

LAIKIPIA COUNTY ANNUAL CAPACITY & PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT (ACPA) REPORT

From

17th July to 21st July 2017

Presented by Lead Consultant

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

Email: customercare@matengogithae.com

Website: www.matengogithae.com



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS.....	1
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
1.0 METHODOLOGY, ASSESSMENT TEAM AND ACTIVITIES.....	6
1.1 Methodology.....	6
1.2 Time Plan	7
2.0 SUMMARY OF RESULTS.....	8
2.1 Minimum Access Conditions (MAC).....	8
2.2 Minimum Performance Conditions.....	11
2.3 Performance Conditions.....	25
Table 5: The summary of results for Performance Conditions.....	25
3.0 SUMMARY OF CAPACITY BUILDING REQUIREMENTS.....	80
3.1 Summary of Results.....	80
4.0 CHALLENGES IN THE ASSESSMENT	84
5.0 SPECIFIC AND GENERAL COMMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL ASPECTS OF THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS	85
5.1 MAC's.....	85
5.2 MPC's Issues.....	85
5.3 PMs	85
6.0 NOTIFICATION OF DISAGREEMENT WITH THE OUTCOME OF	88
THE ASSESSMENT ALREADY NOTED DURING THE FIELD-TRIP.....	88
7.0 OVERVIEW OF THE 5 WEAKEST PERFORMANCES	89
ANNEX 1: MINUTES OF THE ENTRANCE MEETING HELD AT LAIKIPIA COUNTY.....	91
ANNEX 2: MINUTES OF THE EXITMEETING HELD AT LAIKIPIA COUNTY	93

ACRONYMS

ACPA	-	Annual Capacity and Performance Assessment
ADP	-	Annual Development Plans
CB	-	Capacity Building
CEC	-	County Executive Committee
CFAR	-	County Financial and Accounting Report
LCG	-	Laikipia County Government
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 Laikipia 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 Mr. J.M Mathenge, the Head of Public Participation 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. J.M Mathenge was also the focal point and the tireless coordinator of the assessment exercise on behalf of the County Government and County Assembly of Laikipia.

Finally, we want to acknowledge the County Secretary, Mr. Charles Nderitu 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 Laikipia 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 2016/17) to fund county executed capacity building and to increase the incentives for counties to proactively invest in their own capacity.

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

This report documents the key issues that arose during the final assessment of Laikipia 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	All have complied with MAC except for item 3 and 4, which has not been implemented
MPC	Have met 8 MPCs. MPC 5-Adherence to investment menu are not applicable in this assessment.

ACPA Measures	Outcome	Score
PM	KRA 1: Public Financial Management	12
	KRA 2: Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	13
	KRA 3 :Human Resources Management	6
	KRA 4: Civic Education and Participation	7
	KRA 5: Investment implementation & Social And environmental performance	5
	TOTAL	43

Achievements

The County performed well in the area of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation where there are annual progress reports for the various sectors.

Further, there were proper systems in place for financial management and planning documents in place.

The County performed well in the area of civic education and public participation as evidenced in the many records availed to the assessors.

Weaknesses

In the area of Investment Implementation & Social and Environmental Performance the main weakness was lack of a project completion register and also records to show the actual costs incurred for projects so as to ensure that projects were implemented according to costs no maintenance budgets for completed projects. It was noted county environmental committee was not in place, members have been identified awaiting gazettelement and that no annual environmental and social audits are undertaken.

Challenges

The main challenges faced during the assessment include:

- Lack of preparation by the staff for the assessment
- Documents required for the assessment were not provided
- Unreliability of the IFMIS system as it was experiencing a down time during this period hence getting some reports from the system was difficult

Areas of Improvement

The county should improve on the following areas:

- Train budgeting staff on the use of IFMIS Hyperion module in budget preparation;
- Put in place and training the audit committee to be effective;
- Fully automating revenue collection for all the revenue streams;
- Putting in a place a project completion register for the whole county
- Setting up of a competent and proactive centralized M&E unit that will lead and coordinate the activities of various sectional/departmental M&E units or staffs
- Development of a comprehensive M&E framework and system and training of M&E staff on result based M&E
- Out in place a Monitoring Committee
- Put in place approved staffing plans and annual target;
- Develop a skills and competency framework;
- Put in place proper monitoring and evaluation systems for project implementation;
- Train and sensitize County Assembly's Public Finance and Investment Committee to scrutinize external audit reports in a timely manner;
- Ensure that the annual financing requirement of the CIDP is not far off the budgetary allocations;
- Put in place a focal planning and M & E officer in all sectors;
- Publish and sharing county core financial materials and performance assessments reports on the county website;
- Training on project management to ensure of projects implementation within the budget estimates
- Providing of sufficient budget for maintenance of projects after their completion.
- Put in place a fully functional, with adequate staff and well-funded civic education and public participation unit to handle all civic education and public participation programs and activities
- 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.
- Carry out annual environmental and Social Audits / reports as is required.

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 Laikipia 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 Laikipia 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
- 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	17 th July 2017	18 th July 2017	19 th Jul 2017	20 th July 2017	21 st July 2017
Inception meeting					
Assessing the Minimum Access Conditions					
Assessing minimum Performance Measures					
Assessing Performance Measures					
Exit Meeting					
Preparing Report					

2.0 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

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

2.1 Minimum Access Conditions (MAC)

Table 3: Summary of results for Minimum Access Conditions

Minimum Conditions for Capacity and Performance Grants (level 1)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification (MoV)	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Finding
1. County signed participation agreement	To ensure that there is ownership and interest from the county to be involved in the Program, and to allow access to information for the AC&PA teams.	Signed confirmation letter/expression of interest in being involved in the Program MoV: Review the confirmation letter against the format provided by MoDP/in the Program Operational Manual (POM).	First ACPA.	Met	A signed participation agreement by the governor dated on 28 June 2016 was availed to consulting team.

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
2. CB plan developed	Is needed to guide use of funds and coordination. Shows the capacity of the county to be in driver's seat on CB.	CB plan developed according to the format provided in the Program Operational Manual/Grant Manual (annex). MoV: Review the CB plan, based on the self- assessment of the KDSP indicators: MACs, MPC and PMs, and compared with format in the POM /Grant Manual (annex).	At the point of time for the ACPA for the current FY. First year a trigger to be achieved prior to the start of FY.	Met	<p>CB Plan for 2016/17 developed according to the format in POM/Grant Manual</p> <p>It was signed by the County Secretary and the Focal Person on 28/6/2016 availed to the team</p> <p>CB Plan for 2017/18 developed in June 2017 according to the format in POM/Grant Manual. It was signed by the County Secretary and the Focal Person on 30/6/2017.</p>
3. Compliance with investment menu of the grant	Important to ensure quality of the CB support and targeting of the activities.	Compliance with investment menu (eligible expenditure) of the Capacity and Performance Grant) documented in progress reports.		N/A	Funds had not been disbursed for this

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
		MoV: Review of grant and utilization – progress reports. Reporting for the use of CB grants for previous FYs in accordance with the Investment menu			
4. Implementation of CB plan	Ensure actual implementation.	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. MoV: Review financial statements and use of CB + narrative of activities (quarterly reports and per the Grant Manual).		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
Minimum Access Conditions complied with					
1. Compliance with minimum access conditions	To ensure minimum capacity and linkage between CB and investments.	Compliance with MACs. MoV: Review of the conditions mentioned above and the MoV of these.	At point of time for the ACPA	Met	A signed participation agreement by the Governor dated on 28 June 2016 was availed to the consulting team. CB Plan for 2017/18 developed in June 2017 according to the format in POM/Grant Manual. It was signed by the County Secretary and the Focal Person on 30/6/2017.
Financial Management					
2. Financial statements submitted	To reduce fiduciary risks	Financial Statements with letter on documentation submitted to the Kenya National Audit Office by 30th September and National Treasury with required signatures (Internal auditor, heads of accounting unit etc.) As per the PFM Act	3 months after closure of the FY (30 th of September). Complied with if the county is submitting	Met	Separate Financial Statements for FY 2015/2016 for the County Executive and the County Assembly were submitted to the Kenya National Audit Office on 30 th September 2016 as evidenced by submission

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 31stOctober. The FS has to be in an auditable format.</p> <p>MoV: Annual financial statements (FSs), submission letters to Office of the Auditor General (OAG) + records in OAG.</p>	<p>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>letter and received stamp.</p> <p>Consolidated financial statements for the County were submitted on 31st October 2016 as evidenced by approval stamps.</p> <p>The financial statements are signed as required and are in accordance with the IPSAS template provided by the PSASB.</p> <p>The financial statements are signed as required by the chief officer and head of treasury.</p>
<p>3. Audit opinion does not carry an adverse opinion, or a disclaimer on any substantive issue</p>	<p>To reduce fiduciary risks</p>	<p>The opinion in the audit report of the financial statements for county legislature and executive of the previous fiscal year cannot be adverse or carry a disclaimer on any substantive issue.</p> <p>MoV: Audit reports from</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</i></p>	<p>Met</p>	<p>The County Executive's audited financial statements for the year 2015/2016 carry a qualified opinion based on the following grounds:</p> <p>i)The accuracy of financial statements for the year ended 30 June 2016 could</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>Office of the Auditor General.</p> <p>Transitional arrangements: Transitional arrangements are in place as audit report may be disclaimed due to balance sheet issues.</p> <p>First year where the Minimum Performance Conditions are applied (i.e. 2nd AC&PA starting in September 2016) the conditions are as follows:</p> <p>Audit report shows that the county has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided documentation of revenue and expenditures (without significant issues leading to adverse opinion); • No cases of substantial mismanagement (which in itself would lead to adverse audit opinion) and fraud; • Spending within budget and revised budget; • Quarterly reports submitted in last FY to 	<p>arrangements: First ACPA where MPCs are applied i.e. in the 2016 ACPA: Issues are defined for the core issues, which disqualify counties as per audit reports, see previous column.</p>		<p>not be ascertained due to variances between balances as per the financial statement and balances as per the supporting schedules provided for audit, specifically for acquisition of assets.</p> <p>ii)The accuracy and completeness of acquisition of assets balance of Kshs 778,198,464 as at 30 June 2016 could not be ascertained.</p> <p>iii) The accuracy of the cash and bank balances reflected in the financial statements could not be confirmed.</p> <p>iv) The County Revenue Fund balance of Kshs 297,884,877 as at 30 June 2016 was not remitted to the Exchequer as required.</p> <p>vi) The accuracy of cash on hand balance of Kshs 108,108 could not be confirmed.</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>Cob;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Books of accounts (cashbooks) posted with bank reconciliations up-to-date. • Assets register for new assets in place 			<p>vii) Rent and rates arrears – The county reported nil balance in respect of rates arrears for the year ended at 30 June 2016. However, review of revenue records and receivables for the year ended 30 June 2016, revealed that the County had rates arrears of Kshs 2,507,637,939.</p> <p>viii) There were unsupported payments for ward development projects amounting to Kshs 9,990,706.</p> <p>ix) There were variances between financial statements balance and IFMIS balances for Cash equivalent, payables, receipts, payment and receivables. Therefore, the accuracy and completeness of the financial statements could not be confirmed.</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 County Assembly's carry a disclaimer opinion based on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Unreconciled financial statements figures with IFMIS figures for receipts, payments, cash and cash equivalents, receivables and payables. ii) Unexplained variance of Kshs 5,766,278 in the figure for compensation of employees stated in the financial statements and ledgers. <p>Compensation of employees – Kshs 212,337,100</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii)Accounts payable – deposits and retention – Kshs 17,802,689 iii)Unsupported sitting allowance payments – Kshs 2,310,000 iv)Car loan and mortgage

