

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

From

3rd July to 7th July 2017

Presented by

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.....	5
1.1 Methodology.....	5
1.2 Time Plan.....	6
2.0 SUMMARY OF RESULTS	7
2.1 Minimum Access Conditions (MAC)	7
2.2 Minimum Performance Conditions	10
2.3 Performance Conditions	21
3.0 SUMMARY OF CAPACITY BUILDING REQUIREMENTS	59
3.1: SUMMARY OF RESULTS.....	59
4.0 CHALLENGES IN THE ASSESSMENT.....	63
5.0 SPECIFIC AND GENERAL COMMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL ASPECTS OF THE ASSESSMENT	64
PROCESS.....	64
5.1 MAC's.....	64
5.2 MPC's Issues	64
5.3 PMs.....	64
6.0 NOTIFICATION OF DISAGREEMENT WITH THE OUTCOME OF THE ASSESSEMENT ALREADY NOTED DURING THE FILED-TRIP	66
7.0 OVERVIEW OF THE 5 WEAKEST PERFORMANCE	67
APPENDIX 1: ENTRY MEETING MINUTES	69
APPENDIX 2: EXIT MEETING MINUTES	71

ACRONYMS

ACPA	-	Annual Capacity and Performance Assessment
ADP	-	Annual Development Plans
CA	-	Chief Administrator
CB	-	Capacity Building
CEC	-	County Executive Committee
CEU	-	Civic Education Unit
CFAR	-	County Financial and Accounting Report
CGM	-	County Government of Mombasa
CIDP	-	County Integrated Development Plan
CO	-	Chief Officer
CPG	-	County Performance Grants
CPGH	-	Coast Provincial General Hospital
CPSB	-	County Public Service Board
CS	-	County Secretary
EA	-	Environmental Audits
EIA	-	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMCA	-	Environmental Management and Coordination Act
FS	-	Financial Secretary
FY	-	Financial Year
ICT	-	Information Communication Technology
IPPD	-	Integrated Payroll and Personnel Database
IPSAS	-	International Public-Sector Accounting Standards
KDSP	-	Kenya Devolution Support Programme
KRA	-	Key Result Area
M&E	-	Monitoring and Evaluation
MAC	-	Minimum Access Conditions
MCA	-	Member of County Assembly
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
PA	-	Personal Assistant
PFM	-	Public Finance Management (Act)
POM	-	Programme Operation Manual

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The consulting team from **Matengo Githae & Associates** thanks all Mombasa County Government and County Assembly Officials, senior management and staff who participated in Annual Capacity and Performance Assessment Mombasa County. 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 Francis Thoya- County Secretary for Chairing entry meeting held on Monday 3rd July 2017 at the County Secretary Offices. We would like to thank M/S Pamela Obuya – Director Cabinet Affairs and Inter-Governmental Relations for the excellent coordination of the whole assessment exercise.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

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

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

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

The consulting team undertook the assignment from 3rd to 5th July 2017.

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

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

ACPA Measures	Outcome
MAC	All have complied with MAC except for item 3 and 4- which has not been implemented
MPC	Have met 6 MPCs, 2 MPCs Audit Opinion and Adherence to Investment Menu are not applicable in this assessment and have not met 1 MPC on Citizen Complaint System

ACPA Measures	Outcome	Score
PM	KRA 1: Public Financial Management	16
	KRA 2: Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	8
	KRA 3 :Human Resource Management	6
	KRA 4: Civic Education and Participation	9
	KRA 5: Investment implementation & Social and environmental performance	7
	TOTAL	46

Achievements

The County has shown a progressive increase in own revenue source after automation.

Weaknesses

Key weakness noted was in Human Resource Management and Monitoring and Evaluation of county projects.

Challenges

- The ACPA was delayed due to late arrival of the introductory letter to the County Government which was received at the time of starting the assessment on 3rd July 2017.
- Lack of M & E Unit and substantive M & E focal person led to unascertainment of projects status for non-production of any record as evidence
- Resistance by the CEC's to allow the Junior officers to produce the required documents hindered our scoring.
- Traffic congestion in town could not allow the visit of the envisaged number of County Projects.
- Disconnection of the internet connectivity by the service provider hindered our desktop reviews.

Areas of Improvement

Establishment of Monitoring and Evaluation Unit at the Executive with key personnel will enable the County to have up to date progress reports across the County Departments. This should also be supported with budget provisions and allocations

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 Mombasa 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 Mombasa County team and shared their experience during the assessment. This was meant to reduce any potential conflict on the outcome of the results, by explaining the basis for outcome.

The debriefing meeting agenda comprised of the following:

- Preliminary key findings and outcomes of the assessments.
- Sharing of the draft findings and possible next course of action.
- The level of information availed and the expectation from the manual
- The final scoring of the results.

1.2 Time Plan

Table 2: Activity Work Plan

Activity	3 rd July 2017	4 th July 2017	5 th July 2017	6 th July 2017	7 th July 2017
Inception meeting					
Assessing the Minimum Access Conditions					
Assessing minimum Performance Measures					
Assessing Performance Measures					
Visit to County projects					
Exit meeting					
Preparing draft report					

2.0 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

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

2.1 Minimum Access Conditions (MAC)

Table 3: Summary of results for Minimum Access Conditions

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	Copy of signed participation agreement availed. Agreement signed by the Governor on 28 th June 2016.
2. CB plan developed	Is needed to guide use of funds and coordination. Shows the capacity of the county to be in driver's seat on CB.	CB plan developed according to the format provided in the Program Operational Manual/Grant Manual (annex). MoV: Review the CB	At the point of time for the ACPA for the current FY. First year a trigger to be	Met	The CB plan was signed as is required by County Secretary and NCBF FOCAL person

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
		plan, based on the self-assessment of the KDSP indicators: MACs, MPC and PMs, and compared with format in the POM /Grant Manual (annex).	achieved prior to the start of FY.		
3. Compliance with investment menu of the grant	Important to ensure quality of the CB support and targeting of the activities.	Compliance with investment menu (eligible expenditure) of the Capacity and Performance Grant) documented in progress reports. MoV: Review of grant and utilization – progress reports. Reporting for the use of CB grants for previous FYs in accordance with the Investment menu		N/A	C&P Grant not yet channeled to County Government
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		N/A	C&P Grant not yet channeled to County Government

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
		<p>planned CB activities by end of FY.</p> <p>MoV: Review financial statements and use of CB + narrative of activities (quarterly reports and per the Grant Manual).</p>			

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	Participation agreement signed on 28 th June 2016 by the Governor of Mombasa (attached copy)
Financial Management					
2. Financial statements submitted	To reduce fiduciary risks	Financial Statements with letter on documentation submitted to the Kenya National Audit Office by 30th September and National Treasury with required signatures (Internal auditor, heads of accounting unit etc.) as per the PFM Act Art.116 and Art. 164 (4). This can be either individual submissions from each department, or consolidated statement for the whole county. If individual	3 months after closure of the FY (30 th of September). Complied with if the county is submitting individual department statements: 3 months after end of FY for	Met	Financial Statements for the year ended 30 th June 2016 submitted by 30 th September 2016 and received by the Auditor General office- Mombasa Hub

