014 <b>vi)</b> Kitui County Charcoal Management Bill, 2014 <b>vii)</b> Kitui County Health Facilities Bill, 2014 <b>viii)</b> Kitui County Alcoholic Drinks Control



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
							Bill, 2014 <b>ix)</b> Kitui County Finance Bill, 2014 <b>x)</b> Kitui County Flags, Symbols and Names Bill, 2014. <b>xi)</b> Kitui County Villages Bill, 2014 <b>xii)</b> Kitui County Supplementary Appropriations Bill, 2015 <b>xiii)</b> Kitui County Supplementary Appropriations Bill (II), 2015 <b>xiv)</b> Kitui County Kitui County Finance Bill, 2015 <b>xv)</b> Kitui County Supplementary Appropriations Bill, 2016 <b>xvi)</b> Kitui County Appropriation Bill, 2016 <b>xvii)</b> Kitui County Finance Bill, 2016 <b>xviii)</b> Kitui County

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
							Health Facilities Management Committees (Amendment) Bill, 2016. <b>xix)</b> Kitui County Business Licensing (Amendment) Bill 2016
<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 implemented	The % of planned projects (in the ADP) implemented in last FY according to completion register of projects  <i>Note: Assessment is done for projects planned in the Annual Development Plan for that FY and the final contract prices should be used in the calculation. Weighted measure where the size of the projects is factored in. If</i>	Sample min 10 larger projects from minimum 3 departments/sectors.  Points are only provided with 100 % completion against the plan for each project.  If a project is multi-year, the progress is reviewed against the expected level of completion by end of last FY.  Use all available	<b>Maximum 4 points (6 points in the first two AC&amp;PAs).<sup>2</sup></b>  More than 90 % implemented: 4 points ( <u>6 points</u> in the first two AC&PAs).  85-90 %: 3 points  75-84%: 2 points	<b>2</b>	Completion register of projects for 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> quarter of FY 2015/2016 availed.  20% of the sampled completed projects that were implemented in the FY 2015/2016 could not be linked to the ADP FY 2015/2016.  <b>i)</b> Construction of ECDE classroom At Isekele Primary School, Ngomeni,

<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
			there are more than 10 projects a sample of 10 larger projects is made, and weighted according to the size.	documents in assessment, including: CoB reports, procurement progress reports, quarterly reports on projects, M&E reports etc.	65-74%: 1 point  Less than 65 %: 0 point. If no information is available on completion of projects: 0 point will be awarded.  An extra point will be awarded if the county maintains a comprehensive, accurate register of completed projects and status of all ongoing projects (within the total max points available, i.e. the overall max is 4 points/6 respectively in the first two AC&PA).		FY2015/2016 budgeted at Kshs and implemented at Kshs. 850,000. Construction and equipping of 40 ECDE centres had been planned for in the ADP2015/2016. ii) Construction of ECDE classroom at Gacigongo primary school, Tharaka, FY2015/2016 at Kshs. 851,800. Construction and equipping of 40 ECDE centres had been planned for in the ADP 2015/2016. iii) Pipeline Extension from Maaini-Kwa Kyembeni (1.7km), Maseki village, FY2015/2016 at Kshs. 1,048,747. 10 pipelines covering 50KMs had been planned for in 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
							<p>ADP2015/2016.</p> <p><b>iv)</b> Completion of Kauma health facility, FY2015/2016 at Kshs. 1,449,391</p> <p><b>v)</b> Rehabilitation of water pipeline from Misuuni water project, Mbitini, FY2015/2016 at Kshs. 894,400. 20 pipelines/boreholes had been planned for in the ADP 2015/2016.</p> <p><b>vi)</b> Purchase of veterinary equipment for all wards at Kshs.5,420,000</p> <p><b>vii)</b> Desilting and enlargement of Malatani water pan, Mutitu, FY2015/2016 at Kshs. 458,082. 18 earth dams had been planned for in the ADP 2015/2016.</p> <p><b>viii)</b> Construction of Kyakavi earth dam,</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>Ikutha, FY2015/2016 at Kshs.2, 000,000. 18 earth dams had been planned for in the ADP 2015/2016.</p> <p>ix) Kyume borehole, Endau, FY2015/2016 at Kshs. 3,899,938. 15 Boreholes had been planned for in the ADP 2015/2016.</p> <p>x) Ivonya Ngya borehole equipping, Kyuso, FY2015/2016 at Kshs.3, 072,221. 15 Boreholes had been planned for in the ADP 2015/2016.</p>
5.2	Projects implemented according to cost estimates	Implementation of projects and in accordance with the cost estimates	Percentage (%) of projects implemented within <b>budget</b> estimates (i.e. +/- 10 % of estimates).	<p>Sample of projects: a sample of 10 larger projects of various sizes from a minimum of 3 departments/ sectors.</p> <p>Review budget, procurement plans, contract, plans and costing against actual</p>	<p><b>Maximum 4 points. (5 points in the first two AC&amp;PAs).</b></p> <p>More than 90 % of the projects are executed within +/-5 of budgeted costs: 4 points (5</p>	0	Budget estimates for the following sampled projects implemented to completion were not availed. Hence, it was not possible to ascertain whether the projects were implemented within +/- 10% of respective budget