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>scheme for MCAs – Kshs 6,916,127.99</p> <p>v)Modernization of Assembly chambers and offices – Kshs 5,625,000</p> <p>v)Domestic travel and subsistence expenses - Kshs 48,458,437</p>
<p>4. Annual planning documents in place</p>	<p>To demonstrate a minimum level of capacity to plan and manage funds</p>	<p>CIDP, Annual Development Plan and budget approved and published (on-line). (Note: The approved versions have to be the version published on county website) (PFM Act, Art 126 (4).</p> <p>MoV: CIDP, ADP, and budget approval documentation, minutes from council meetings and review of county web-site.</p>	<p>At the point of time of the ACPA, which will take place in Sep-Nov, the plans for current year are reviewed.</p>	<p>Met</p>	<p>CIDP for the year 2013-2017 developed in July –October 2014 hard copy availed and published on the county website.</p> <p>Annual Development 2017/2018 was received by the County Assembly on 26th August 2016 as per stamp. The ADP FY 2017/2018 was posted to the county website.</p> <p>The approved budget for the financial years 2017/2018 was availed. The budget is</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>posted to the county website.</p> <p>Budget FY 2017/2018 was received by the county assembly on 29/4/2016 and approved on 27/5/2016.</p>
Use of funds in accordance with Investment menu					
<p>5. Adherence with the investment menu</p>	<p>To ensure compliance with the environmental and social safeguards and ensure efficiency in spending.</p>	<p>Adherence with the investment menu (eligible expenditures) as defined in the PG Grant Manual.</p> <p><u>MoV</u>: Review financial statements against the grant guidelines. Check up on use of funds from the CPG through the source of funding in the chart of accounts (if possible through the general reporting system with Source of Funding codes) or special manual system of reporting as defined in the Capacity and Performance Grant Manual)</p> <p>Review budget progress reports submitted to CoB.</p>	<p>In 2016 ACPA (Q3 2016) this MPC will not be measured as the level 2 grant starts only from FY 2017/18.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The investment menu relates to the actual capacity building grant which is yet to be given</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
Procurement					
<p>6. Consolidated Procurement plans in place.</p>	<p>To ensure procurement planning is properly coordinated from the central procurement unit instead at departmental, and to ensure sufficient capacity to handle discretionary funds.</p>	<p>Up-dated consolidated procurement plan for executive and for assembly (or combined plan for both).</p> <p><u>MoV:</u> Review procurement plan of each procurement entity and county consolidated procurement plan and check up against the budget whether it encompass the needed projects and adherence with procurement procedures. The procurement plan(s) will have to be up-dated if/and when there are budget revisions, which require changes in the procurement process.</p> <p>Note that there is need to check both the consolidated procurement plan for 1) the assembly and 2) the executive, and whether it is revised when</p>	<p>At point of the ACPA (for current year)</p>	<p>Met</p>	<p>Procurement plans for the County Executive are prepared at the departmental level and then consolidated for the County. Consolidated procurement plan and plans for the FY 2016/2017 for all the Eight (8) departments were availed.</p> <p>Procurement plan for the County Assembly for the FY2016/2017 was availed.</p> <p>The individual plans were uploaded on IFMIS.</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
		budget revisions are made.			
Core Staffing in Place					
7. County Core staff in place	To ensure minimum capacity in staffing	<p>Core staff in place as per below list (see also County Government Act Art. 44).</p> <p>The following staff positions should be in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The country secretary • Chief officer of finance, • Planning officer, • Internal auditor, • Procurement officer • Accountant • Focal Environmental and Social Officer designated to oversee environmental and social safeguards for all sub projects • M&E officer <p><u>MoV</u>: Staff organogram, schemes of service to review the qualifications against requirements (hence the staff needs to be substantive compared to the schemes of</p>	At the point of time for the ACPA.	Met	<p>All the core staff are there and captured on the organogram both at the Count Executive and the Assembly</p> <p>Staff organogram in place with explanation on the county structure.</p> <p>The following positions have been filled by qualified staff who have been substantially appointed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ag. County Secretary • Chief officer of finance • Planning officer • Internal auditor • Procurement officer • Accountant • Focal environmental and social officer designated • M & E Officer <p>The positions indents,</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>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>adverts, shortlists, award reports, letters of offer and appointment were availed.</p> <p>Job descriptions are provided in the letters of offer on which staff sign on acceptance.</p> <p>Staff in acting capacity such as County Secretary is held on acting capacity by the duly qualified Director of Economic planning and County development.</p>
Environmental and Social Safeguards					
<p>8. Functional and Operational Environmental and Social Safeguards Systems (i.e. screening/vetting, clearance/approval, enforcement</p>	<p>To ensure that there is a mechanism and capacity to screen environmental and social risks of the planning process prior</p>	<p>1) Counties endorse and ratify the environmental and social management system to guide investments (from the ACPA starting September 2016).</p> <p>2) All proposed investments screened* against set of environmental and social criteria/checklist, safeguards</p>	<p>Note that the first installment of the expanded CPG investment menu covering sectoral investments starts from July 2017 (FY 2017/18).</p>	<p>Met</p>	<p>1. LCG embraces EMCA and collaborates with NEMA in the environmental and social screening, vetting and licensing of all projects within the county including those it funds.</p> <p>2. The county environment office is a NEMA</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>& compliance monitoring, grievance redress mechanisms, documentation & reporting) in place.</p>	<p>to implementation, and to 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</p>	<p>instruments prepared. (Sample 5-10 projects). (From the second AC&PA, Sept. 2016).</p> <p>3) Prepare relevant RAP for all investments with any displacement. Project Reports for investments for submission to NEMA. (From the 3rd AC&PA, Sept. 2017). Sample 5-10 projects.</p> <p>4) Establishment of County Environment Committee.</p> <p><u>MoV</u>: Review endorsements 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</p>	<p>Hence some of the conditions will be reviewed in the ACPA prior to this release to ascertain that capacity is in place at county level, and other MPCs will review performance in the year after start on the utilization of the expanded grant menu (i.e. in the 3rd AC&PA, see the previous column for details).</p>		<p>designated Lead Agent and receives all project reports for the county to input its perspectives before environment licensing of proposed projects.</p> <p>This is evidenced in the seven reports availed vide:</p> <p>i) PR/LKP/5/2/374 Proposed Ewaso Ngiro river Bridge Laikipia North.</p> <p>ii) PR/LKP/5/2/664 Proposed rehabilitation of Ndindaka Dam, Gathiga Ward</p> <p>iii) PR/LKP/5/2/163 propose Marmanet-salama electric fence Laikipia West sub-county</p> <p>IV) PR/LKP/5/2/459 Proposed rehabilitation of Ainapmoi Dam, Rumuruti ward.</p> <p>v) PR/LKP/5/2/417 Proposed Laikipia West electric game</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>participation and consultation in safeguards process (free, prior and informed consultations – FPIC)</p>	<p>projects are screened.</p> <p>* In cases where the county has clear agreement with NEMA that it does the screening and that all projects are screened, this condition is also seen to be fulfilled.</p>			<p>fence, Laikipia West</p> <p>vi) PR/LKP/5/2/539 Propose drilling of a borehole at Ngishishi Location Timau division</p> <p>vii) PR/LKP/5/2/412 Proposed construction of Laikipia county Headquarters Rumuruti ward.</p> <p>3. There is no project which has been undertaken since 2013 that required resettlement of citizens</p> <p>4. The County Environment Committee (CeC) is in place as evidenced by a letter dated 29/11/2017. Evidence of gazettelement of the committee was not availed.</p> <p>5. The environment focal point person and the social point person were appointed as evidenced by a letter dated</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
					29/11/2017.
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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) complaints/grievance committee to handle complaints pertaining to fiduciary, environmental and social systems. b) A designated a Focal Point Officer to receive, sort, forward, monitor complaints c) simple complaints form/template designed and available to the public d) Multiple channels for receiving complaints e.g. email, telephone, anti-corruption boxes, websites etc.) e) Up to date and serialized record of complaints coordinate implementation of the Framework and a grievance committee is in place. 	At point of time for the ACPA.	Met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) LCG has established an operational complaints handling system in the public participation unit as evidenced by a letter dated 29/11/2017. b) The grievances redress flowchart indicates that the County Secretary (CS) is the central person to whom county complaints are addressed, directed, received and who files substantive complaints at the registry. There is a designated social focal point person who receives, sorts, forwards and monitors complaints. c) Citizens' complaints are registered through a complaints handling self-registration form which is available to the public.

