



LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Amudat District

(Vote Code: 581)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	3	50%
No	3	50%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.	xxx	Not Compliant – No evidence that Amudat District submitted the APC 2017/18 (Form B) to MoFPED, let alone submit in time.	No
Assessment area: Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).	xxxxx	Compliant – A signed and stamped Amudat District Budget (APC) 2017/18 (submitted to MoFPED on the 26th May 2017 Receipt No: 0633) was accompanied by a Procurement Plan.	Yes
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			
LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)	xxxxx	Not Compliant – The Amudat District APR 2016/17 was submitted late to the MoFPED (as seen on Receipt dated 18thAugust 2017 and Receipt No: 4561), hence going in late (i.e. after 31st July 2017). The late submission was attributed to understaffed Departmental staff due to a recruitment ban, the limited awareness of the skeleton staff on the need for timely submissions, their low capacity in using OBT whereby the planner – the only officer in the planning unit – is called upon to assist other staff in all other departments as they prepared their submissions.	No
LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)	xxxxxx	Not Compliant – Amudat District submitted all 4 quarterly reports for the FY 2016/17 but Q4 submitted late (i.e. Q1 - 21st/11/2016 Receipt No: 0092; Q2 – 6th/3/2017 Receipt No: 0457; Q3 – 25th/5/2017 Receipt No: 0766; and Q4 – 18th/8/2017 Receipt No: 4561).	No

Assessment area: Audit

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by April 30 (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action (PFMA Act 2015; Local Governments Financial and Accounting Regulations 2007; The Local Governments Act, Cap 243).</p>	<p>XXXXXX</p>	<p>The LG provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General findings for the previous Financial year. The submission dated 20th /3/2017 was received on 24th/3/2017. All the 22 audit queries were responded to by the LG.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>XXXXXX</p>	<p>From the Annual report of the Auditor General, financial year 2016/2017, Amudat District obtained an unqualified Audit opinion.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Amudat District

(Vote Code: 581)

Score 47/100 (47%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality; and (ii) all Town Councils in a District are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a municipality/district has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 2. 	0	<p>At the time of the assessment (31st/1/2018), there was no evidence that Amudat District had formed a Physical Planning Committee (PPC) – no copy seen of CAO appointment of any PPC members and minutes to help gauge its functionality at the time of the assessment (as at 31st/1/2018) – i.e. with minutes that demonstrate that the PPC's sat to help approve/consider new investments within 28 days of receipt of applications. NB: Amudat District has 1 Town Council, which was reportedly functional in terms having in place systems such a PPC at the time of the assessment.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2. 	0	<p>Amudat District did not have a substantively recruited Physical Planner and funding for the area at the time of the assessment (29th-30th/1/2018). It is not surprising that there were no records to refer to and no documented evidence (minutes) available for proof of approval of plans consistent with the Physical Plan. While official records got from MoLHUD, (Status of Physical Planning in Uganda 2017, the MoLHUD Physical Planning Department (2015) considered Amudat District to have had/available both a Structural Plan and a Detailed Plan that were being prepared (seen on Page 1), the was no plan submitted to the assessment team for verification its existence. Indeed, there were no records (minutes) of the District Council having approving either a Structural Plan or Detailed Plan referred to by MoLHUD and Amudat District officials, respectively.</p>

The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles

- Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.

2

The Amudat District Budget Conference was held on the 15th December 2017. Based on the contents of the summarized BCR, there was some evidence that the AWP 2017/18 was based on outcomes of the budget conference. The BCR contained departmental presentations that specified the priorities that were easy to see in the AWP 2017/18. For education, construction of classrooms block was on page 52 of the AWP 2017/18 and on page 3 of the summary note of the BCR. For health, completion of maternity ward HC III was seen on page 47 of the AWP 2017/18 and on page 3 of the summary note of the BCR. For water, construction of mini piped water system was seen on page 63 of the AWP 2017/18 and on page 3 of the summary note of the BCR.

- Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If different, justification has to be provided and evidence that it was approved by Council. Score 2.