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
				<p>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 completed project with original budgeted costs in the ADP/budget.</p>	<p>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>		<p>estimates:</p> <p><b>i)</b> Borehole equipping at Kyatulu, Kitui south sub county, implemented at Kshs. 2,956,094.20.</p> <p><b>ii)</b> Equipping at kamulew borehole implemented at Kshs. 3,517,525.00</p> <p><b>iii)</b> Purchase of galla bucks implemented at Kshs. 3,300,000.00</p> <p><b>iv)</b> Purchase of bee keeping equipment implemented at Kshs. 6,356,500.00</p> <p><b>v)</b> Construction of perimeter wall fencing at Kitui agricultural mechanization implemented at Kshs. 4,440,660</p> <p><b>vi)</b> Supply &amp; installation of pump motor &amp; genset implemented at Kshs. 1,184,050</p> <p><b>vii)</b> Rehabilitation of</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							<p>Ulaa cattle dip implemented at Kshs. 235,480</p> <p>viii) Pipeline extension from Maaini-Kwa Kyembeni (1.7km), maseki village implemented at Kshs. 1,048,747.</p> <p>ix) Grading of road at Kangondi junction-kavaloni market-kwa mulangi-Mutulu Primary School implemented at Kshs.851,624</p> <p>x) Construction of drift along Kavoi along Muthale-Mavole road implemented at Kshs.888,910.</p>
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)	<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-</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</p>	0	<p>There was no proper allocation of maintenance costs to completed projects.</p> <p>Maintenance budget for year 2016/17 for the roads sector was Kshs.</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
			ago) have been sustained with actual maintenance budget allocations (sample of min. 5 larger projects).	3 years ago. 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.	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&PA).  More than 5 % but only 3-4 of the projects are catered for: 2 points. More than 5 % but only 1-2 of the specific sampled projects are catered for: 1 point.		120,484,293 against a total budget of Kshs. 259,606,268 which was 46.4%
5.4	Screening of environmental social safeguards	Mitigation measures on ESSA through audit reports	Annual Environmental and Social <b>Audits/reports</b> for <b>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	0	Annual environmental and Social Audit / reports were not prepared.



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
					accordance with framework for all projects: 2 points (3 points in the first two AC&PAs)  80-99 % of projects: 1 points		
5.5	EIA /EMP procedures	EIA/EMP procedures from the Act followed.	Relevant <b>safeguards instruments Prepared:</b> Environmental and Social Management 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 contain ESMP implementation provisions</b> (counties are expected to ensure their	Sample 5-10 projects	All 100 % of sample done in accordance with framework for all projects: 2 points  80-99 % of projects: 1 points	<b>2</b>	All six (6) sampled projects in section 8 of the MPC's have EIAs done and duly licensed following EIA/ EMP procedures from the EMCA as county legislation on the same is not yet developed.  EMP are expected to have preliminary budgets but indications of these being addressed in project budgets and execution contracts was not availed.