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><u>MoV</u>: Review county policy, availability of the focal office (recruitment files, salary payments, job description for focal point, and evidence for operations, etc. + members of grievance committee, minutes from meetings, various channels for lodging complaints, official and up to date record of complaints etc.</p> <p><i>See also County Government Act Art. 15 and 88 (1)</i></p>			<p>d) Complaints are received through Emails, telephone, short message system for a short code 22031, suggestion boxes and complaint letters received in the various offices.</p> <p>e) Complaints are received in the general registry, date stamped, coded (Folio) and filed in a complaints file. The county secretary then delegates response by forwarding the folio relevant department (office) or committee with directions for action and timeline. Once complaint is addressed, the attendant folio goes back to the county secretary who gives feedback to complainant (S) as appropriate.</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
KRA 1: Public Financial Management Max score: Maximum 30 points.							
<i>Strengthened budget formulation, resource mobilization and allocation</i>							
1.1	Program Based Budget prepared using IFMIS and SCOA	Budget format and quality	<p>The annual budget approved by the County Assembly is:</p> <p>a) Program Based Budget format.</p> <p>b) Budget developed using the IFMIS Hyperion module.</p>	<p>Review county budget document, IFMIS uploads, the CPAR, 2015.</p> <p>Check use of Hyperion Module: all budget submissions include a PBB version printed from Hyperion (submissions may also include line item budgets prepared using other means, but these must match the PBB budget – spot check figures between different versions).</p>	<p>Maximum 2 points.</p> <p>2 milestones (a & b) met: 2 points</p> <p>1 of the 2 milestones met: 1 point</p>	<p>a)1</p> <p>b)0</p>	<p>a) The budget is program based. Various sector specific programmes are clearly defined and have been duly approved and have been approved. Program based budgets for the FY 2015/2016, 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 were availed to the consulting team.</p> <p>b) Budget is not developed using IFMIS Hyperion module. The generic budget is prepared from all the sectors and consolidated because of 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
							approval processes. Once the budget is approved by the County Assembly, the accounting department with the help of the National Treasury uploads it to the IFMIS Hyperion module.
1.2		Budget process follows clear budget calendar	<p>Clear budget calendar with the following key milestones achieved:</p> <p>a) Prior to end of August the CEC member for finance has issued a circular to the county government entities with guidelines to be followed;</p> <p>b) County Budget review and outlook paper – submission by county treasury to CEC by 30 September to be submitted to the County</p>	<p>PFM Act, art 128, 129, 131.</p> <p>Review budget calendar, minutes from meetings (also from assembly resolutions) circular submission letters, county outlook paper, minutes from meetings and Financial Statements.</p>	<p>Max. 3 points</p> <p>If all 5 milestones (a-e) achieved: 3 points</p> <p>If 3-4 items: 2 points</p> <p>If 2 items: 1 point</p> <p>If 1 or 0 items: 0 points.</p>	2	<p>a) County Treasury issued a budget process circular no LAI/TREASURY/CO/VOL/CT/61 for budget of FY 2015/2016 on 28th August 2014. Evidence availed.</p> <p>b) County Budget Review and Outlook paper for financial year 2015/2016 submitted to County Assembly on 29th September 2014 as per receiving stamp</p> <p>c) The County Treasury</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>assembly 7 days after the CEC has approved it but no later than 15th October.</p> <p>c) County fiscal strategy paper (FSP) – submission (by county treasury) of county strategy paper to county executive committee by 28th Feb, County Treasury to submit to county assembly by 15th of march and county assembly to discuss within two weeks after mission.</p> <p>d) CEC member for finance submits budget estimates to county assembly by 30th April latest.</p> <p>e) County assembly passes a budget with or without amendments by</p>				<p>submitted the County Fiscal Strategy Paper 2015/2016 was submitted to the County Assembly 27th February 2015 as per submission letter.</p> <p>d) The CEC-Head of Treasury submitted budget estimates to county assembly on 30th April 2015 as per the submission letter.</p> <p>e) County assembly passed budget for the FY 2015/2016 on 1st July 2015 as evidenced by submission letter.</p> <p>Were late in approving the budget</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
			30 th June latest.				
1.3		Credibility of budget	<p>a) Aggregate expenditure out-turns compared to original approved budget.</p> <p>b) Expenditure composition for each sector matches budget allocations (average across sectors).</p>	Review the original budget and the annual financial statements, budget progress reports, audit reports, etc. Use figures from IFMIS (general ledger report at department (sub-vote) level).	<p>Max. 4 points.</p> <p><u>Ad a):</u> If expenditure deviation between total budgeted expenditures and total exp. in final account is less than 10 % then 2 points.</p> <p>If 10-20 % then 1 point.</p> <p>More than 20 %: 0 point.</p> <p><u>Ad b):</u> If average deviation of expenditures across sectors is less than 10 % then 2 points.</p> <p>If 10-20 % then 1 point.</p> <p>More than 20 %: 0 point.</p>	<p>a)1</p> <p>b)2</p>	<p>Actual Expenditure for FY 2015/2016 was Kshs. 4,149,000,191 versus overall original budget of Kshs. 5,133,879,602 which was 80%. This translates to positive deviation of 20%.</p> <p>b)Average deviation of expenditure across sectors for the FY 2015/2016 was 0.81% as is illustrated below:</p> <p>i) Agriculture sector expenditure was Kshs. 89,917,259 against a budget of Kshs.121, 226,000. This represents a positive deviation of 25.83%.</p> <p>ii) Education, Gender, Sports, Culture & Social Services sector expenditure was Kshs. 93,472,668 against a</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>budget of Kshs.115,098,000 This represents a positive deviation of 18.79%.</p> <p>iii) Public Service and County Administration sector expenditure was Kshs. 2,201,132,047 against a budget of Kshs.2,408,980,000. This represents a positive deviation of 8.63%</p> <p>iv) Lands, housing and development sector expenditure was Kshs. 292,685,687 against a budget of Kshs.317,320,000. This represents a positive deviation of 7.76%.</p> <p>v) Finance and Economic Planning sector expenditure was Kshs. 511,088,006 against a budget 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>Kshs.348, 001,001. This represents a negative deviation of 46.86%</p> <p>vi) Trade, Tourism and Co-operative Development sector expenditure was Kshs. 86,020,098 against a budget of Kshs.78, 700,000. This represents a negative deviation of 9.30%</p> <p>vii) Health and sanitation sector expenditure was Kshs. 326,664,262 against a budget of Kshs.202, 100,000. This represents a negative deviation of 61.63%</p> <p>viii) Water, Environment, Forestry & Natural Resources sector expenditure was Kshs. 89,849,960 against a budget 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>Kshs.132, 240,000. This represents a positive deviation of 32.06%</p> <p>ix) County Assembly expenditure was Kshs. 410,721,749 against a budget of Kshs.411, 560,000. This represents a positive deviation of 0.20%</p>
Revenue Enhancement							
1.4	Enhanced revenue management and administration	Performance in revenue administration	Automation of revenue collection, immediate banking and control system to track collection.	Compare revenues collected through automated processes as % of total own source revenue.	Max: 2 points. Over 80% = 2 points Over 60% = 1 point	0	<p>Revenue collection in the County is not fully automated for all the revenue streams.</p> <p>The Laikipia County Integrated revenue system was adopted in July 2016 in a phased process.</p> <p>The county has fully automated the unstructured revenue like street parking,</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>market fees, cess etc.</p> <p>Own source of revenue in FY 2016/2017 was Kshs.496,229,660.07 out of which 27% (Kshs. 133,245,946) was collected through the automated processes.</p> <p>The county is currently automating the structured revenue collection streams like single business permits property taxes etc.</p>
1.5		Increase on a yearly basis in own source revenues (OSR).	% increase in OSR from last fiscal year but one (year before previous FY) to previous FY	Compare annual Financial Statement from two years. (Use of nominal figures including inflation etc.).	Max. 1 point. If increase is more than 10 %: 1 point.	0	<p>There was a 3.8% increase in the collection of OSR for the FY 2015/2016.</p> <p>FY2014/2015 OSR – Kshs.428,777,357</p> <p>FY 2015/2016 OSR – Kshs. 444,929,340.</p>
<i>Enhanced capacity of counties on execution (including procurement), accounting and reporting</i>							

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
1.6	Reporting and accounting in accordance with PSASB guidelines	Timeliness of in-year budget reports (quarterly to Controller of Budget).	<p>a) Quarterly reports submitted no later than one month after the quarter (consolidated progress and expenditure reports) as per format in CFAR, submitted to the county assembly with copies to the controller of budget, National Treasury and CRA.</p> <p>b) Summary revenue, expenditure and progress report is published in the local media/web-page.</p>	<p>Review quarterly reports, date and receipts (from CoB).</p> <p>Check against the PFM 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>Max. 2 points.</p> <p>(a &b) Submitted on time and published: 2 points.</p> <p>(a only): Submitted on time only: 1 point.</p>	0	<p>a) 1st and 2nd quarter reports and financial statements for the period ended 30th September 2016 and 31st December 2016 availed with no submission letters to establish compliance with set reporting timelines.</p> <p>b) Summary of revenue, expenditure and progress report was availed for the quarters ending September 2015 and December 2015 was not published on the county website.</p>
1.7		Quality of financial statements.	Formats in PFMA and CFAR, and standard templates issued by the IPSAS board are applied and the FS include cores issues such as trial balance, bank	Review annual financial statements, bank conciliations and related documents and appendixes to the FS, date and receipts (from CoB and NT).	<p>Max. 1 point.</p> <p>Quality as defined by APA team or NT assessment (excellent/satisfactory): 1 point</p>	1	The annual financial statements for FY 2015/2016 were submitted to the CoB, CRA and the National Treasury on 18/10/2016.