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>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>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>3. Audit opinion does not carry an adverse opinion, or a disclaimer on any substantive issue</p>	<p>To reduce fiduciary risks</p>	<p>The opinion in the audit report of the financial statements for county legislature and executive of the previous fiscal year cannot be adverse or carry a disclaimer on any substantive issue.</p> <p>MoV: Audit reports from Office of the Auditor General.</p> <p>Transitional arrangements:</p> <p>Transitional arrangements are in place as audit report may</p>	<p>Note. This will be last trigger for release as report is not yet there upon time for the ACPA.</p> <p>Transitional arrangements:</p> <p>First ACPA where MPCs are applied i.e. in the 2016 ACPA: Issues are</p>	<p>MET</p>	<p>The County Executive was issued with a Disclaimer of Audit Opinion.</p> <p>This was on the basis of among others; variances between Financial statements & IFMIS, Unsupported adjustments, Unsupported bank balances and long outstanding imprest</p> <p>The County Assembly was also issued with a Disclaimer of Audit Opinion.</p>

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		<p>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 CoB; • Books of accounts (cashbooks) posted with bank reconciliations up-to- 	<p>defined for the core issues, which disqualify counties as per audit reports, see previous column.</p>		<p>This was on the basis of insufficient and inappropriate audit evidence. This include; inaccuracies in the Financial statements such as unreconciled variances, pending bills, transfers from county treasury or exchequer</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>date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assets register for new assets in place 			
Planning					
4. Annual planning documents in place	To demonstrate a minimum level of capacity to plan and manage funds	<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 website.</p>	At the point of time of the ACPA, which will take place in Sep-Nov, the plans for current year are reviewed.	MET	<p>CIDP, Annual Development Plan and budget approved and published on the County Website. CIDP, ADP and Finance Bill on County website</p> <p>(https://www.mombasa.go.ke/documents/).</p>
Use of funds in accordance with Investment menu					
5. Adherence with the investment menu	To ensure compliance with the environmental and social safeguards	<p>Adherence with the investment menu (eligible expenditures) as defined in the PG Grant Manual.</p> <p>MoV: Review financial statements against the grant</p>	In 2016 ACPA (Q3 2016) this MPC will not be measured as the level 2 grant starts only from	Not Applicable	The grants have not yet been released. However, the County does investment in projects from the Development fund based on CIDP and the ADP

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
	and ensure efficiency in spending.	<p>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>	FY 2017/18.		
Procurement					
6. Consolidated Procurement plans in place.	To ensure procurement planning is properly coordinated from the central procurement unit instead at departmental , and to	<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</p>	At point of the ACPA (for current year)	Met	The CGM develops consolidated procurement plans with updated 2015/2016 and 2016/2017

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
	ensure sufficient capacity to handle discretionary funds.	<p>adherence with procurement procedures.</p> <p>The procurement plan(s) will have to be up-dated if/and when there are budget revisions, which require changes in the procurement process.</p> <p>Note that there is need to check both the consolidated procurement plan for 1) the assembly and 2) the executive, and whether it is revised when budget revisions are made.</p>			
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, 	At the point of time for the ACPA.	MET	<p>All the designated staff are there and captured in respective departmental organograms. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The country secretary • Chief officer of finance, • Planning officer, • Internal auditor, • Procurement officer • Accountant

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement officer • Accountant • Focal Environmental and Social Officer designated to oversee environmental and social safeguards for all sub projects • M&E officer <p><u>MoV</u>: Staff organogram, schemes of service to review the qualifications against requirements (hence the staff needs to be substantive compared to the schemes of service), sample check salary payments, job descriptions, interview and sample checks. Staff acting in positions may also fulfill the conditions if they comply with the qualifications required in the schemes of service.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal Environmental Officer. <p>However, the CGM does not have a substantive M & E Officer. Each department has an appointed person to undertake M&E functions through support of development partners including USAID.</p> <p>The county has three categories of staff; Employees inherited from local authorities, employees seconded from the national government and first-time employee by the County All departments have developed respective organograms which show approved staff establishment.</p>
Environmental and Social Safeguards					
8. Functional and Operational Environmental and	To ensure that there is a mechanism	1. Counties endorse and ratify the environmental and social management system to guide	Note that the first installment of the expanded	Met	Environmental Impact Assessments – EIA,

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>Social Safeguards Systems (i.e. screening/vetting, clearance/ approval, enforcement & compliance monitoring, grievance redress mechanisms, documentation & reporting) in place.</p>	<p>and capacity to screen environmental and social risks of the planning process prior to implementation, and to monitor safeguard during implementation.</p> <p>To avoid significant adverse environmental and social impacts</p> <p>To promote environmental and social</p>	<p>investments (from the ACPA starting September 2016).</p> <p>2) All proposed investments screened* against set of environmental and social criteria/checklist, safeguards instruments prepared. (sample 5-10 projects). (From the second AC&PA, Sept. 2016).</p> <p>3) Prepare relevant RAP for all investments with any displacement. Project Reports for investments for submission to NEMA. (From the 3rd AC&PA, Sept. 2017). Sample 5-10 projects.</p> <p>4. Establishment of County Environment Committee.</p> <p><u>MoV</u>: Review endorsements 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</p>	<p>CPG investment menu covering sectoral investments starts from July 2017 (FY 2017/18). Hence some of the conditions will be reviewed in the ACPA prior to this release to ascertain that capacity is in place at county level, and other MPCs will review performance in the year after start on the utilization of the expanded grant menu (i.e. in the 3rd AC&PA, see the previous column for details).</p>		<p>undertaken for both county and private sponsored projects and EIA reports provided as evidence. Some of the projects that have undergone EIA include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improving the existing Storm Water Outlets, Outfall and Combined Sewer Overflows in Mombasa Island Works carried out under Contract No.: C WS B /WaSSIP-A F/C/37/ 2016 2. The Proposed 224 apartments on plot L.R. NO. MN/II/69 in Mishomoroni Area, Mombasa County 2. Kipevu Waste Water Treatment Plant Immediate Works And Extension

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>benefits and ensure sustainability</p> <p>To provide opportunity for public participation and consultation in safeguards process (free, prior and informed consultations – FPIC)</p>	<p>by various departments, but there is a need to provide an overview and evidence that all projects are screened.</p> <p>* In cases where the county has clear agreement with NEMA that it does the screening and that all projects are screened, this condition is also seen to be fulfilled.</p>			

MPCs for Capacity & Performance Grants (level 2)	Reason and Explanation	Detailed indicator and Means of Verification	Timing	Assessment Met/ Not Met	Detailed Assessment Findings
9. Citizens' Complaint system in place	To ensure sufficient level of governance and reduce risks for mismanagement.	<p>Established an operational Complaints Handling System, including a:</p> <p>(a) complaints/grievance committee to handle complaints pertaining to fiduciary, environmental and social systems.</p> <p>b) A designated a Focal Point Officer to receive, sort, forward, monitor complaints</p> <p>c) simple complaints form/template designed and available to the public</p> <p>d) Multiple channels for receiving complaints e.g. email, telephone, anti-corruption boxes, websites etc.)</p> <p>e) Up to date and serialized record of complaints coordinate implementation of the Framework and a grievance committee is in place.</p>	At point of time for the ACPA.	Not Met	<p>a) There is no established complain handling system in place.</p> <p>b) No designated focal person to receive, sort, forward and monitor citizens' complaints</p> <p>c) No grievances committee in place but whenever a complaint is lounged, an adhoc team is formed to attend into the matter. This was confirmed by availed letter</p> <p>d) There is a complaints handling desk at the main entrance where they also maintain the complains register.</p> <p>e) Multiple channels for receiving complaints that includes; register, email, social media and telephone.</p> <p>f) There is an up-to-date and serialized record of complaints</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><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>			

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
<p>KRA 1: Public Financial Management</p> <p>Max score: Maximum 30 points.</p>							
<p><i>Strengthened budget formulation, resource mobilization and allocation</i></p>							
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 up-loads, 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 –</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>	1	Budget is program based. Its prepared on excel and later uploaded on IFMIS System