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
			works contracts for which ESIA's /ESMPs have been prepared and approved safeguards provisions from part of the contract.				
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 i.e. 80 % satisfactory</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 points, more than 85 % 4 points, etc.</p>	In order to ensure that the scores always vary between 0-100 points, the 5 points are allocated across the PMs 5.1-5.4 with 2 extra points to the	N/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
				projects= XX points, 70 % = XX points.		PM No. 5.1 and 1 extra to each of the PMs No's 5.2-5.4 until VfM is introduced from the 3 <sup>rd</sup> AC&PA	
					<b>Total Maximum Score: 100 points.</b>	<b>48</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	Assessment Met
2. Capacity Building plan developed	Assessment Met
3. Compliance with investment menu of the grant	Not applicable
4. Implementation of CB plan	Not applicable

Table 7: Summary of Results Minimum Performance Conditions

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

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

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

Key Result Areas	Result/Score
<b>KRA 1: Public Financial Management</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>KRA 2: Planning and monitoring and evaluation</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>KRA 3: Human Resources Management</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>KRA 4: Civic Education and Participation</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>KRA 5: Investment implementation &amp; Social and environmental performance</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>48</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**

- Train staff on proficiency and use of IFMIS Hyperion module;
- Acquire and install automated revenue collection systems in all the sub counties to enhance revenue generation, collection and accountability;
- Acquire an audit software that can perform an extensive range of audit work and also add quality to audit work;
- Recruit audit committee members as per the regulations and train them on their roles and responsibilities. This would enhance the functionality of the internal audit unit;
- Train and sensitize the County Assembly Public Finance and Investment Committee to enable them to scrutinize the external audit reports in a timely manner; and
- Urgent need for a secure storage space in the county offices for procurement files; and
- Put in place proper filing and archival mechanisms.

**b) Human Resources**

- Staff rationalization for all these categories in accordance with the new scheme of service developed by SRC for the counties to be done;
- CARPS report for the County are prepared but are yet to be used;
- Putting in place the staffing plan and annual targets;
- Develop skills and competency framework;
- Develop capacity in service reengineering; and
- Support performance improvement through training, short courses, workshops, conferences.

**c) Environment and Social Safeguards**

- Capacity building in screening of environmental social safeguards and follow up and implementation of EIA/EMP procedures; and
- Capacity building in preparing annual environmental and Social Audit / reports.
- Separation of allocation of maintenance costs to completed projects.

**d) Monitoring and Evaluation**

- Induction training for M&E staff, departmental staff etc. on central M&E framework data and information collection, analysis and reporting for projects;
- Training of staff on M&E systems, data and information collection for M&E, preparation of status/periodical progress reports and disseminations;
- Train staff to establish and maintain a detailed register of completed projects; and
- Training of staff on “value for money” assessments and reporting for projects/investments.

e) **Civic Education and Participation**

- Put in place a Citizens' complaint system;
- Prepare a proper C-APR and
- Publish all documents relating to the budget and fiscal strategy on the website.

## 4.0 CHALLENGES IN THE ASSESSMENT

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

- Unreliability of the IFMIS system hence getting some reports from the system was a major challenge
- Some of the tools required to be in place for verification purposes were not presented and some of the staff was unaware of their existence.
- Challenges in retrieving procurement files from the registry due to an improper filing system;
- Distinction of “Annual Audits” referred to in performance measure 5.4 is assumed to refer to completed projects whose operation requires monitoring through Audits. The Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) provides the initial (Yr=0) baseline conditions (Data) which are audited against in first annual audit.