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
			reconciliations linked with closing balances, budget execution report, schedule of outstanding payments, and appendix with fixed assets register.	<p>Check against the PFM Act, Art. 166 and the IPSAS format.</p> <p>CFAR, Section 8. Check against requirements.</p> <p>If possible review ranking of FS by NT (using the County Government checklist for in-year and annual report), and if classified as excellent or satisfactory, conditions are also complied with.</p>			Financial statements for 2015/2016 were in the format prescribed by the PSASB. The format used comprises of statement of receipts and payments, statement of assets, statement of cash flow, statement of appropriation (recurrent and development), summary of provisioning, significant accounting policies as well as notes to the financial statements.
1.8		Monthly reporting and up-date of accounts, including:	<p>The monthly reporting shall include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Income and expenditure statements; 2. Budget execution report, 3. Financial statement including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Details of income 	<p>Review monthly reports.</p> <p>See also the PFM Manual, p. 82 of which some of the measures are drawn from.</p>	<p>Max. 2 points.</p> <p>If all milestones (1-3): 2 points</p> <p>If 1 or 2: 1 point</p> <p>If none: 0 points.</p>	1	<p>Budget execution reports for FY2015/2016 were availed.</p> <p>Bank reconciliations for 30 June 2016 for all the accounts operated by the Executive were availed.</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>and revenue</p> <p>b. Summary of expenditures</p> <p>c. Schedule of imprest and advances;</p> <p>d. Schedule of debtors and creditors;</p> <p>e. Bank reconciliations and post in general ledger.</p>				
1.9		Asset registers up-to-date and inventory	Assets registers are up-to date and independent physical inspection and verification of assets should be performed once a year.	<p>Review assets register, and sample a few assets. PFM Act. Art 149.</p> <p>Checkup-dates.</p>	<p>Max. 1 point.</p> <p>Registers are up-to-date: 1 point.</p> <p>Transitional arrangements: <u>First year:</u> Assets register need only to contain assets acquired by county governments since their establishment. <u>Second year</u></p>	0	<p>The County Assembly's assets register was updated up-to 30 June 2017.</p> <p>The assets register maintained by the County Executive was not up to date (updated on 4/11/2014).</p> <p>The assets register detailed the date of acquisition, value of the assets, location of the assets, condition and asset tags, names</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
					onwards: register must include all assets, including those inherited from Local Authorities and National Ministries		(particulars) for all assets acquired by the County Assembly and the Executive from the year 2013. No evidence was availed to establish whether independent annual physical inspection and verification of assets was performed.
<i>Audit</i>							
1.10	Internal audit	Effective Internal audit function	Internal audit in place with quarterly IA reports submitted to IA Committee (or if no IA committee, in place, then reports submitted to Governor)	Review audit reports. Check against the PFM Act Art 155	Max. 1 point. 4 quarterly audit reports submitted in previous FY: 1 point.	1	The internal audit unit at the Executive is in place with 5 members of staff. The department currently reports administratively to the CFO and functionally to the Governor. Quarterly internal audit reports for the quarters ending September

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>2015, December 2015, March 2016 and June 2016 were availed to the consulting team.</p> <p>The proposed internal audit charter and the work plan for the FY 2017/2018 were also availed to the consulting team.</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 in the Committee). PFM Act Art 155.	Max. 1 point. IA/Audit Committee established and reports reviewed by Committee and evidence of follow-up: 1 point.	0	<p>The internal audit Committee for the Executive is not in place.</p> <p>The County Executive is at an advanced stage of recruiting internal audit committee members with interviews having been already conducted.</p> <p>The internal audit committee for the County Assembly was appointed to office but the committee has not</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
							held any meeting.
1.12	External audit	Value of audit queries	The value of audit queries as a % of total expenditure	Review audit report from KENAO. Total expenditure as per reports to CoB.	Max. 2 points Value of queries <1% of total expenditures: 2 points <5% of total expenditure: 1 point	0	The value of audit queries for the County Executive for the FY 2015/2016 was Kshs.3,586,530,712 while the County Assembly's was Kshs. was Kshs.293,449,354. The total value of audit queries is Kshs 3,879,980,066 out of the consolidated expenditure for the county Kshs 4,520,153,482 (85.84%)
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.	Max. 1 point. 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.	0	The total value of audit queries for the FY 2015/2016 was Kshs 3,879,980,066 while for the FY 2014/2015 was Kshs 847,744,470. Therefore, there was no reduction in value of audit queries in both FYs. NB. The audited

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							County Assembly's financial statements for the FY 2014/2015 were not available on the KENAO websites for our review.
1.14		Legislative scrutiny of audit reports and follow-up	Greater and more timely legislative scrutiny of external audit reports within required period and evidence that audit queries are addressed	Minutes from meetings, review of previous audit reports.	Max. 1 point. Tabling of audit report and evidence of follow-up: 1 point.	0	There was no evidence availed to establish whether the Finance Committee of the County Assembly undertook legislative scrutiny and follow-up of audit reports for the FY 2014/2015.
Procurement							
11.5	Improved procurement procedures	Improved procurement procedures including use of IFMIs, record keeping, adherence to procurement thresholds	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	Annual procurement assessment and audit by PPRA and OAG Sample 5 procurements (different size) and review steps complied with in the IFMIS guidelines. Calculate average steps complied with in the sample.	Max. 6 points. a) IFMIS Steps: <15steps=0 points; 15-23=1 point; 24-25=2 points b) Timely submission of quarterly reports to PPRA (both	a)0 b)0	a) 13 steps in IFMIS are adhered to in the procurement and payment processes. b) Annual reports for the FY 2015/2016 were submitted the PPRA on 2nd November 2016. Forwarding letter for the same 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
		and tender evaluation.	<p>adhered with.</p> <p>b) County has submitted required procurement reports to PPRA on time.</p> <p>c) Adherence with procurement thresholds and procurement methods for type/size of procurement in a sample of procurements.</p> <p>d) Secure storage space with adequate filing space designated and utilized – for a sample of 10 procurements, single files containing all relevant documentation in one place are stored in this secure storage space (1 point)</p> <p>e) Completed evaluation reports, including individual evaluator scoring against pre-</p>	<p>Review reports submitted.</p> <p>Check reports from tender committees and procurement units.</p> <p>Check a sample of 5 procurement and review adherence with thresholds and procurement methods and evaluation reports.</p> <p>Check for secure storage space and filing space, and for a random sample of 10 procurements of various sizes, review contents of files.</p>	<p>annual reports plus all reports for procurements above proscribed thresholds):</p> <p>1 point</p> <p>c) Adherence with procurement thresholds and procurement methods for type/size of procurement in a sample of procurements:</p> <p>1 point</p> <p>d) Storage space and single complete files for sample of procurements: 1 point</p> <p>e) Evaluation reports: 1 point</p>	c)1	<p>No evidence was provided that quarterly reports were submitted to the PPRA.</p> <p>c)The County adheres to PPRA 2006 regulations and PPDA 2015 to ensure adherence with various with the following procurement thresholds:</p> <p>Low value procurements –for procurements below Kshs.30,000</p> <p>Open tender – for procurements above Kshs.5,000,000</p> <p>Request for quotations –for procurements below Kshs.5,000,000</p> <p>The following procurements were</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
			defined documented evaluation criteria and signed by each member of the evaluation team, available for a sample of 5 large procurements (2 points)				<p>sampled:</p> <p>i)LCCG/C09/Agric/43/2015/16, Rehabilitation of Nkando Earth dam in Nanyuki Ward awarded to Stadan General Contractors at a contract sum of Ksh.3,484,656. Request for quotations procurement method was used as evidenced by quotations evaluation reports and quotes raised by 4 suppliers.</p> <p>ii)LGC/CO4/MOH/92/2014/15/16, Renovation works at Gatehouse, Laboratory and Kitchen at Rimuruti Hospital, Rimuruti ward awarded to Janra Holding at Kshs.1,246,490.76. Request for quotations procurement method was used as evidenced</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>by quotations evaluation report and quotes raised by 4 suppliers.</p> <p>iii)LCC/a17/Agric/46/2015/2016, Supply of Delivery drip kit awarded to Sparlex Ltd at Kshs.1,964,250. Request for quotations procurement method was used as evidenced by quotations evaluation report and quotes raised by 4 suppliers.</p> <p>iv)LCC/A002/2015-2016, Supply and delivery of plastic water tanks awarded to Act Branding Kenya for Special group declaration with prices of water tanks listed various water tanks listed therein(2300L- Kshs.24,634, 3000L –</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>Kshs. 27,600, 5000L-Kshs.46,564 and 10000L-Kshs.94,800). Tender method was used as evidenced by tender advert and minutes of tender evaluation committee and tender opening availed.</p> <p>v)LCC/C11/Agric/32/2015/2016, Rehabilitation of Majani Earthdam in Marmanet Ward awarded to Thejay Investment Company at Kshs.3,977,820. Quotations method was used as evidenced by quotations evaluation reports and quotes raised by 4 suppliers.</p> <p>vi)LCC/C10/Water/2014/15-16/53 for the proposed supply of pipes fittings, trenching</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>and pipe laying-Kigumo water project awarded to Colti Construction at Ksh.3,992,927.40. Tender method was used as evidenced by tender advert as evidenced by minutes of the evaluation committee meeting; tender opening minutes and bid documents from 4 bidders.</p> <p>d) The storage space is adequate and secure in the case of County Executive.</p> <p>As for the County Assembly, there is need to look into having more secure storage space for procurement files.</p> <p>Filing is done as a single file for each procurement item.</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>d)1</p> <p>e)1</p>	<p>The procurement files includes, tenders documents, evaluation reports, contracts (copy), minutes of tender opening, tender evaluation.</p> <p>Adverts are kept separately in the registry and are attached in the payment vouchers.</p> <p>e) Evaluation reports for the procurements sampled in (c) above were reviewed. Quotation evaluation reports were signed off by all the evaluators.</p> <p>Tender evaluation for (c (iv)) above included individual evaluator scoring against pre-defined documented evaluation criteria.</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
Key Result Area 2: Planning and M&E Max score: (tentative 20 points)							
2.1	County M&E system and frameworks developed	County M&E/Planning unit and frameworks in place.	<p>a) Planning and M&E units (may be integrated in one) established.</p> <p>b) There are designated planning and M&E officer and each line ministry has a focal point for planning and one for M&E</p> <p>c) Budget is dedicated for both planning and M&E.</p>	<p>Review staffing structure and organogram.</p> <p>Clearly identifiable budget for planning and M&E functions in the budget.</p>	<p>Maximum 3 points</p> <p>The scoring is one point per measure Nos. a-c complied with.</p>	<p>a)1</p> <p>b)0</p>	<p>a) The county has the Economic Planning unit whose mandate is leadership in planning processes, county statistical support, budget formulation, and M & E.</p> <p>b) There are no designated planning and M&E officer and neither does each line ministry have focal point for planning and no M&E officer.</p> <p>However, the Economic Planning department has planning officers who also serve the M&E functions.</p> <p>c) There is a budget allocation for Planning and M & E. Kshs.2,</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
						c)1	290,431 for the FY 2015/2016.
2.2		County M&E Committee in place and functioning	County M&E Committee meets at least quarterly and reviews the quarterly performance reports. (I.e. it is not sufficient to have hoc meetings).	Review minutes of the quarterly meeting in the County M&E Committee.	Maximum: 1 point Compliance: 1 point.	0	There is no County M & E committee in place. There is a focal point for planning & M&E with no established committee. At sectoral level, the in charge – chief officer can appoint one person in progress reporting to consolidate reports at sectoral level. The planning officers undertake M &E functions/activities. Reports in soft copy availed.
2.3	County Planning systems and functions established	CIDP formulated and up-dated according to guidelines	a) CIDP: adheres to guideline structure of CIDP guidelines, b) CIDP has clear objectives, priorities and	CIDP submitted in required format (as contained in the CIDP guidelines published by MoDP).	Maximum: 3 points 1 point for compliance with each of the issues:	a)1 b)1	a) CIDP 2013-2017 was developed in required format (as contained in the CIDP guidelines published by MoDP.