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
				spot check figures between different versions).			
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 assembly 7 days after the CEC has approved it but no later than 15th October.</p> <p>c) County fiscal strategy paper (FSP) – submission</p>	<p>PFM Act, art 128, 129, 131.</p> <p>Review budget calendar, minutes from meetings (also from assembly resolutions) circular submission letters, county outlook paper, minutes from meetings and Financial Statements.</p>	<p>Max. 3 points</p> <p>If all 5 milestones (a-e) achieved: 3 points</p> <p>If 3-4 items: 2 points</p> <p>If 2 items: 1 point</p> <p>If 1 or 0 items: 0 points.</p>	3	<p>The budget preparation follows the full process from inception to publishing on the county website: CEC finance submits</p> <p>a) circular setting out deadlines to be followed by all county government departments in the budget process.</p> <p>b) The CGM prepares CBROP Estimates and submitted to County assembly. The 2016/2017 CBROP was submitted to County Assembly on 29th September 2016.</p> <p>c) Submit to the County Assembly</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 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 30th June latest.</p>				budget summary and other budget estimates. d) County Fiscal Strategy Paper 207/2018 Prepared and submitted to the County Assembly on 24 th November 2016.
1.3		Credibility of budget	<p>a) Aggregate expenditure out-turn compared to original approved budget.</p> <p>b) Expenditure composition for each sector matches budget allocations (average</p>	Review the original budget and the annual financial statements, budget progress reports, audit reports, etc. Use figures from	Max. 4 points. <u>Ad a):</u> If expenditure deviation between total budgeted	2	Actual Expenditure for 2015/16 was Kshs. 8,513,407, 616 versus overall original budget of Kshs. 9,978,786,273 which was 85%. Positive variance of

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			across sectors).	IFMIS (general ledger report at department (sub-vote) level).	<p>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>15%</p> <p>Average deviation of expenditure across sectors in the year 2015/16 was 31.67% as shown below;</p> <p>County Executive 32.64%, County Assembly 28.40%, Public Service Board 53.06%, Finance and Economic Planning-38.02%, Tourism, Development and Culture 53.09%, Children (Care, Education, Environment) 32.94%, Health Services 16.74%, Water & Natural Resources 36.08%, Youth, Gender 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
							Sports74.13%, Trade, Energy and Industry53.94%, Lands, Planning & Housing- 1.70%, Transport and Infrastructure 5.16%, Agriculture, Livestock & Fisheries 65.28%
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	Automated revenue collection system started from July 2015 The collections through the automated system from July 2015 to June 2016 amount to KShs. 266,215,331 out of total own resources of KShs. 2,943,520,686 which is 9.0%
1.5		Increase on a yearly basis in	% increase in OSR from last fiscal year but one (year before previous FY)	Compare annual Financial Statement from two years.	Max. 1 point.	1	Own sources for the fiscal year 2014/2015 was KShs.

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
		own source revenues (OSR).	to previous FY	(Use of nominal figures including inflation etc.).	If increase is more than 10 %: 1 point.		2,492,600,145 compared to financial year 2015/2016 of KShs. 2,943,520,686 an increase of 18%
<i>Enhanced capacity of counties on execution (including procurement), accounting and reporting</i>							
1.6	Reporting and accounting in accordance with PSASB guidelines	Timeliness of in-year budget reports (quarterly to Controller of Budget).	a) Quarterly reports submitted no later than one month after the quarter (consolidated progress and expenditure reports) as per format in CFAR, submitted to the county assembly with copies to the controller of budget, National Treasury and CRA. b) Summary revenue, expenditure and progress report is published in the local media/web-page.	Review quarterly reports, date and receipts (from CoB). Check against the PFM Act, Art. 166. CFAR, Section 8. Review website and copies of local media for evidence of publication of summary revenue and expenditure outturns.	Max. 2 points. (a &b) Submitted on time and published: 2 points. (a only): Submitted on time only: 1 point.	2	Quarterly reports submitted to Treasury, Controller of Budget and the Commission on Revenue Allocation as scheduled and as per the PFM Act, Art. 166. Most recent being the 3 rd Quarter 2016/2017 report submitted to on 5 th May 2017.
1.7		Quality of financial	Formats in PFMA and CFAR, and standard	Review annual financial statements,	Max. 1 point.	1	Financial statements for the year 2015/16 were

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
		statements.	templates issued by the IPSAS board are applied and the FS include cores issues such as trial balance, bank reconciliations linked with closing balances, budget execution report, schedule of outstanding payments, appendix with fixed assets register.	<p>bank conciliations and related documents and appendixes to the FS, date and receipts (from CoB and NT).</p> <p>Check against the PFM Act, Art. 166 and the IPSAS format.</p> <p>CFAR, Section 8.</p> <p>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>	Quality as defined by APA team or NT assessment (excellent/satisfactory): 1 point		<p>prepared according to PFMA and IPSAS. They include; Income and Expenditure Statement, Statement of Financial position, Statement of Cash flows and notes to the Accounts.</p> <p>The CGM is currently preparing the financial statements for the year ended 30th June 2017.</p> <p>Bank Reconciliations up to date with the 4th (last) Quarter (30th June 2017) reconciliations on-going</p> <p>All reports prepared as provided for by PFM Act, Art. 166 and the IPSAS format.</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
1.8		Monthly reporting and up-date of accounts, including:	<p>The monthly reporting shall include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Income and expenditure statements; 2. Budget execution report, 3. Financial statement including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Details of income and revenue b. Summary of expenditures c. Schedule of imprest and advances; d. Schedule of debtors and creditors; e. Bank reconciliations and post in general ledger. 	<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	Monthly Management accounts and other reports prepared and submitted to the executive as required and prepared according to PFMA and IPSAS.
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.</p> <p>PFM Act. Art 149.</p>	<p>Max. 1 point.</p> <p>Registers are up-to-date:</p> <p>1 point.</p>	0	The CGM does not have an updated Asset Register.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
				Check up-dates.	<p>Transitional arrangements: <u>First year:</u> Assets register need only to contain assets acquired by county governments since their establishment.</p> <p><u>Second year onwards:</u> register must include all assets, including those inherited from Local Authorities and National Ministries</p>		
	<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	<p>Review audit reports.</p> <p>Check against the PFM Act Art 155</p>	<p>Max. 1 point.</p> <p>4 quarterly audit reports submitted in previous FY: 1</p>	1	There is internal audit function with 3 staff and headed by a Director. We sampled Audit reports for

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
			submitted to Governor)		point.		Mombasa water company. Also, a memo dated 31 st March 2017 (MCG/AUD/REP/1/19) on submission of Internal Audit report to CEC Finance for onward forwarding to the Governor for department of Water.
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	Max. 1 point. IA/Audit Committee established and reports reviewed by Committee and evidence of follow-up: 1 point.	0	The County Internal Audit Committee is yet to be constituted. An advertisement was done on Thursday 9 th June 2016 (Standard Newspaper) to fill up the positions. The County Public Service Board has shortlisted individuals to be appointed to the committee.