## 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

- Planning requirements are met with minimal gaps identified in the assessment
- Procurement indicators are met with Consolidated Procurement Plan for the current Financial Year in place.
- Core staff are in place.
- Environmental and Social Safeguards systems were not met because there was no County Environment committee.
- Civic Complaints system was met.

### 5.3 PMs

#### KRA 1: Public Finance Management

The following observations were made:

- IFMIS Hyperion module not used for budget preparation
- IFMIS System not fully utilized especially for procurement and cash modules
- There is no automated revenue collection system in place.
- 4th quarter reports FY2015/2016 were submitted late by one month after end of the quarter;
- Summary of revenue, expenditure and progress reports FY 2015/2016 were not published in the website;
- There was no audit software in use;
- Audit committee is not in place;
- There was a reduction in the value of audit queries in FY 2015/2016 from FY 2014/2015;
- There was no evidence that the County Assembly scrutinized the audited financial statements for the year 2014/2015;
- There is no adequate secure storage space for procurement files; and
- No proper filing and archival mechanisms in place.

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

The following was observed:

- All departments have a dedicated focal planning and M&E officer track and generate reports of the projects being implemented;
- There is no M & E framework in place;
- There is a M&E committee in place, however, meetings so far have not been held /recorded on a regular basis;
- CIDP, ADP and Budgets are in place. The CIDP, ADP and budgets were published on the county website;
- Linkages between CIDP , ADP and budget were not easy to establish as there seem to be no document available that could properly link all the three documents; and
- Means of verifying that the CIDP provided for reporting mechanism and monitoring and evaluation of the projects.

## **KRA 3: Human Resource**

- No staffing plans are in place with recruitment mainly addressing attrition from transfers and death
- Skills and competency framework not developed
- Service re-engineering not yet done
- No RRI is undertaken

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

- County core financial materials and performance assessments reports like financial statements or annual budget execution report, audit reports of financial statements, reports documenting project implementation and budget execution during each quarter and annual progress reports (C-APR) were not published and shared on the County webpage.

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

- There is no proper allocation for maintenance costs
- Annual environmental and Social Audit / reports are not prepared

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

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

## 7.0 OVERVIEW OF THE 5 WEAKEST PERFORMANCES

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

KRA	Performance Measure	Issues
KRA 1	Public Finance Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lacks Capacity in IFMIS Hyperion Module</li> <li>• There is no automated revenue collection system in place</li> <li>• Audit Committee to be constituted urgently</li> <li>• Lack of legislative scrutiny of audit reports by the County Assembly and follow-up on the same</li> <li>• Urgent need for storage facilities of the procurement files</li> <li>• No proper filing and archival mechanisms in place</li> </ul>
KRA 2	Planning &M&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No properly constituted M &amp; E committee</li> <li>• Linkages between CIDP , ADP and budget were not easy to establish as there seem to be no document available that could properly link all the three documents</li> <li>• No proper timelines when the C-APR should be prepared</li> </ul>
KRA 3	Human Resource Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No staffing plans and annual targets</li> <li>• Training of staff is not regular</li> <li>• Skills and competency framework not developed</li> <li>• No RRI is undertaken</li> </ul>
KRA 4	Civic Education and Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citizens' complaint system not in place</li> </ul>

<b>KRA 5</b>	Investment implementation & social and environmental performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is no proper allocation for maintenance costs</li><li>• Mechanism to ensure that projects completed according to costs</li><li>• Annual environmental and Social Audit / reports were not prepared.</li></ul>
--------------	--	---