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>outcomes, reporting mechanism, result matrix, key performance indicators included; and</p> <p>c) Annual financing requirement for full implementation of CIDP does not exceed 200% of the previous FY total county revenue.</p>	<p>See County Act, Art. 108, Art 113 and Art. 149.</p> <p>CIDP guidelines, 2013, chapter 7.</p>	a, b and c.	c)0	<p>b) CIDP has clear objectives, priorities and outcomes, reporting mechanism, result matrix, key performance indicators included.</p> <p>c)The annual financing requirement of the ADP 2015/2016 was Kshs. 12,337,005,988.6 which was 355% of the previous FY2014/2015county revenue (Kshs.3,473,548,465)</p>
2.4		ADP submitted on time and conforms to guidelines	<p>a) Annual development plan submitted to Assembly by September 1st in accordance with required format & contents (Law says that once submitted if they are silent on it then it is assumed to be passed).</p> <p>b) ADP contains issues</p>	Review version of ADP approved by County Assembly for structure, and approval procedures and timing, against the PFM Act, Art 126, 1.	<p>Maximum: 4 points</p> <p>Compliance a): 1 point.</p> <p>b) All issues from A-H in PFM Act Art 126,1: 3 points 5-7 issues: 2 points</p>	<p>a)1</p> <p>b)1</p>	<p>a) The revised ADP 2016/2017 was submitted to the County Assembly on 23/3/2016. The evidence of first submission was not availed</p> <p>The ADP 2017/2018 was submitted to the County Assembly on</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			mentioned in the PFM Act 126,1, <u>number A-H</u>		3-4 issues: 1 point, see Annex.		<p>26/8/2016 as evidenced by the approval stamp.</p> <p>Individual ADP for FY2015/2016 and 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 were availed.</p> <p>The ADP contains 4 issues mentioned in the PFM Act 126,1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) strategic priorities for the medium term that reflect the county government's priorities and plans; ii) a description of how the county government is responding to changes in the financial and economic environment; iii) programmes to be delivered with details for each programme; and iv) A description of significant capital

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>developments. The ADP lacks the following issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) payments to be made on behalf of the county governments, including details of any grants, benefits and subsidies that are applied; ii) a description of significant capital developments; iii) detailed description of proposals with respect to the development of physical, intellectual, human and other resources of the county, including measurable indicators where feasible. iv) A summary budget in the format required by regulations; and (h) such other matters as may be required by

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 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)	<p>Review the three documents: CIDP, ADP and the budget. The budget should be consistent with the CIDP and ADP priorities.</p> <p>The costing of the ADP is within +/- 10% of final budget allocation.</p> <p>Sample 10 projects and check that they are consistent between the two documents.</p>	<p>Maximum: 2 points</p> <p>Linkages and within the ceiling: 2 points.</p>	1	<p>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 included:</p> <p>i) Rehabilitation of earth dams, with 100% variance.</p> <p>ii) Construction of milk cooling plants, with 100% variance.</p> <p>lii) Construction of slaughter houses, with 100% variance.</p> <p>IV) Construction of classrooms, with 100%</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							<p>variance.</p> <p>v)Construction of pit latrines in schools, with 100% variance.</p> <p>vi) Design and website upgrading vii) Construction of dispensaries, with 100% variance.</p> <p>viii) Supply, deliver, commissioning of 250KVA generator at Nyahururu County Hospital, with 100% variance.</p> <p>ix) Supply, installation, testing and commissioning of dry oxygen refill compressor, with 100% variance.</p> <p>x) Construction of maternity blocks/wards, with 100% variance.</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>100% of the sampled projects had a 100% variance in terms of costing between CIDP and ADP, the ADP and CIDP do not have the costs for the activities.</p> <p>ADP FY 2015/2016 costing was Kshs. 12, 343,005,988.60 versus approved development budget of Kshs. 1, 344,350,000. The ADP for the FY 2015/2016 was not within +/- 10 % of final budget allocation.</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</p>	<p>Check contents of C-APR and ensure that it clearly link s with the CIDP indicators.</p> <p>Verify that the indicators have been sent to the CoG.</p>	<p>Maximum: 5 points.</p> <p>a) C-APR produced = 2 points</p> <p>b) C-APR produced by end</p>	4	<p>C-APR prepared is called Annual Progress Report and it was prepared by 1st September 2016.</p> <p>Tied to the budget papers. Shorter version engaging the citizens.</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>targets and within result matrix for results and implementation.</p> <p>(Ad b) Compliance if produced within 3 months of the closure of a FY and sent to Council of Governors for information. This will be done in reference with the County Integrated M&E System Guidelines.</p>		<p>of September. 1 point.</p> <p>c) C-APR includes performance against CIDP performance indicators and targets and with result matrix for 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>		<p>Every department within the County prepares annual progress reports.</p> <p>Quarterly reports that are prepared are purely sectoral and are not consolidated for easier consumption by the County Assembly.</p> <p>The quarterly reports are based on planned projects in the ADP against what had been budgeted.</p> <p>Ward progress reports for ward 1 to 15 for the FY 2015/2016 availed. These reports are produced by beginning of August for dissemination.</p> <p>Reports are not complexly structured. They indicate sectoral achievements and also</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							give the views of all the wards.
2.7		Evaluation of CIDP projects	Evaluation of completion of major CIDP projects conducted on an annual basis.	Review completed project and evaluations (sample 5 large projects).	Maximum: 1 point. Evaluation done: 1 point.	1	There was an evaluation exercise undertaken and it focused on the following issues: i) Implemented projects against the budget. ii) Evaluation also assessed the progress/achievement made in each financial year in relation to what had been planned and budgeted. CIDP will be subjected to an end term review.
2.8		Feedback from Annual Progress Report to Annual Development Plan	Evidence that the ADP and budget are informed by the previous C-APR.	Review the two documents for evidence of C-ARP informing ADP and budget	Maximum: 1 point. Compliance: 1 point.	1	When the annual progress reports are prepared, they are published and shared with respective departments. The CBROP reviewed

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>the performance for the previous financial year and informs the ADP.</p> <p>In November each year, each department holds sector working group meetings after which 2 main budget output papers, County Budget Review and Outlook Paper and County Fiscal Strategy Paper give citizens a chance to focus on the ADP and the budget estimates.</p>
<p>Key Result Area 3: Human Resource Management Max score: 12 points.</p>							
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</p>	<p>Staffing plan</p> <p>Capacity Building Assessment / CARPS report</p> <p>Documentation evidencing hiring,</p>	<p>Maximum 3 points:</p> <p>First AC&PA: a = 2 points, b = 1 point c= NA.</p>	a)1	<p>a) The county has a cabinet approved organ chart with a staffing plan developed through a strategic human resources management consultancy by Ernest</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>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>training, promotion, rationalization, etc.</p> <p>In future years (after first AC&PA), there has to be evidence that CB/skills assessments are conducted annually to get points on (b). Targets within (+/- 10 % variations).</p>	<p>Future AC&PAs: a=1 point, b = 1 point, c = 1 point</p>	<p>b)1</p>	<p>and Young The county's organization structure with appendices for staffing Matrix (levels) and job descriptions were availed in soft copy. (soft copy availed),</p> <p>At the assembly the commission on revenue allocation provides guidance only on request stipulating staffing numbers pegged to numbers of members of county assembly without stipulation of positions, cadre or terms.</p> <p>b) The executive staff plan was informed by a capacity building assessment as contained in Laikipia County strategic human resource management</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>plan consultancy's terms of reference.</p> <p>c) The annual targets are not met due to limited financial resources.</p>
3.2	Job descriptions, including skills and competence requirements	Job descriptions, specifications and competency framework	<p>a) Job descriptions in place and qualifications met (AC&PA 1: Chief officers / heads of departments; 2nd AC&PA: all heads of units; future AC&PAs: all staff (sample check))</p> <p>b) Skills and competency frameworks and Job descriptions adhere to these (AC&PA 1: Chief officers / heads of departments; 2nd AC&PA: all heads of units; future AC&PAs: all staff (sample check))</p> <p>c) Accurate recruitment, appointment and</p>	<p>Job descriptions</p> <p>Skills and competency frameworks.</p> <p>Appointment, recruitment and promotion records</p>	<p>Maximum score: 4 points</p> <p>All a, b and c: 4 points.</p> <p>Two of a-c: 2 points</p> <p>One of a-c: 1 point</p>	4	<p>a) Job descriptions used heavily borrow from The public service commission and SRC. Adverts for positions provided have summary job descriptions and requisite qualifications that were used in candidates' selection.</p> <p>b) Competitive hiring in place is set against competency framework and skills levels provided in the Public Service Commission human resource manual and those developed by Ernst & Young.</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
			promotion records available				<p>Skills, and competency frameworks match job descriptions as contained in the offers of/ letters of appointment signed by the employee</p> <p>c) Accurate recruitment and appointment are maintained as are details of internal communications meant for promotions (samples availed). The Laikipia county public services board interviews applicants and comes up with a promotions decisions report, The staff is informed via a letter copied to salaries section salary adjustments. Common cadre promotions are initiated by officers</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
							through their supervisors to county secretary who delegates to the human resources department for submission to the County Human Resource Management advisory Committee which generates recommendations to county public service board for approval and confirmation.
3.3	Staff appraisal and performance management operationalized in counties	Staff appraisals and performance management	a) Staff appraisal and performance management process developed and operationalized. b) Performance contracts developed and operationalized c) service re-engineering undertaken	Review staff appraisals. County Act, Art 47 (1). Country Public Service Board Records. Staff assessment reports. Re-engineering reports covering at least one	Maximum score: 5 points.¹ a) Staff appraisal for all staff in place: 1 point. (If staff appraisal for b) Performance Contracts in place for CEC Members and Chief	a)0 b)0	a) No staff appraisals are being carried out in the county. b) Performance contract were signed between Governor and County executive Committee members in 2014/2015 were not extended to the lower echelons