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
				from last FY, e.g. control systems in place, etc. (evidence from follow-up meetings in the Committee). PFM Act Art 155.			
1.12	External audit	Value of audit queries	The value of audit queries as a % of total expenditure	Review audit report from KENAO. Total expenditure as per reports to CoB.	Max. 2 points Value of queries <1% of total expenditures: 2 points <5% of total expenditure: 1 point	0	The value of audit queries as a % of total expenditure for the year 2016 was 133.6% This is based on; variances between Financial statements & IFMIS 6,934,700,068, Unsupported Balances 1,200,000,937, Bank balances 368,211,091, Outstanding Imprest 188,398,683, Imprest 135,250,923, Exchequer Releases 5,600,804,835, Compensation of

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
							<p>Employees 1,357,194,489, Mbsa Int'l Cultural festival 23,154,298, Transfers to other Govt Units 474,324,675, Acquisition of Assets- Vehicles & Equipments 60,246,174, Construction of Roads 99,535,675, Use of Quotation Mtd 28,070,850, Garbage Collection 82,208,599 and Pending Bills 1,411,188,865</p> <p>Total Queries 11,375,444,806</p> <p>Total Payments 8,513,407,595</p>
1.13		Reduction of audit	The county has reduced the value of the audit queries	Review audit reports from	Max. 1 point.		There is no reduction of audit Queries from

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
		queries	(fiscal size of the area of which the query is raised).	KENAO from the last two audits.	Audit queries (in terms of value) have reduced from last year but one to last year or if there are no audit queries: 1 point.		<p>the Year 2015 to 2016. Both audit reports had a Disclaimer of audit opinion.</p> <p>Queries Reviewed for the Year 2015 values 5,927,817,298</p> <p>Payments for the Year 7,018,813,788</p> <p>Value of Queries as a % is 84.45%</p> <p>There's increase in value of audit queries reviewed by 49.15%</p>
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	0	The County Assembly of Mombasa does not undertake scrutiny of audit reports. However, the Department of Finance through its Chief

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
					point.		Officer responds to audit queries from the Auditor General. Response to Audit queries for 2015/2016 by CO done on 13 th February 2017 to AG.
<i>Procurement</i>							
1.15	Improved procurement procedures	Improved procurement procedures including use of IFMIs, record keeping, adherence to procurement thresholds and tender evaluation.	Note: When PPRA develop a standard assessment tool, APA will switch to using the score from the PPRA assessment as the PM (PFR may incentivize PPRA to do this in DLI 1 or 3). a) 25 steps in the IFMIS procurement process adhered with. b) County has submitted required procurement reports to PPRA on time. c) Adherence with procurement thresholds	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 annual reports plus all reports for procurements above prescribed	4	Less than 15 steps in IFMIS procurement are done through the portal because the IFMIS E-procurement portal does not work effectively. IFMIS procurement procedures are followed off the system and PPRA guidelines are as well followed. PPRA reports submitted as required bi-annually. PPRA report for the period January to June 2016 submitted online

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 procurement methods for type/size of procurement in a sample of procurements.</p> <p>d) Secure storage space with adequate filing space designated and utilized – for a sample of 10 procurements, single files containing all relevant documentation in one place are stored in this secure storage space (1 point)</p> <p>e) Completed evaluation reports, including individual evaluator scoring against pre-defined documented evaluation criteria and signed by each member of the evaluation team, available for a sample of 5 large procurements (2 points)</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>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:</p>		<p>(email) and submission record seen.</p> <p>Sampled procurement records adhered to the thresholds.</p> <p>Open tender is used for procurements over Kshs. 4 million, Quotations are used for procurements between Kshs. 100,000 and Kshs. 3.8 million and direct procurement for low value procurements for less than Kshs. 100,000. Storage is Decentralized per Department; each department is responsible for all Departmental requisitions.</p> <p>Every procurement undergoes an evaluation by a committee appointed</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
					1 point		by the Chief Officer Finance.
Key Result Area 2: Planning and M&E Max score: (tentative 20 points)							
2.1	County M&E system and frameworks developed	County M&E/Planning unit, and frameworks in place.	a) Planning and M&E units (may be integrated in one) established. b) There are designated planning and M&E officer and each line ministry has a focal point for planning and one for M&E c) Budget is dedicated for both planning and M&E.	Review staffing structure and organogram. Clearly identifiable budget for planning and M&E functions in the budget.	Maximum 3 points The scoring is one point per measure Nos. a-c complied with.	1	Results Management office under the Governor's office works with the Efficiency Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator who does data management The CGM has not developed M & E Framework. Each Department has a staff designated to serve as a M & E Officer All the Departmental M & E Designated staff forms the Technical working group which is supported by Development Partners-

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>USAID.</p> <p>However, there is no overall substantive M & E Officer in the Executive.</p> <p>CGM has no specific budget allocation for Monitoring and Evaluation.</p>
2.2		County M&E Committee in place and functioning	County M&E Committee meets at least quarterly and reviews the quarterly performance reports. (I.e. it is not sufficient to have hoc meetings).	Review minutes of the quarterly meeting in the County M&E Committee.	<p>Maximum: 1 point</p> <p>Compliance: 1 point.</p>	0	Despite the existence of Technical working group, CGM has not set up a formal County Monitoring & Evaluation Committee
2.3	County Planning systems and functions established	CIDP formulated and updated according to guidelines	<p>a) CIDP: adheres to guideline structure of CIDP guidelines,</p> <p>b) CIDP has clear objectives, priorities and outcomes, reporting mechanism, result matrix,</p>	<p>CIDP submitted in required format (as contained in the CIDP guidelines published by MoDP).</p> <p>See County Act,</p>	<p>Maximum: 3 points</p> <p>1 point for compliance with each of the issues: a, b and c.</p>	2	<p>The CIDP adheres to its guidelines as provide for by MODP</p> <p>CIDP includes individual objectives, priorities, strategies, outcomes and an implementation matrix.</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 performance indicators included; and c) Annual financing requirement for full implementation of CIDP does not exceed 200% of the previous FY total county revenue.	Art. 108, Art 113 and Art. 149. CIDP guidelines, 2013, chapter 7.			Annual financing for Fiscal year 2015/2016 was Kes 8,701,342,396 against the revenue of the year 2014/2016 of Kes 7,241,290,264. This is 120% which does not exceed the requirement for full implementation of CIDP by 200%.
2.4		ADP submitted on time and conforms to guidelines	a) Annual development plan submitted to Assembly by September 1st in accordance with required format & contents (Law says that once submitted, if they are silent on it then it is assumed to be passed). b) ADP contains issues mentioned in the PFM Act 126,1, <u>number A-H</u>	Review version of ADP approved by County Assembly for structure, and approval procedures and timing, against the PFM Act, Art 126, 1.	Maximum: 4 points Compliance a): 1 point. b) All issues from A-H in PFM Act Art 126,1: 3 points 5-7 issues: 2 points 3-4 issues: 1 point, see Annex.	3	ADPs for the 2015/2016 and 2016/17 compliant with PFM Act Art 126 are uploaded on the County website. However, letter of submission to the Assembly on time was not obtained
2.5		Linkage between	Linkages between the ADP and CIDP and the budget	Review the three documents: CIDP,	Maximum: 2	2	The budget is consistent with the CIDP and ADP

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
		CIDP, ADP and Budget	in terms of costing and activities. (costing of ADP is within +/- 10 % of final budget allocation)	ADP and the budget. The budget should be consistent with the CIDP and ADP priorities. The costing of the ADP is within +/- 10% of final budget allocation. Sample 10 projects and check that they are consistent between the two documents.	points Linkages and within the ceiling: 2 points.		priorities. Improvement of classified County roads to open up peri-urban feeder roads accessibility was envisaged in the CIDP and which we confirmed tarmacking of Vikwatani-Turkey Bay Road.
2.6	Monitoring and Evaluation systems in place and used, with feedback to plans	Production of County Annual Progress Report	a) County C-APR produced; b) Produced timely by September 1 and c) C-APR includes clear performance progress against CIDP indicator targets and within result matrix for results and	Check contents of C-APR and ensure that it clearly links with the CIDP indicators. Verify that the indicators have been sent to the CoG.	Maximum: 5 points. a) C-APR produced = 2 points b) C-APR produced by end of September. 1 point.	0	County Annual Progress Report in the prescribed format was not available. Consultants were not provided with County Progress Report showing the progress done from 2013-2017