## ANNEX 1: ENTRANCE MEETING

### Minutes of the entrance meeting for Kitui County ACPA held on 3rd July 2017 at Tanathi boardroom

#### Present

Name	Designation
1. Everlyn Mutave	MGA Consultant
2. Justin Miano	MGA Consultant
3. Patricia Koki	Assistant County Secretary
4. Wilfred N. Mutua	Principal Human Resources Management Officer
5. Paul Kimwele	Senior Economist
6. Michael Mwangangi	Assistant Director Monitoring & Compliance
7. Patrick Kiema	Assistant Director Supply Chain Management
8. Erastus Ndeleva - County Assembly	Principal Human Resources Management Officer
9. Dominic Mumbu	Assistant Director
10. Robert Nguli	Chief Internal Auditor
11. Jacob Kimanzi	County Assembly of Kitui
12. Charles Muinde	Principal Procurement Officer
13. Mutetei Mutisya	County Assembly of Kitui
14. Mary Musyoka	County Assembly of Kitui
15. Musya Joyce	Ministry of Finance & Economic Planning
16. Lucy Waema	County Assembly of Kitui
17. Roseline Munyasya Economic Planning	Senior Finance Officer, Ministry of Finance &
18. Augustus Kyenze	Senior Accountant – County Assembly
19. Risper Joseph	Senior Internal Auditor – County Assembly
20. Doris Mbula	County Assembly of Kitui

#### Agenda

- The purpose and objective of the exercise;
- Emphasis on the need for the County to support the exercise; and
- Need to present evidence to demonstrate change.

#### Min 1/3/2017: Introduction

Mrs. Patricia Koki Mbisi, the chair of the day called the meeting to order at 9.35am. The session was opened with a word of prayer from Mr. Kimwele and thereafter a round of introduction from the members in attendance.

### **Min 2/3/2017: Preliminaries**

Mrs. Mbisi briefly explained the agenda of the of assessors visit. She stated that the ACPA exercise was a follow up to the sensitization carried out by Embu KDSP and the staff at various county departments should plan around for the three days dedicated for the assignment by attending interactive sessions with the assessors and themselves and presenting relevant documents for verification. She then handed over the session to the MGA consultants to brief elaborate further on the assignment.

### **Min 3/3/2017: MGA Consultants' briefing**

The assessors appreciated the county staff for making the time to attend the entrance meeting. The Consultants stated that the assessment would be the trigger for release of level 2 funds combined with level 1 funding. The exercise was basically a follow up exercise the self-assessment carried out by the County Government and the County Assembly on themselves.

The methodology of the exercise would be to gather data through holding interviews with key staff for various departments within the County Executive and the County Government. The 3 tools, namely: The Minimum Access Condition, Minimum Performance Measures and Performance Measures developed by KDSP would be used to guide the process of gathering data. The Performance measures would cover 5 key result areas and it was important to conduct interviews with key staff from the treasury/finance, budget, revenue, internal audit, procurement, planning, M&E, Human Resource Management Section of both the executive and the County Assembly. They also indicated that they would interview the key staff tasked with ensuring environmental safeguards and citizen participation in the county forum.

### **Min 4/3/2017: Documentary evidence**

The assessors emphasized on the need for supporting the results of the assessment with documentary evidence so as to minimize on instances of low scores that would have otherwise been different if records were availed for review. The county staff were notified of the assessors' intention to retain photocopies of all the documents reviewed.

### **Min 5/3/2017: Duration of the exercise**

The assessors pointed out that the exercise would last 3 days. An exit meeting was scheduled on the third day with the County Government of Kitui.

### **Min 6/27/2017: Conclusion and adjournment**

The procurement team through the chair stated that they were ready to be assessed. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 10.00am.

## **ANNEX 2: EXIT MEETING**

### **Minutes of the exit meeting for Kitui County ACPA held on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2017 at the Governor's Boardroom**

#### **Present**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>
1. Everlyn Mutave	MGA Consultant
2. Justin Miano	MGA Consultant
3. Alex Kimanzi	Ag. County Secretary
4. Patricia Koki	Assistant County Secretary
5. Wilfred N. Mutua	Principal Human Resources Management Officer
6. Paul Kimwele	Senior Economist
7. Michael Mwangangi	Assistant Director Monitoring & Compliance
8. Patrick Kiema	Assistant Director Supply Chain Management
9. Erastus Ndeleva	Principal Human Resources Management Officer - County Assembly
10. Dominic Mumbu	Assistant Director
11. June Kanyati	Ag. Chief Officer/CFO

#### **Agenda**

- Preliminary key findings and outcomes of the assessments;
- Sharing of the final results;
- The level of information availed and the expectation from the manual; and
- The final scoring of the results.