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

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			d) RRI undertaken	service RRI Reports for at least one 100 day period	Officers: 1 point Performance Contracts in place for the level below Chief Officers: 1 point c) Service delivery processes re-engineered in counties: 1 point d) Rapid Results Initiatives-RRIs launched/upscaled : 1 point	c)0 d)0	(operationalized). No subsequent actions or appraisals have since been undertaken on these. c) No service delivery processes re-engineered in the county. d)No RRI was launched
Key Result Area 4: Civic Education and Participation - <i>A citizenry that more actively participated in county governance affairs of the society</i> Max score: 18 points							
4.1	Counties establish functional Civic education Units	CEU established	Civic Education Units established and functioning: (a) Formation of CE units (b) Dedicated staffing and (c) Budget,	County Act, Art 99-100.	Maximum 3 points. CEU fully established with all milestones (a) - (e) complied with: 3 points. 2-4 out of the five	1	a) No formal civic education unit established. However, the Laikipia Public Participation Act 2014 creates the Department of Public Participation with functions similar to civic education units

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
			(d) Programs planned, including curriculum, activities etc. and (e) Tools and methods for CE outlined.		<p>milestones (a-e): 2 points</p> <p>Only one: 1 point.</p>		<p>in the executive and assembly respectively.</p> <p>b) A dedicated staff that includes the Director Public Participation and two other staff vide: accountant and the secretary are in place.</p> <p>c) The Chief Officer (CO) county administration and public service provides for a dedicated budget for the public participation department by issuing a directorate ceiling verbally. (However evidence of the dedicated budget has not availed).</p> <p>d) The public participation directorate develops an activities annual work</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>plan within the budget ceiling guidelines which have remained the same at Kshs.15Million in 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 financial years. However, no evidence of civic education curriculum was provided.</p> <p>e) Suggested tools used include presentations at public participation meetings and fora such as world commemorative days like world environment and HIV –AIDs days. Training of Trainer (TOT) workshops, focus groups, newsletters and internet based interactive platforms.</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
4.2		Counties roll out civic education activities	Evidence of roll-out of civic education activities – (minimum 5 activities).	County Act, art. 100. Examples are engagements with NGOs to enhance CE activities/joint initiatives on training of citizens etc. Needs to be clearly described and documented in report(s) as a condition for availing points on this.	Maximum 2 points. Roll out of minimum 5 civic education activities: 2 points.	0	No relevant evidence of roll out of civic education was availed as there was no curriculum developed and suggested planned activities (see below) seem to be actually ad-hoc and ride on events opportunities convened for other objectives.
4.3	Counties set up institutional structures systems & process for Public Participation	Communication framework and engagement .	a) System for Access to information/ Communication framework in place, operationalized and public notices and user-friendly documents shared In advance of public forums (plans, budgets, etc.) b) Counties have designated officer in place, and officer is operational.	County Act, Art. 96. Review approved (final) policy / procedure documents describing access to information system and communication framework and review evidence of public notices and sharing of documents. Review job descriptions, pay-sheets and / or other relevant records to ascertain whether	Maximum 2 points. a) Compliance: 1 point. b) Compliance: 1 point.	2	a) Laikipia Public Participation Act 2014 provides policy for access to information. The county websites are well updated and include background information on order papers that contain motions policies and bills being discussed b) The Director, Public Participation is the designated officer and the system is

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
				designated officer is in place; review documents evidencing activities of the designated officer (e.g. reports written, minutes of meetings attended etc.)			operational
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>PFM Act, Art. 137.</p> <p>County Act, 91, 106 (4), Art. 115.</p> <p>Invitations Minutes from meetings in the forums.</p> <p>List of attendances, Meetings at ward levels,</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 /</p>	<p>Maximum 3 points.</p> <p>All issues met (a-f): 3 points. 4-5 met: 2 points. 1-3 met: 1 point.</p>	2	<p>a) Public participation forums on 2015 County fiscal strategy paper and 2016/2017 fiscal budget were held as evidenced by the reports were availed to the consulting team.</p> <p>b) Invitation to public hearing on the MTEF budget 2015/2016 to 2017/2018 and invitation to validation on 2016/2017 fiscal budget were made to the public at ward level.</p> <p>Hearings were held in all 15 wards in the count between 17th and</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			<p>d) Evidence that forums are structured (not just unstructured discussions)</p> <p>e) Evidence of input from the citizens to the plans, e.g. through minutes or other documentation</p> <p>f) Feed-back to citizens on how proposals have been handled.</p>	minutes of meetings where feedback provided to citizens			<p>18th February 2015.</p> <p>c) Attendance list presented per ward level indicated representation by the participators in attendance from the youth, local administration, farmers, traders, schools, faith based organization, business community and village elders.</p> <p>d) Invitation to public hearing detailed the wards, venue, date, time and a program of the daily activities indicated.</p> <p>e) Minutes and reports on public participation forums held on 2015 County fiscal strategy paper and 2016/2017 fiscal budget were availed to evidence</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>input from the citizens to the plans.</p> <p>f) Reports on public participation forums held on 2015 County fiscal strategy paper and 2016/2017 fiscal budget incorporated feed-back to citizens on how proposals have been handled in the recommendations sections.</p> <p>The report detailed all issues raised at ward level and the respective proposed interventions.</p>
4.5.		Citizens' feed back	Citizen's feedback on the findings from the C-APR/implementation status report.	Records of citizens engagement meetings on the findings of the C-APR. Review evidence from how the inputs have been noted and adhered with and whether there is feed-back mechanism in	Maximum points: 1 Compliance: 1 point.	0	No records of citizens' engagement meetings on the findings of the sector working group reports (departmental annual progress reports) were 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
				place.			
4.6		County core financial materials, budgets, plans, accounts, audit reports and performance assessments published and shared	<p>Publication (on county web-page, in addition to any other publication) of:</p> <p>i) County Budget Review and Outlook Paper</p> <p>ii) Fiscal Strategy Paper</p> <p>iii) Financial statements or annual budget execution report</p> <p>iv) Audit reports of financial statements</p> <p>v) Quarterly budget progress reports or other report documenting project implementation and budget execution during each quarter</p> <p>vi) Annual progress reports (C-APR) with core county indicators</p> <p>vii) Procurement plans and rewards of contracts</p>	<p>PFM Act Art 131. County Act, Art. 91.</p> <p>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>Maximum points: 5 points</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>	0	<p>The following publications were not available on the County web-page:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Budget Review and Outlook Paper • Fiscal Strategy Paper • Approved budget • Annual development plans • CIDP • Quarterly budget progress implementation reports • Audit reports of financial statements; • Annual progress reports (C-APR) with core county indicators • Procurement plans and rewards of contracts • Annual Capacity & Performance

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
			viii) Annual Capacity & Performance Assessment results ix) County citizens' budget				Assessment results
4.7		Publication of bills	All bills introduced by the county assembly have been published in the national and in county gazettes or county web-site, and similarly for the legislation passed.	County Act, Art. 23. Review gazetted bills and Acts, etc. Review county web-site.	Maximum 2 points Compliance: 2 points.	2	16 bills have been assented and 10 Acts published on the web page. Among the Acts are: i) Laikipia County Alcoholic Drinks Control Act, 2014 ii) Laikipia County Finance Act,2015 iii) Laikipia County Finance Act,2014 iv) The Laikipia County (Powers and Privileges and Immunities) Act 2014 v) Laikipia County Appropriation Act 2014 vi) Laikipia County Development Authority Act, 2014 vii) Laikipia County Education Bursary Fund

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
							Act, 2014 viii) Laikipia County Enterprises Fund Act, 2014 ix) Laikipia County Finance Act, 2013 x) Laikipia County Health Services Act, 2014
Result Area 5. Investment implementation & social and environmental performance Max score: 20 points.							
5.1	Output against plan – measures of levels of implementation	Physical targets as included in the annual development plan implemented	<p>The % of planned projects (in the ADP) implemented in last FY according to completion register of projects</p> <p><i>Note: Assessment is done for projects planned in the Annual Development Plan for that FY and the final contract prices should be used in the calculation. Weighted measure where the size of the</i></p>	<p>Sample min 10 larger projects from minimum 3 departments/sectors.</p> <p>Points are only provided with 100 % completion against the plan for each project.</p> <p>If a project is multi-year, the progress is reviewed against the expected level of completion by end of last FY.</p>	<p>Maximum 4 points (6 points in the first two AC&PAs).²</p> <p>More than 90 % implemented: 4 points (<u>6 points</u> in the first two AC&PAs).</p> <p>85-90 %: 3 points</p> <p>75-84%: 2 points</p>	3	<p>Based on the project plans outlined in the ADP, 100% of the sampled projects as illustrated below were completed on time:</p> <p>i) Rehabilitation of Rimuruti water supply project which is 100% complete.</p> <p>ii) Construction of Munyu Dam, 100% complete</p> <p>iii) Drilling of Ewaso borehole, 100%</p>