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>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>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>		
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).	<p>Maximum: 1 point.</p> <p>Evaluation done: 1 point.</p>	0	No report was availed to the consultants to confirm that this is conducted on a continuous basis which entails all projects in the county under

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
							various departments
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.	0	Although the published ADP on the Website for the year 2016/2017 indicates that strategic priorities and plans for the County Government are in line with the CIDP and the budget, this could not be ascertained in absence of C-APR
Key Result Area 3: Human Resource Management Max score: 12 points.							
3.1	Staffing plans based on functional and organizational assessments	Organizational structures and staffing plans	a) Does the county have an approved staffing plan in place, with annual targets? b) Is there clear evidence that the staffing plan was informed by a Capacity Building assessment / functional and organizational assessment and approved	Staffing plan Capacity Building Assessment / CARPS report Documentation evidencing hiring, training, promotion,	Maximum 3 points: First AC&PA: a = 2 points, b = 1 point c = NA. Future AC&PAs:	1	The CGM does not have an approved staffing plan in place and no annual targets. Available Departmental staff plans were informed by the department staff needs.

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
			organizational structure. c) Have the annual targets in the staffing plan been met?	rationalization, etc. In future years (after first AC&PA), there has to be evidence that CB/skills assessments are conducted annually to get points on (b). Targets within (+/- 10 % variations).	a=1 point, b = 1 point, c = 1 point		
3.2	Job descriptions, including skills and competence requirements	Job descriptions, specifications and competency framework	a) Job descriptions in place and qualifications met (AC&PA 1: Chief officers / heads of departments; 2nd AC&PA: all heads of units; future AC&PAs: all staff (sample check)) b) Skills and competency frameworks and Job descriptions adhere to these (AC&PA 1: Chief officers / heads of departments; 2nd AC&PA:	Job descriptions Skills and competency frameworks. Appointment, recruitment and promotion records	Maximum score: 4 points All a, b and c: 4 points. Two of a-c: 2 points One of a-c: 1 point	3	General Job Descriptions from SRC adopted. Job descriptions for all cadre of staff sampled across the all departments CGM has not developed a skills and competency frameworks Due process of accurate

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>all heads of units; future AC&PAs: all staff (sample check)</p> <p>c) Accurate recruitment, appointment and promotion records available</p>				staff recruitment, appointment and promotion process is followed and records were available.
3.3	Staff appraisal and performance management operationalized in counties	Staff appraisals and performance management	<p>a) Staff appraisal and performance management process developed and operationalized.</p> <p>b) Performance contracts developed and operationalized</p> <p>c) service re-engineering undertaken</p> <p>d) RRI undertaken</p>	<p>Review staff appraisals.</p> <p>County Act, Art 47 (1).</p> <p>Country Public Service Board Records.</p> <p>Staff assessment reports.</p> <p>Re-engineering reports covering at least one service</p>	<p>Maximum score: 5 points.¹</p> <p>a) Staff appraisal for all staff in place: 1 point. (If staff appraisal for</p> <p>b) Performance Contracts in place for CEC Members and Chief Officers: 1 point</p> <p>Performance Contracts in</p>	2	<p>Staff performance Management system is in place but is yet to be implemented cascaded to all cadres of staff.</p> <p>Performance contracts in place for only the COs and CECs.</p> <p>Performance contracts place for other staff not done.</p> <p>CGM has not done re-engineering of service</p>

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
				RRI Reports for at least one 100-day period	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		delivery processes. RRIs not yet launched by CGM.
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	County Act, Art 99-100.	Maximum 3 points. CEU fully established with all milestones (a)- (e) complied with: 3 points.	2	CEU established and is headed by the County Civic Education Service Manager. The County is yet to establish the Civic Education Committee. No specific budget for

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) Budget, (d) Programs planned, including curriculum, activities etc. and (e) Tools and methods for CE outlined.		2-4 out of the five milestones (a-e): 2 points Only one: 1 point.		public participation. However, there is a budget under the department of devolved units which is utilized by the sub-county administrators in collaboration with ward administration. The CGM is yet to develop Tools and methods for Civic Education.
4.2		Counties roll out civic education activities	Evidence of roll-out of civic education activities – (minimum 5 activities).	County Act, art. 100. Examples are engagements with NGOs to enhance CE activities/joint initiatives on training of citizens etc. Needs to be clearly described and documented in report(s) as a condition for availing points on	Maximum 2 points. Roll out of minimum 5 civic education activities: 2 points.	0	Except the involvement of citizens in the development of CIDP and Budget preparation process, CGM has not undertaken other civic education activities in the county.

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
				this.			
4.3	Counties set up institutional structures systems & process for Public Participation	Communication framework and engagement.	<p>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.)</p> <p>b) Counties have designated officer in place, and officer is operational.</p>	<p>County Act, Art. 96.</p> <p>Review approved (final) policy / procedure documents describing access to information system and communication framework</p> <p>and review evidence of public notices and sharing of documents.</p> <p>Review job descriptions, pay-sheets and / or other relevant records to ascertain whether designated officer is in place; review documents</p>	<p>Maximum 2 points.</p> <p>a) Compliance: 1 point.</p> <p>b) Compliance: 1 point.</p>	0	CGM has not developed a Communication Framework for Public is participation.

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
				evidencing activities of the designated officer (e.g. reports written, minutes of meetings attended etc.)			
4.4		Participatory planning and budget forums held	<p>a) Participatory planning and budget forums held in previous FY before the plans were completed for on-going FY.</p> <p>b) Mandatory citizen engagement /consultations held beyond the budget forum, (i.e. additional consultations)</p> <p>c) Representation: meets requirements of PFMA (section 137) and stakeholder mapping in public participation guidelines issued by MoDP.</p> <p>d) Evidence that forums are</p>	<p>PFM Act, Art. 137.</p> <p>County Act, 91, 106 (4), Art. 115.</p> <p>Invitations</p> <p>Minutes from meetings in the forums.</p> <p>List of attendances,</p> <p>Meetings at ward levels,</p> <p>Link between minutes and actual plans.</p> <p>List of suggestions</p>	<p>Maximum 3 points.</p> <p>All issues met (a-f): 3 points.</p> <p>4-5 met: 2 points.</p> <p>1-3 met: 1 point.</p>	1	<p>No evidence to prove that participatory planning meetings were held for the budget for the fiscal year 2017/18</p> <p>No record of further engagements beyond the budget forums. Invitations available, minutes from the meetings of the forums available, list of attendance available, meetings at ward level available. Minutes seen for February 14th, 2015, April 15th 2016,</p>