2

There is some evidence that the capital investments in the approved AWP 2017/18 are derived from 5-year Development Plan 2015/16-2019/20 (project profiles appended between pages 230-251). On the AWP-DDP linkages, the approved AWP (pages 96) shows education sector investments e.g. construction of teachers' houses that appears also in the DDP on page 173. The approved AWP (pages 92) shows health sector investments e.g. maternity ward construction that appears also in the DDP on page 165. Also, the approved AWP (pages 103) shows water sector investments e.g. drilling of boreholes that appear also in the DDP on page 183.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 1. 	1	<p>The TPC Minutes offered documented proof that the DTPC meetings sat to discuss the developed project profiles (e.g. DTPC 27th/7/2016), and by implication discussing the DDP 2015/16-2019/20. Even so, the way the DTPC minutes appeared to be documented reflected discussions of agenda items with more generalities than specifics of deliberations. A case in point is agenda item 8 “project profiles” minute number (8/7/167/ADLG) seen on page 5-6. Here, details on the projects are missing. Indeed, for the FY2016/17, while NPA’s (2017) Certificate of Compliance with Planning Guidelines awarded Amudat District a score of 75% on the robustness of the planning process but an average score of 41.3% when all planning aspects were kept into view (see page 81).</p>
3	<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual statistical abstract, with gender disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum 1 point. 	1	<p>The Statistical Abstracts (June 2016) were seen and it captured some gender-related and gender dis-aggregated data and information (e.g. on page 18 – population; page 19 population projections; – page 23 school-going age children; and – page 24 trained teachers and performance in national examinations). The DTPC 11th/11/2016 minute min. 31/11/1617/ADLG (pages 2-3) showed that the TPC meeting mentioned the need for departments to use the statistics for inform allocations and decision making. However, the suggestion was general without specific details on what statistics warranted use for effective evidence utilisation.</p>
4	<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2 	2	<p>While there was no proof that the AWP was approved by council, according to documented evidence drawn from the APC/Budget 2016/17, all projects implemented in the FY 2016/17 were drawn from AWP 2016/17. For example, under education, supply of Double Cabin Pickup was seen on page 52 of the AWP 2016/17 and on page 91 of the APC/Budget 2016/17. For health, Theater construction and rehabilitation was seen on page 46 of the AWP 2016/17 and on page 85of the APC/Budget 2016/17. For water, construction of piped water system was seen on page 58 of the AWP 2016/17 and on page 99 of the APC/Budget 2016/17.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	0	<p>Only a few projects (77%) implemented in FY 2016/17 were completed as per work plan. However, about 2 out of 9 projects are still on-going. For example, the piped water supply was still on-going at the time of the assessment (30th/1/2018).</p>
5	<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects and assets during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	0	<p>Only some investment projects (77%) implemented in FY 2016/17 were completed within approved budget.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	2	<p>Attempts are made to budget for O&M but more often than not the actual expenditure on O&M far exceeds (184%) what is budgeted for (i.e. as seen from a comparison of APC/Budget 2016/17 and the AFA 2016/17). Amudat's O&M budget was 113,314,000/= but actual expenditure for FY2016/17 amounted to a total of 208,659,595/=, total actual figures almost double the budget figures).</p>
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				

LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.

- Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2

0

Verifiable evidence available on the personal files of HoDs in form of Performance Agreements and Performance contracts revealed that only 3 HoDs were appraised during the previous FY as indicated below:

1. District Comm. Dev. Officer- Appraised on 5/07/2017. Performance Agreement signed on 15/07/17 and Performance Report dated 5/07/2017 duly endorsed by CAO.
2. Chief Finance Officer- Appraised on 30/06/2017. Performance Agreement signed on 2/07/2016 and Performance Report dated 30/07/2017 duly signed by CAO
3. District Engineer- Appraised on 30/06/2017. Performance Agreement signed on 1/06/16 and Performance Report dated 30/06/2017 duly signed by CAO.

Performance Agreements and Reports for the Natural Resources Officer and other HoDs appointed on Assignment of Duty were not available for verification during the assessment exercise.

Four (4) out of the existing 7 HoD positions at Amudat district were substantially filled by the time of the review. The Position of Commercial Officer was still vacant.

Verified information included:

- An approved staff list duly signed by the CAO available in the HRM office. The list contains all employees/staff of Amudat district as at 1st January 2018 (the list is updated from time to time)
- MoPS approved Organisational structure that was issued at the commencement of Amudat district in 2010 available in the HRO's office.