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

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			<i>projects is factored in.</i> If there are more than 10 projects a sample of 10 larger projects is made, and weighted according to the size.	Use all available 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).		complete. iv) Renovation works at Solio, 100% v) Construction of 2 classrooms at Ngobit,100% complete vi) Installation of CCTV & renovation of server at Nyahururu and Nanyuki,100% complete vii) Construction of Baraka Dispensary,100% complete viii) Construction of Nturukuma maternity block, 100% complete ix) Supply, installation, testing and commissioning of dry oxygen refill compressor, 100% complete x) Construction of Laboratory in Nanyuki Teaching & Referral Hospital, 100%

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
							complete. Departmental project completion registers were maintained with some not being comprehensive enough to indicate the status of implemented projects in 2015/2016.
5.2	Projects implemented according to cost estimates	Implementation of projects and in accordance with the cost estimates	Percentage (%) of projects implemented within budget estimates (i.e. +/- 10 % of estimates).	Sample of projects: a sample of 10 larger projects of various sizes from a minimum of 3 departments/ sectors. Review budget, procurement plans, contract, plans and costing against actual funding. If there is no information available, no points will be provided. If the information is available in the budget this is used. (In case there are	Maximum 4 points. (5 points in the first two AC&PAs). More than 90 % of the projects are executed within +/- 5 of budgeted costs: 4 points (5 points in the first two AC&PAs) 80-90%: 3 points 70-79%: 2 points 60-69%: 1 point	0	It was not possible to establish whether sampled completed projects were implemented within +/- 10 % of estimates budget because the estimated projects costs was not clear in the procurement plans and estimates: Sampled projects include: i) Rehabilitation of Rimuruti water supply project, implemented

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>conflicts between figures, the original budgeted project figure will be applied). Review completion reports, quarterly reports, payment records, quarterly progress reports, etc. Review M&E reports.</p> <p>Compare actual costs of completed project with original budgeted costs in the ADP/budget.</p>	Below 60%: 0 points.		<p>at Kshs.10,028,350.70</p> <p>ii)Construction of Munyu Dam implemented at Kshs.3,920,750</p> <p>iii)Drilling of Ewaso borehole, implemented at Kshs.3,06,980</p> <p>iv)Renovation works at Solio implemented at Kshs.1,631,714</p> <p>v) Construction of 2 classrooms at Ngobit, implemented at Kshs.2,421,256.40.</p> <p>vi) Installation of CCTV & renovation of server at Nyahururu and Nanyuki, implemented at Kshs.1,200,600.</p> <p>vii) Construction of Baraka Dispensary, implemented at Kshs.4,412,534.</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>viii) Construction of Nturukuma maternity block, implemented at Kshs.3,399,826.80</p> <p>ix) Supply, installation, testing and commissioning of dry oxygen refill compressor, implemented at Kshs.5, 100,000.</p> <p>x) Construction of Laboratory in Nanyuki Teaching & Referral Hospital budgeted at Kshs.9, 000,000 and implemented at Kshs.4, 200,000.53.33% variance.</p>
5.3	Maintenance	Maintenance budget to ensure sustainability	Maintenance cost in the last FY (actuals) was minimum 5 % of the total capital budgeted evidence in selected larger projects (projects which have been	<p>Review budget and quarterly budget execution reports as well as financial statements.</p> <p>Randomly sample 5 larger projects, which</p>	<p>Maximum 3 points (4 points in the first two AC&PAs).</p> <p>Maintenance budget is more</p>	0	There was no proper allocation of maintenance costs to completed projects.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			completed 2-3 years ago) have been sustained with actual maintenance budget allocations (sample of min. 5 larger projects).	have been completed 2-3 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.	than 5 % of capital budget and sample projects catered for in terms of maintenance allocations for 2-3 years after: 3 points (4 in the first two AC&PA). More than 5 % but only 3-4 of the projects are catered for: 2 points. More than 5 % but only 1-2 of the specific sampled projects are catered for: 1 point.		
5.4	Screening of environmental social safeguards	Mitigation measures on ESSA through audit reports	Annual Environmental and Social Audits/reports for EIA /EMP related investments.	Sample 10 projects and ascertain whether environmental/social audit reports have been produced.	Maximum points: 2 points (3 points in the first two AC&PAs) All 100 % of	0	No annual environmental and social audits were undertaken

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
					sample done in accordance with framework for all projects: 2 points (3 points in the first two AC&PAs) 80-99 % of projects: 1 points		
5.5	EIA /EMP procedures	EIA/EMP procedures from the Act followed.	Relevant safeguards instruments Prepared: Environmental and Social Management Plans, Environmental Impact Assessment, RAP, etc. consulted upon, cleared/approved by NEMA and disclosed prior to commencement of civil works in case where screening has indicated that this is required. All building & civil works investments contracts contain ESMP implementation provisions (counties are expected to ensure their works contracts for	Sample 5-10 projects	All 100 % of sample done in accordance with framework for all projects: 2 points 80-99 % of projects: 1 points	2	All sampled projects prepared reports that include environment and social management plans and their implementation at all project phases form conditions of the environment licenses issued. Non-conformity with these conditions invokes punitive measures such as works stoppage prosecution by NEMA. Projects sampled include:

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
			which ESIA's /ESMPs have been prepared and approved safeguards provisions from part of the contract.				<p>i) PR/LKP/5/2/374 Proposed EwasoNgiro river Bridge Laikipia North.</p> <p>ii) PR/LKP/5/2/664 Proposed rehabilitation of Ndindaka Dam, Gathiga Ward</p> <p>iii)PR/LKP/5/2/163 propose Marmanet-salama electric fence Laikipia West sub-county</p> <p>iv)PR/LKP/5/2/459 Proposed rehabilitation of Ainapmoi Dam, Rumuruti ward.</p> <p>v) PR/LKP/5/2/417 Proposed Laikipia West electric game fence, Laikipia West</p> <p>vi) PR/LKP/5/2/539 Propose drilling of a borehole at Ngishishi Location Timau division</p> <p>vii) PR/LKP/5/2/412 Proposed construction of Laikipia 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
							Headquarters Rumuruti ward.
5.6	Value for the Money (from the 3 rd AC&PA).	Value for the money.	Percentage (%) of projects implemented with a satisfactory level of value for the money, calibrated in the value for the money assessment tool.	<p>To be included from the 3rd AC&PA only. A sample of minimum 5 projects will be reviewed.</p> <p>The methodology will be developed at a later date, prior to the 3rd AC&PA.</p> <p>Note that a sample will be taken of all projects, not only the ones, which are funded by the CPG. The % of projects (weighted by the size of the projects) with a satisfactory level of value for the money will be reflected in the score i.e. 80 % satisfactory projects= XX points, 70 % = XX points.</p>	<p>Maximum 5 points.</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
						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 rd AC&P A.	
					Total Maximum Score: 100 points.	43	

3.0 SUMMARY OF CAPACITY BUILDING REQUIREMENTS

3.1 Summary of Results

Table 6: Summary of Results for Minimum Access Conditions

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

Table 7: Summary of Results Minimum Performance Conditions

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

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

Table 8: Summary of Results for Performance Measures

Key Result Areas	Result/Score
KRA 1: Public Financial Management	12
KRA 2: Planning and monitoring and evaluation	13
KRA 3: Human Resources Management	6
KRA 4: Civic Education and Participation	7
KRA 5: Investment implementation & Social and environmental performance	5
TOTAL SCORE	43

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;
- Sensitize and induct relevant staff on installed ICT based revenue collection systems to enhance revenue generation, collection and accountability;
- Recruit new audit committee members as per the regulations and train them on their roles and responsibilities;
- Train the county treasury on the need to submit quarterly reports to the National Treasury and within the stipulated timelines;
- Train and sensitize the County Assembly Public Finance and Investment Committee to enable them to scrutinize the external audit reports in a timely manner;
- Urgent need for a secure storage space in the county offices for procurement files;
- Train and sensitize the Executive on the need to maintain an updated assets register;
- Sensitize the County Assembly on the need to adhere to the budget calendar when it comes to passing the budget; and
- Sensitize the county staff on the need to maintain documents trail for all the submission and acknowledgement letters for various reports submitted to PPRA, CoB, National Treasury, County Treasury, Auditor General, CRA, County Assembly, CEC etc.

b) Human Resources

- Develop an effective staffing plan with annual staffing targets and a revised skills and competency framework.
- Develop staff performance appraisal system and performance contracting for the senior staff
- Capacity building skills in performance appraisal skills to supervisors to enable them carry out effective appraisals for all staff;
- 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;
- Participation in workshops and conferences arranged by professional bodies and special interest groups/networks (e.g. NEMA)

d) Monitoring and Evaluation

- Putting in place a central M& E framework and policy
- Putting in place M & E focal point persons in all departments
- Putting in place the County M& E Committee
- 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 register of completed projects for the whole county instead of departmental;
- Training of staff on “value for money” assessments and reporting for projects/investments

e) Civic Education & Public Participation

- Set up a fully functional civic education unit
- Capacity in setting up functional civic education units including developing the programs, curriculum and activities;
- Development of tools and methods for civic education and setting up institutional systems and process for public participation

4.0 CHALLENGES IN THE ASSESSMENT

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

- Lack of preparation by the staff for the assessment
- Documents required for the assessment were not provided

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, however the CIDP, ADP and budgets were not posted on to the website
- Procurement indicators were not met with departmental Procurement Plans for the current Financial Year in place but combined Procurement plan for the whole county not availed.
- Core Staff in place was fully met.
- Environmental and Social Safeguards systems were not met due to the fact that the County Environment committee was yet to be gazzetted.
- Civic Complaints system was not met.

5.3 PMs

KRA 1: Public Finance Management

The following observations were made:

- IFMIS Hyperion not used for budget preparation
- IFMIS System not fully utilized especially for procurement and cash modules
- Automated revenue collection system started in July 2016 for the structured revenue streams
- The County Assembly did not adhere to the budget calendar: the budget for FY 2015/2016 was approved on 1 July 2016;
- Audit committee is not in place
- Quarterly reports for the 3 and 4th quarter were not submitted to the National Treasury within the stipulated timelines
- The County Assembly did not scrutinize the audited financial statements for the year 2014/2015
- There is no adequate secure storage space for procurement files in the case of the County Assembly
- The Executive did not maintain an updated assets register

- Sensitize the county staff on the need to maintain documents trail for all the submission and acknowledgement letters for various reports submitted to PPRA, CoB, National Treasury, County Treasury, Auditor General, CRA, County Assembly, CEC etc.