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			<p>structured (not just unstructured discussions)</p> <p>e) Evidence of input from the citizens to the plans, e.g. through minutes or other documentation</p> <p>f) Feed-back to citizens on how proposals have been handled.</p>	<p>from citizens, e.g. use of templates for this and reporting back.</p> <p>Feedback reports / minutes of meetings where feedback provided to citizens</p>			<p>December 13th 2016 and 17th January 2017.</p> <p>List of suggestions from citizens available</p> <p>The representation meets the requirements of PFMA. Details of full membership to the County Budget Economic Forum availed</p> <p>Feedback reports/ minutes of meetings where feedback is provided to citizens availed</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	Maximum points: 1 Compliance: 1 point.	0	<p>There is no evidence of Citizens feedback input from public participation forums.</p> <p>This is because the County Government</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
				been noted and adhered with and whether there is feed-back mechanism in place.			does not develop consolidated C-APR.
4.6		County core financial materials, budgets, plans, accounts, audit reports and performance assessments published and shared	Publication (on county web-page, in addition to any other publication) of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) County Budget Review and Outlook Paper ii) Fiscal Strategy Paper iii) Financial statements or annual budget execution report iv) Audit reports of financial statements v) Quarterly budget progress reports or other report documenting project implementation and budget execution during each quarter vi) Annual progress reports (C-APR) with core county indicators 	PFM Act Art 131. County Act, Art. 91. Review county web-page. (N.B.) Publication of Budgets, County Integrated Development Plan and Annual Development Plan is covered in Minimum Performance Conditions)	Maximum points: 5 points 9 issues: 5 points 7-8 issues: 4 points 5-6 issues: 3 points 3-4 issues: 2 points 1-2 issues: 1 point 0 issues: 0 point.	4	Publications online include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Budget Review and Outlook Paper 2016/2017 • Fiscal Strategy Paper 2015-2016 • Approved budget 2016-2017 • ADP 2014-2015, 2015-2016, 2016-2017 • CIDP 2013-2017 The following publications were not available on-line: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audit reports of financial statements;

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
			<p>vii) Procurement plans and rewards of contracts</p> <p>viii) Annual Capacity & Performance Assessment results</p> <p>ix) County citizens' budget</p>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual progress reports (C-APR) with core county indicators • Procurement plans and award of contracts • Annual Capacity & Performance 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.	<p>County Act, Art. 23.</p> <p>Review gazette bills and Acts, etc.</p> <p>Review county web-site.</p>	<p>Maximum 2 points</p> <p>Compliance: 2 points.</p>	2	Thirty-Six (36) Bills were published on the County website. Out of which 27 were passed.
<p>Result Area 5. Investment implementation & social and environmental performance Max score: 20 points.</p>							
5.1	Output against	Physical targets as	The % of planned projects (in the ADP) implemented	Sample min 10 larger projects from	Maximum 4 points (6 points)	4	There is no projects completion register.

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
	plan – measures of levels of implementation	included in the annual development plan implemented	<p>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 projects is factored in. If there are more than 10 projects a sample of 10 larger projects is made, and weighted according to the size.</i></p>	<p>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>Use all available documents in assessment, including: CoB reports, procurement progress reports, quarterly reports on projects, M&E</p>	<p>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> <p>65-74%: 1 point</p> <p>Less than 65 %: 0 point.</p> <p>If no information is available on completion of projects: 0 point will be awarded.</p> <p>An extra point</p>		<p>Major projects went across the different sectors in the County</p> <p>Of the visited County projects though not funded by the project grants, they were complete and in operation or in use.</p> <p>These include painting & Refurbishment of the Provincial General Hospital, Renovations of the wards, Hospital Kitchen Boiler, Installation of Dialysis Centre and equipment, Hospital Incinerator, Vikwatani Turkey Bay Road, ECD Centre</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
				reports etc.	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).		Kadzandani
5.2	Projects implemented according to cost estimates	Implementation of projects and in accordance with the cost estimates	Percentage (%) of projects implemented within budget estimates (i.e. +/- 10 % of estimates).	Sample of projects: a sample of 10 larger projects of various size from a minimum of 3 departments/ sectors. Review budget, procurement plans,	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	0	We visited the projects within reach which were under County Development fund and privately sponsored by Development partners They were complete. ECD Centre was awaiting the hand over.

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>contract, plans and costing against actual funding. If there is no information available, no points will be provided. If the information is available in the budget this is used. (In case there are conflicts between figures, the original budgeted project figure will be applied).</p> <p>Review completion reports, quarterly reports, payment records, quarterly progress reports, etc.</p> <p>Review M&E reports.</p>	<p>points (5 points in the first two AC&PAs)</p> <p>80-90%: 3 points</p> <p>70-79%: 2 points</p> <p>60-69%: 1 point</p> <p>Below 60%: 0 points.</p>		<p>The hospital projects were also complete and in use</p> <p>Could not obtain completed projects register at the executive and projects implementation progress report to ascertain the percentage of completion within 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
				Compare actual costs of completed project with original budgeted costs in the ADP/budget.			
5.3	Maintenance	Maintenance budget to ensure sustainability	Maintenance cost in the last FY (actuals) was minimum 5 % of the total capital budget and evidence in selected larger projects (projects which have been completed 2-3 years ago) have been sustained with actual maintenance budget allocations (sample of min. 5 larger projects).	<p>Review budget and quarterly budget execution reports as well as financial statements.</p> <p>Randomly sample 5 larger projects, which have been completed 2-3 years ago.</p> <p>Review if maintenance is above 5 % of the capital budget and evidence that budget allocations have been made for projects completed</p>	<p>Maximum 3 points (4 points in the first two AC&PAs).</p> <p>Maintenance budget is more than 5 % of capital budget and sample projects catered for in terms of maintenance allocations for 2-3 years after: 3 points (4 in the first two AC&PA).</p> <p>More than 5 %</p>	0	Matching of the maintenance expenditure from the budget of the fiscal year 2016/17 could not be established. This is categorized under use of goods and services

No.	Priority Outputs	Performance Area	Performance Measure (Detailed Indicators)	Means of Verification and Issues to Check	Scoring /level of importance	Result (Score)	Detailed Assessment Findings
				2-3 years ago and evidence that funds have actually been provided for maintenance of these investments.	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 sample done in accordance with framework for all projects: 2 points (3 points in the first two AC&PAs)	2	All county projects undergo screening by the NEMA Committee

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
					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 which ESIA's /ESMPs have been prepared and approved safeguards provisions from	Sample 5-10 projects	All 100 % of sample done in accordance with framework for all projects: 2 points 80-99 % of projects: 1 points	1	Sampled projects visited had safeguard instruments prepared An all-inclusive County Government Environmental Bill is yet to be passed

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
			part of the contract.				
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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The % of projects (weighted by the size of the projects) with a satisfactory level of value for the money will be</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>	N/A	Not applicable at this point of evaluation

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
				reflected in the score i.e. 80 % satisfactory projects= XX points, 70 % = XX points.			
					Total Maximum Score: 100 points.	46	

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 1. Compliance with Minimum access conditions	To ensure minimum capacity and linkage between CB and Investments	Assessment Met
Financial Management 2. Financial statements submitted	To reduce fiduciary risks	Assessment Met
3. Audit Opinion does not carry an adverse opinion or a disclaimer on any substantive issue	To reduce Fiduciary risks	Not Applicable
Planning 4. Annual planning documents in place	To demonstrate a minimum level of capacity to plan and manage funds	Assessment Met
5. Adherence with the investment menu 6. Consolidated procurement plans in place	To ensure procurement planning is properly coordinated from the central procurement unit	Not Applicable Assessment Met
7. County Core staff in place	Core staff in place as per County Government Act	Assessment Met

8. Environmental and social safeguards	To ensure that there is a mechanism and capacity to screen environmental and social risks	Assessment Met
9. Citizens' Complaint System in place	To ensure sufficient level of governance and reduce risks for mismanagement	Not Met

Table 8: Summary of Results for Performance Measures

Key Result Area	Results /Score
KRA 1: Public Financial Management	16
KRA 2: Planning and Monitoring and Evaluation	8
KRA 3: Human Resources Management	6
KRA 4: Civic Education and Participation	9
KRA 5: Investment implementation & Social and environmental performance	7
Total Score	46