The meeting started at 12.35pm. The Ag. County Secretary called the meeting to order and thanked the county staff present for according the assessors cooperation. He then called upon the Consultants to brief the team on the preliminary results of the assessment.

### **Min 1/7/2017: Preliminary key findings and outcomes of the assessments**

The assessors thanked the county team for the cooperation accorded during the assessment. The assessors highlighted the following areas of weaknesses noted;



- Budget not prepared using the Hyperion module on IFMIS;
- Lack of an automated revenue collection system resulting to low revenue collection under OSR;
- The Internal audit department lacked an audit software;
- The internal audit committee was not yet appointed resulting to a serious gap within the internal audit function of the county;
- Storage space was not adequate and there was no proper filing system in place;
- There is no M&E policy in place and in addition, there's no M&E framework in place; No structured timelines for carrying out M&E on completed projects;
- Financial statements and all the reports submitted to the National Treasury, CoB, PPRA, CRA, OAG were not published to the County Government Website;
- No proper allocation for maintenance costs; and
- Failure to present submission letters for various reports submitted to the National Treasury, CoB, PPRA and OAG.

#### **Min 2/7/2017: Sharing of the final results**

The assessors stated that they would not be able to share with the team the results of the assessment but would highlight the various areas of weaknesses noted. The county staff were informed that the final report would be shared during the validation workshop whose date and venue would be communicated by KDSP.

#### **Min 3/7/2017: The level of information availed and the expectation from the manual**

Generally, most of the departments availed the required information for review except for the budget related information for the FY 2015/2016 and financial statements submitted to the OAG. Low scoring in some areas of the assessment were as a result of failure to avail documentary evidence e.g submission letters for reports to either the CoB, County Assembly, National Treasury, PPRA etc.

#### **Min 4/7/2017: Reaction to the de-briefing by the county staff**

The CS acknowledged lack of M & E framework within the County and an automated revenue collection system which the county was in the process of acquiring. He pointed out that they were in the process of recruiting an internal audit committee an advertisement on was put in the dailies in April 2017 and applications received.

The CFO stated that the e-revenue module on IFMIS should be activated so that the County does not have to buy a revenue collection system that may turn out to be incompatible with IFMIS. She acknowledged a serious capacity gap with IFMIS operation spanning budget preparation, e-procurement and financial statements preparation and bank reconciliation. She added that she would fast track the retrieval and presentation of outstanding information to the consultants

before they left Kitui County. She further pointed out that, measures will put in place to ensure that all financial reports reports prepared by the County are published on the website.

The Assistant County Secretary raised a concern regarding the information requested via the checklist shared to them compared to a lot of information requested by the consultants. She pointed out that in future, a detailed checklist should be shared to enable them prepare adequately for the assessment.

The Principal Human Resources Management Officer from the County Assembly inquired what percentage of the grant the County Assembly of Kitui would get from the grant. He also raised concerns about the CB plan that focused on the support staff for the County and failed to incorporate the capacity of the legislative arm of the County Assembly e.g the procedural clerks.

The team pointed a capacity gap in filing and archival of county documents and that the KDSP should consider building capacity around ICT (server usage, e-filing, online recruitments, rational database management of Suppliers and vendors).

#### **Min 5/7/22017: Conclusion and adjournment**

In closing, the team leader gave a vote of thanks to the county representatives and once again appreciated them for the support given. The County Secretary, similarly appreciated the MGA team on the work done and expressed his optimism in the county receiving the grant stating that the funds would be very useful in bringing about change in the county of Kitui.

There being no other business, the meeting ended at 1.34pm with a word of prayer from Mr. Kimwele.