KRA 2: Planning and Monitoring & Evaluation

The following was observed:

- There is no designated focal planning and M&E officers in place. However, the Economic Planning department has planning officers who also serve the M&E functions.
- CIDP, ADP and Budgets are in place but were not published on the county website
- There were instances where the submission and acknowledgement of some budget output papers were not available
- 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
- Sectoral working group reports were deemed the annual progress reports

KRA 3: Human Resource

- There was an approved staffing plan is in place and no annual targets.
- Performance contracting are not cascaded down
- Competitive hiring in place set against competency frame work and skills levels provided in the Public Service Commission human resource Manual and those developed by Ernest & Young
- Skills, and competency frameworks match job descriptions as contained in the offers of appointment
- Rapid Results Initiatives are undertaken in ad hoc manner last done in 2014

KRA 4: Civic Educations and Participation

- There is no functional Civic education department in place but there is a an effective communication frameworks for effective engagement with the citizenry.
- There is no evidence of roll out of civic education activities
- Participatory planning and budget forums were held
- County core financial materials, budgets, plans, accounts, audit reports and performance assessments not published on the county website
- All the bills passed by the County Assembly were posted the website

KRA 5 Investments and Social Environment Performance

- A project completions register is in place at departmental level. However, it was not easy to measure the percentage of planned projects completed because the planned projects in the ADP are not disaggregated.
- There is no proper allocation of maintenance costs to completed projects.
- Annual environmental and social audits are not undertaken

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"> • Lacks Capacity in IFMIS Hyperion Module • The County Assembly did not adhere to the budget calendar: the budget for FY 2015/2016 was approved on 1 July 2016; • Audit Committee to be constituted urgently • Quarterly reports to be submitted to the National Treasury and CoB within the stipulated timelines • Inadequate procurement storage space for the county assembly • Lack of an updated assets register for the Executive • Lack of legislative scrutiny of external audit reports by the County Assembly
KRA 2	Planning &M&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to have a designated focal planning and M&E • Putting in place Monitoring and Evaluation Committee • The annual financing requirement for the ADP is not analogous to the respective budgetary allocations • Linkages between the CIDP, ADP and Budget not clearly identifiable • Monitoring and evaluation of completed projects
KRA 3	Human Resource Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No staffing plans and annual targets • Performance contracts not cascaded to the lower cadre staff

KRA 4	Civic Education and Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County core financial materials, budgets, plans, accounts, audit reports and performance assessments not published on the county website • Put in place a unit to specifically handle Civic Education and Public Participation • No planned programs for Civic Education • There is need to partner with NGOs to roll-out civic education activities
KRA 5	Investment implementation & social and environmental performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A project completions register is in place at departmental level. It was not easy to measure the percentage of planned projects completed because the planned projects in the ADP are not disaggregated. • There is no proper allocation of maintenance costs to completed projects. • Annual environmental and social audits are not undertaken

ANNEXTURE

ANNEX 1: MINUTES OF THE ENTRANCE MEETING HELD AT LAIKIPIA COUNTY

Date: 17th July 2017

Time: 10.25 AM to 11.15 AM

Venue: Laikipia County Headquarters, Nanyuki

In attendance

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 1) Joseph Ndegwa Mwangi | Planning Officer |
| 2) Gerald Mwangi Muturi | Head of Human Resources Management |
| 3) Joseph Mwangi Kamau | Ag. Director, Economic Planning |
| 4) Evelyn Mutave | Consultant, Matengo Githae & Associates |
| 5) Justin Miano | Consultant, Matengo Githae & Associates |
| 6) Daniel Ngumi | Head of Treasury Accounting |
| 7) Mwangi J. Wambui | Environment Officer |
| 8) JM Mathenge | Head of Public Participation (Focal person) |
| 9) JG Muritu | Accountant |
| 10) Ephantus Wangombe | Internal Auditor |
| 11) Elijah Kamunya | Revenue Officer |
| 12) Julius King'ori | Budget Officer |
| 13) Mary Mwangi | Ag. Head of Procurement |
| 14) Alex Nzau | Planning Officer |

Agenda

- 1) Introductions by County Officials
- 2) MGA Consultants' briefing
- 3) Documentary evidence
- 4) Duration of the exercise; and
- 5) Conclusion

Min 1: Introduction

Mr. Mathenge, the Head of Public Participation called the meeting to order at 10.25am and requested a round of introduction from the members in attendance.

Min 2: 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 3: 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 4: Duration of the exercise

The assessors pointed out that the exercise would last 3 days. An exit meeting was scheduled on third day after the assessment.

Min 5: Conclusion and adjournment

There being no other business, the meeting ended at 10.15am.

ANNEX 2: MINUTES OF THE EXITMEETING HELD AT LAIKIPIA COUNTY

Date: 19th July 2017

Time: 3.30 PM to 4.30 PM

Venue: Laikipia County Assembly boardroom, Nanyuki

In attendance

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 1) Charles Nderitu | County Secretary |
| 2) Joseph Ndegwa Mwangi | Planning Officer |
| 3) Gerald Mwangi Muturi | Head of Human Resources Management |
| 4) Joseph Mwangi Kamau | Ag. Director, Economic Planning |
| 5) Everlyn Mutave | Consultant, Matengo Githae & Associates |
| 6) Justin Miano | Consultant, Matengo Githae & Associates |
| 7) Ann Wambui | Senior Clerk Assistant |
| 8) Mwangi J. Wambui | Environment Officer |
| 9) JM Mathenge | Head of Public Participation (Focal person) |
| 10) JG Muritu | Accountant |
| 11) Leshorwai Sein | Human Resources Officer |
| 12) Julius King'ori | Budget Officer |
| 13) John Kihanda | Fiscal Analyst |
| 14) John Ngethe | Senior Planning Officer |
| 15) Mary Mwangi | Ag. Head of Procurement |
| 16) Alex Nzau | Planning Officer |
| 17) Edson Monda | Senior Environment Officer |
| 18) Caroline Kirichu | ICT/Research Coordinator |

Agenda

- 1) Key findings of the assessment and recommendations from consultants
- 2) Responses from County Government and Recommendations
- 3) Any disagreement and the final resolution

The meeting started at 3.30 pm with a prayer from one of the county officials.

Min 1: Key Findings of the Assessment

The Team leaders took the meeting through the general findings and areas of weaknesses as follows:

Minimum Access Conditions

The county met the minimum access conditions by signing the participation agreement and developing a CB Plan for 2016/2017 and 2017/2018.

Minimum Performance Conditions

There is no consolidated procurement plan for the Executive. Only departmental procurement plans are available.

Performance Measures

KRA 1: Public Financial Management

- County needs to adopt the IFMIS Hyperion method in coming up with their budget instead of doing it manually as is the case currently;
- County need to enhance documents trail with respect to submission and acknowledgement letters for reports and documents presented to the National Treasury, County Treasury, Controller of Budget, KENAO, PPRA, CRA, County Assembly, County Executive Committee etc;
- The County did not adhere to the budget process by following the budget calendar as is stipulated: The County assembly passed budget for the FY 2015/2016 on 1st July 2015;
- The credibility of the budget- budget was under absorbed by 20%;
- Although the county has an automated revenue collection mechanism which was in place from July 2016 the amounts collected through the system were at 27%. The structured revenue streams is yet to be automated and this needs to be fast tracked;
- Income & Expenditure statement and budgets execution reports not prepared monthly as is required;
- The external audit report for the FY2015/2016 was not been scrutinized by the County Assembly;
- There is no Audit Committee in place;
- The assets register maintained by the County Executive was not up to date;
- Procurement: use of the IFMIS system is not as expected since only 13 steps are complied with via the portal;
- There is need for the County Assembly's procurement department to look into having a secure storage location for all files in the department.

KRA 2: Planning and M&E

- There was no designated focal planning and M & E officers
- There was no monitoring and evaluation committee
- Linkage between CIDP, ADP and budget not clearly identifiable
- The annual financing requirement for the ADP is not analogous to the respective budgetary allocations

KRA 3: Human Resource Management

- No staffing plans and annual targets
- Performance contracts not cascaded to the lower cadre staff

KRA 4: Civic Education and Public Participation

- County core financial materials, budgets, plans, accounts, audit reports and performance assessments not published on the county website

KRA 5: Investment Implementation and Social and Environment Performance

- A project completions register is in place at departmental level. It was not easy to measure the percentage of planned projects completed because the planned projects in the ADP are not disaggregated.
- There is no proper allocation of maintenance costs to completed projects.
- Annual environmental and social audits are not undertaken

Min 2: Responses from County Government

The County officials responded to the various findings raised in the assessment as indicated below:

They noted that the IFMIS system has not been very stable and there needs done to improve the system. Suppliers do not understand the concept of IFMIS procurement process and internet connectivity posed a challenge in operating the system.

The County officials noted that there was need to improve on budget estimates to ensure that there was proper budget utilization.

There was no audit committee in place and the process of recruiting new audit committee members was on going.

The Economic Planning department has planning officers who also serve the M&E functions.

The original CIDP was bloated by incorporating national government projects. It is expected that the subsequent CIDP, ADP will take into account the linkages with the budget.

The county officials noted that the ADP disparity with the budget is being addressed. The ADP 2017/2018 financing is Kshs.7 billion, a reduction from the Kshs.12 billion that was the financing requirement for the previous year ADP (FY2016/2017)

The County noted that in most cases the projects are not completed in the expected timeframe due to various reasons stated below:

- Most financing of projects is availed towards the end of the second and third quarter.
- The procurement plan is availed towards the end of the first quarter hence meeting the projects deadline is nearly impossible by the second and third procurement quarter simultaneously.

Min 3: Any Other Business

The County team took the findings and the recommendations of the assessment process positively and promised to implement the suggestions for improvement.

There being no other business the meeting ended 4.30 PM.