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

- Onsite support for county staff on use of IFMIS.
- Propose that the County government support the strengthening of the internal audit office and appointment of key staff to manage this important function.
- County Finance department to work closely with the internal auditor to proactively reduce queries by the Auditor General.
- The county government should devise ways of Imprest management which is currently out of control and stood at Kes 112 Million as at 30th June 2015. This situation should longer be allowed by the county executive and assembly.
- Initiate a process of developing an appropriate asset register for both the county executive and assembly.
- Propose the digitalization of revenue collection system to reduce spillage of revenue and enhance accountability.
- Training of MCAs and their Personal Assistants (PAs) on Public Financial Management including Public Procurement and Disposal Act 2012.
- Capacity building of MCAs on matters of Governance and particularly on their roles and responsibilities & what is expected of them by the law.

b) Human Resources

- The county government needs to cascade the identification of capacity /training needs (TNAs) for all departments.
- Develop a capacity building/training plan for all departments based on the TNA.
- Initiation of performance management system for all departments including the Executive, County Assembly and Public Service Board.
- Development of Service Charters for all County Departments as part of monitoring, evaluation and assessment tools.
- Undertake a comprehensive review of the human resource function and develop an appropriate staff establishment for all departments.
- Based on the departmental organograms, develop a consolidated staff structure for the whole county. Current
- Recommend the Digitalization of County Human Resource Information System/processes such as recruitment, short-listing, feedback mechanisms through acquisition of an appropriate Human Resource Information System and Integrated Records Management System.
- Development of a fully equipped County Human Resource Centre (Training Hall, Interview Room, Library- access to schemes of service for all departments, annual reports, human resource manuals & human resource policies).
- Technical support to County Public Service Board on the development and review of Human Resource Policies and Laws anchored on the new legislations.
- Propose that upon offer of employment, all new staff should be given clear and comprehensive Job Descriptions (JDs) based on the approved schemes of service.
- Recommend the finalization of the process on the development of consolidated JDs, Organogram and staff establishment which were being undertaken by Ernest and Young- recommend a new consultant to complete the process.
- To ensure that there is effective communication between the county Assembly and Executive, the County Assembly should develop communications policies and associated procedures.
- Training County Assembly technical officers (clerks of committees, Hanzard Clerks) to enhance the quality of legislative processes.
- Support the various departments of the County Assembly to develop appropriate systems and policies for effective management.

c) Environment and Social Safeguards

- Enhance social safeguards for all county projects through the development of social and environmental impact assessment as required by the relevant legislation and the constitution 2010.

d) Monitoring and Evaluation

- Onsite support for county staff on use of IFMIS.
- There is need for the county staff to be trained on effective documentation and record management.
- Suggest the digitalization of all county records and information through the setting-up of an integrated information management system supported by an appropriate software

- Recommend that the county government of Mombasa prioritizes the setting-up and funding of a county Monitoring and Evaluation unit under the county secretary.
- Propose that the County government support the strengthening of the internal audit office and appointment of key staff to manage this important function.
- Capacity building of county staff on report development based on the LIAFORM (revenue collection) system to reduce spillage of revenue.
- Training on Integrated Payroll and Personnel Database (IPPD) for all Human Resource (HR) officers.

e) Civic Education & Participation

- County government should put in place a Civic Education Committee.
- Capacity building of staff and new committee on CE (including benchmarking).
- Propose a clear budget for the Civic Education Unit including more staff to enable the unit to deliver on its mandate.
- Recommend that the county of Mombasa fast track the passage of the public participation Bill 2014 which has been with the County Assembly since 2014.
- Recommend specific budget allocation for public participation.
- The County Government of Mombasa is yet to develop Tools and methods for Civic Education.
- Except the involvement of citizens in the development of CIDP and Budget preparation process, CGM has not undertaken other civic education activities in the county.
- There is no established complaints handling system.

4.0 CHALLENGES IN THE ASSESSMENT

- The ACPA was delayed due to late arrival of the introductory letter to the County Assembly which was received late - received at the time of starting the assessment on 3rd July 2017.
- Evidence and documentation of project implementation status was absent due to lack of M & E Unit focal persons in most departments
- Junior staff unable to provide the necessary information without requisite permission from their seniors who were absent during the assessment.
- Traffic jams in town could not allow visit of the envisaged number of County Projects.
- At the time of conducting the assessment the County had no internet connectivity due to disconnection by the service provider

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

Issue no. 1: Copy of signed participation agreement availed. Agreement signed by the Governor on 28th June 2016. The CB plan was signed as is required by County Secretary and NCBF CB FOCAL person on 30th June 2016.

5.2 MPC's Issues

- Key County Staff in place with clear job descriptions but there is need to undertake Training needs analysis (TNAs) to enable the development staff capacity building plan.
- Provision for public complaints mechanism through a complaint register.
- Internal audit system not working effectively.
- No functional Monitoring and Evaluation Function.

5.3 PMs

KRA 1: Public Finance Management

The following was observed:

- The CGM does not have an updated Asset Register.
- The internal auditor seemed inexperienced and did not produced up-to date records or reports for our verification. The Internal Audit Committee is yet to be constituted.
- The County Assembly of Mombasa does not undertake scrutiny of audit reports.
- Budget not prepared on Hyperion module as required.

KRA 2: Planning and Monitoring & Evaluation

The following was observed:

- The CGM has not developed a M & E Framework.
- CGM has no specific budget allocation for Monitoring and Evaluation.
- Despite the existence of Technical working group, there is no formal County M & E Committee.
- CGM does not have a substantive M & E Officer.

KRA 3: Human Resource

The following was observed:

- CGM has not developed a skills and competency frameworks
- The County is yet to finalize on all Departmental staffing plans.
- Staff performance Management in place but is yet to be cascaded to all cadres of staff. Performance contracts place for COs and CECs only.

KRA 4 Civic Educations and Participation

- The County is yet to establish the Civic Education Committee.
- No specific budget for public participation.
- The County Government of Mombasa is yet to develop Tools and methods for Civic Education.
- The CGM is yet to develop Tools and methods for Civic Education.
- Except the involvement of citizens in the development of CIDP and Budget preparation process, CGM has not undertaken other civic education activities in the county.
- There is no established complaints handling system.

KRA 5 Investments and Social Environment Performance

- There is no projects completion register.

6.0 NOTIFICATION OF DISAGREEMENT WITH THE OUTCOME OF THE ASSESSEMENT ALREADY NOTED DURING THE FILED-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 pilot assessment report

7.0 OVERVIEW OF THE 5 WEAKEST PERFORMANCE

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

KRA	Performance Measure	Issues
KRA 1	Public Finance Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak County internal audit office • The county government should devise ways of Imprest management which is currently out of control and stood at Kes 112 Million as at 30th June 2015. • Lack of an appropriate asset register for both the county executive and assembly. • Digitalization of revenue collection system to reduce spillage of revenue and enhance accountability.
KRA 2	Planning &M&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest the digitalization of all county records and information through the setting-up of an integrated information management system supported by an appropriate software • Recommend that the county government of Mombasa prioritizes the setting-up and funding of a county Monitoring and Evaluation unit under the county secretary. • Propose that the County government support the strengthening of the internal audit office and appointment of key staff to manage this important function.
KRA 3	Human Resource Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The county government needs to cascade the identification of capacity /training needs (TNAs) for all departments. • Develop a capacity building/training plan for all departments based on the TNA. • Initiation of performance management system for all departments including the Executive, County Assembly and Public Service Board. • Development of Service Charters for all County Departments as part of monitoring, evaluation and assessment tools.
KRA 4	Civic Education and Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County government should put in place a Civic Education Committee. • Capacity building of staff and new committee on CE (including benchmarking). • Propose a clear budget for the Civic Education Unit including more staff to enable the unit to deliver on its mandate. • Recommend that the county of Mombasa fast track the passage of the public participation Bill 2014 which has been with the County Assembly since 2014.

KRA 5	Investment implementation & social and environmental performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is no projects completion register.
--------------	--	---

APPENDIX 1: ENTRY MEETING MINUTES

Held on 3rd July 2017 at Betting Control Office Boardroom, Mombasa

Agenda

1. Welcoming Address from The Chair
2. Introductions
3. Objectives and Main Key Milestones of ACPA- By Consultants, Matengo & Githae
4. Three Day Schedule of the Mombasa ACPA
5. Closing Remarks

1. **Welcoming Address from The Chair:** The Chairman of the meeting M/S. Pamela Obuya, who is also Director- Cabinet Affairs and Inter-Governmental Relations, welcomed all the staff and the consultant from Matengo & Githae to the Entry meeting of the Mombasa ACPA. She reiterated that the ACPA is part of the National Capacity Building Framework (NCBF) Medium Term Intervention (MTI) under the Ministry of Devolution and National Planning and with technical and financial assistance of the World Bank. Pamela added that Mombasa ACPA shall be undertaken in the next three days (3rd to 5th July) and will be finalized with the holding of an exit meeting on Wednesday 5th July 2017.
2. **Introductions:** A brief round of introduction was done. She first appreciated the presence of the two team of consultant from Matengo & Githae Associates, Nairobi, who will lead the Mombasa ACPA assignment. The two consultants are Mr. Waweru Martin (Team Leader) and Mr. Thomas Kirongo. The two consultants thanked the Mombasa staff for the warm welcome accorded to them. The members of the Mombasa Team included both members of the County Executive, County Assembly and the County Public Service Board (CPSB) led by the Ag. CEO Mr. Jeizan M. Faruk
3. **Objectives and Main Key Milestones of ACPA:** Mr. Martin Waweru, Matengo & Githae Consultant briefed the meeting on the objectives, process and schedule of the ACPA process. He noted that the ACPA had been commissioned by the Ministry of Devolution and Planning with financial support of the World Bank. The main purpose of the ACPA assignment is to build the capacity of County Governments officials to improve performance and deliver better services to the citizens. Mr. Martin added that the ACPA started with a self-capacity assessment by the Mombasa County Staff that identified capacity gaps that needs to be addressed.

M/S Pamela Obuya reported that the Mombasa ACPA is a three-step process. Adding that the ACPA was part of the Kenya Devolution Support Programme (KDSP) that will support the implementation of five key result areas (KRAs) under the National Capacity Building Framework (NCBF) Medium Term Intervention (MTI). It will support the results around the strengthened capacity of both national and county institutions in five key result areas:

- **KRA 1- Public Finance Management** including improved county budgeting, revenue management; use of IFMIS; financial accounting, recording and reporting, procurement and internal audit performance.
- **KRA 2- Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation** including improved county planning, process reports, monitoring & evaluation, and linkages between county plans and budgets.

- **KRA 3- Human Resource and Performance Management including** county staffing plans, HR Competency frameworks, appraisal and performance contracting systems.
- **KRA 4- Devolution and Intergovernmental Relations** including introduction of a new performance based –conditional grant.
- **KRA 4-Civic Education and Public Participation:** Enhanced rollout of civic education and county civic education units; greater number of counties that meet county Government Act requirements for public participation and transparency.
It was further emphasized that the KDSP under NCBF-MTI will support county level results that contribute to strengthened institutions for devolved service delivery.

4. **Three Day Schedule of the Mombasa ACPA:** M/S Pamela Obuya, the Mombasa Focal person, reported to the meeting that the Mombasa ACPA will be undertaken for three days and will end on 5th July 2017 with a visit to selected county projects. She informed the meeting that she will coordinate all the activities in consultation with the consultants for the three days. Pamela added that the Mombasa County Government Leadership are in full support of the ACPA and requested the full cooperation of all county staff in this important exercise.
5. **ACPA Exit Meeting and Closing Remarks:** Mr. Martin Waweru told the meeting that on the afternoon of Wednesday 5th July 2017 there shall be an exit meeting to have a review of the Mombasa ACPA and agree on the way forward.

APPENDIX 2: EXIT MEETING MINUTES

Held on 5th July 2017 at Betting Control Office Boardroom, Mombasa

Agenda

1. Welcoming Address from The Chair
2. Feedback of ACPA Process by County Staff
3. Brief Overview of ACPA Findings
4. Key Findings of Mombasa ACPA
5. Way forward an Closing Remarks

6. **Welcoming Address from The Chair:** The Chairman of the meeting M/S. Pamela Obuya, who is also Director- Cabinet Affairs and Inter-Governmental Relations, welcomed all the staff and the consultant from Matengo & Githae to the Mombasa ACPA Exit Meeting. She thanked both the Staff and the Consultants for their time in providing documentation and the needed information for the Mombasa ACPA. She noted the active participation of the staff of the County Assembly (CA) in the assessment explaining that the CA is part and parcel of the CGM.

7. **Feedback of ACPA Process by County Staff:** The County Staff present requested for clarification on the use of the Self-Assessment Report done earlier and ACPA assessment findings. Mr. Martin Waweru clarified that the findings from both tasks will be used to address the capacity gaps identified. Adding that participants were still free before the closure of the exit meeting to make recommendations to the Consultants. Mr Martin added the final Report of the ACPA will be shared with respective entities at both National and County Levels.

8. **Brief Overview of ACPA Findings:** At the meeting, staff from the County Assembly thanked both the leadership of the CGM and the ACPA Consultants for involving all the departments in the ACPA, adding that they had learned a lot from the assignment which will go a long way improving their performance. Mr. Munga, The Deputy Head of the Country Treasury stressed that the ACPA exercise will lead to improved delivery of accounting services at the Country Treasury.

9. **Key Findings of Mombasa ACPA:** Mr Martin Waweru, Matengo & Githae Consultant briefed the meeting on some of the Key findings of the Mombasa ACPA as follows:
 - a. **Public Finance Management**
 - Weak County internal audit office
 - The county government should devise ways of Imprest management which is currently out of control and stood at Kes 112 Million as at 30th June 2015.
 - Lack of an appropriate asset register for both the county executive and assembly.
 - Need for digitalization of revenue collection system to reduce spillage of revenue and enhance accountability.

 - b. **Planning &M&E**
 - Suggest the digitalization of all county records and information through the setting-up of an integrated information management system supported by an appropriate software

- Recommend that the county government of Mombasa prioritizes the setting-up and funding of a county Monitoring and Evaluation unit under the county secretary.
- Propose that the County government support the strengthening of the internal audit office and appointment of key staff to manage this important function.

c. Human Resource Management:

- The county government needs to cascade the identification of capacity /training needs (TNAs) for all departments.
- Develop a capacity building/training plan for all departments based on the TNA.
- Initiation of performance management system for all departments including the Executive, County Assembly and Public Service Board.
- Development of Service Charters for all County Departments as part of monitoring, evaluation and assessment tools.
- Capacity Building of MCAs and their PAs on their constitutional roles and responsibilities.

d. Civic Education and Participation

- County government should put in place a Civic Education Committee.
- Capacity building of staff and new committee on CE (including benchmarking).
- Propose a clear budget for the Civic Education Unit including more staff to enable the unit to deliver on its mandate.
- Recommend that the county of Mombasa fast track the passage of the public participation Bill 2014 which has been with the County Assembly since 2014.

e. Investment implementation & social and environmental performance

- All projects including those funded outside the County Budget should be designed in line with CIDP and ADP guidelines.

10. Way forward on Closing Remarks: There being no other business the Chair thank everyone for their participation in the 2017 Mombasa ACPA exercise.