The substantive HoDs include:

1. Chief Finance Officer: Personal File Ref: CR/AMT/166/001- Appointed on 31/03/2016 as per DSC Min. extract 26/ADSC/2016 Ref: 156/2

• Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3

0

2. District Production Officer: Personal File Ref: CR/ADLG/375, Appointed on 16/03/2017, Ref. no: ADM/CR/156/2 and as per DSC Min. extract 168/ADSC/2017

3. Community Dev. Officer. Personal File Ref: CR/AMT/116/27. Appointed on 31/03/16, Ref. no: CR/156/2 and as per Min. extract 27/ADSC/2016

4. District Education Officer: Personal File Ref: CR/ADLG/009. Appointed on 31/03/2016, as per DSC min extract 33/ADSC/2016

The following positions are occupied by staff appointed by CAO on *Assignment of Duty*. No position is occupied by staff in acting capacity.

1. District Health Officer: Personal File Ref No: CR/AMT/166/011

Appointed as a Vote Controller on 4/07/2016 ref: CR/156.

2. District Engineer: File Ref No: CR/ADLG/171, Appointed on 17/10/2016, ref: CR/156

3. District Natural Resources Officer: Personal File Ref: CR/AMT/166/066. Appointed on 11/01/2016 ref: ADM/CR/156/2

Absence of a wage bill and failure to attract suitable applicants when positions are advertised were the major two reasons cited for the low staffing level. Approval however, was given by MoPS for the recruitment for key positions in FY 2017/18

The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

• Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2

2

All (100%) submissions for recruitment made by CAO to DSC for consideration were considered. Verified evidence indicated that:

- CAO requested MoPS for the approval of recruitment for 17 critical vacant positions in the district as per letter dated 1/08/2016, ref: ARC/ 293/05. The critical positions included: Senior Human Resource Officer, District Engineer, Senior Inspector of Schools, Senior Environment Officer, and Community Development Officer among others. CAO's run the adverts on behalf of the DSC.

- DSC sat from 23rd to 24th March and shortlisted for the positions. Ref: DSC minutes of the 23rd-24th meeting. Interviews were conducted from the 3rd to 7th April 2017 and an *Instrument of Appointment* for the selected candidates was issued by the DSC on the 10/04/2017 as per letter from Secretary to DSC to CAO Ref: no. CR/156/2 containing minute extracts for the appointment of each one of the selected candidates.

• Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1

1

No submissions were made by CAO to DSC for confirmations of the 17 staff recruited during the FY. The staff had not yet completed their probationary performance assessment to qualify for confirmation. Probationary appraisals were due in October 2017.

• Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1

1

No Disciplinary cases were submitted by CAO to DSC for consideration during the FY. Minor cases however, were referred to the Rewards and Sanctions committee for action.

Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.

• Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3

3

Fifteen (15) staff (88%) of the 17 recruited during the FY managed to access the salary pay roll not later than 2 months after appointment. A sample of five files was done and all the five appear on the June 2017 Salary Pay Roll in the HRO's office and their salary data is available on the Pay Change Forms verified at the HRO's office. The IPPS numbers for the five staff are indicated below:

1. 1005040
2. 1005041
3. 1005042
4. 1005043
5. 1005044

Note however that, two (2) staff (Stores Assistant and Information Officer) could not access the pay roll due to reasons beyond the control of the district: the Stores Assistant position was upgraded by MoPS to Assistant Inventory Management Officer and hence the old position could not be reflected on the IPPS and the position of Information Officer was also not reflected on the IPPS system.

The information on the IPPS has since been updated and the two officers are currently on the salary payroll.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2 	0	<p>No pensioner (0%), of the 2 existing in the district managed to access the Pension Pay Roll not later than two months after retirement.</p> <p>Pensioner Ref No. CR/NPT/166/194 retired in March 2014, while Pensioner Ref. No: CR/NPT/166/194 retired in December 2016. None of them appear on Pension Pay Roll. The reasons for this status cited by the HRO include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delays in initiation of files by the retirees (one of the pensioners had been transferred from Moroto to Amudat but had not updated his file records) Transfer of CAOs in 2017 (three CAOs tranferred in one momnth) , affected the processing of files as the account that been created by one of transferred CAOs was closed before the process could be moved to the next level.
--	--	---	---	---

Assessment area: Revenue Mobilization

9	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If increase in OSR from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10% : score 4 points If the increase is from 5 -10% : score 2 point If the increase is less than 5% : score 0 points. 	0	<p>There was a decline in OSR from Ugx: 68,622,720 in FY 2015/16 to Ugx: 56,600,209 in FY 2016/17. This gives a decline of Ugx 12,022,511 i.e. 21% decline. The decline was attributed to the low revenue base, seasonal factors which force animals to search for pasture in other Districts and when sold the revenue goes to those districts, Quarantine and the community is ignorant about the value of paying taxes.</p>
---	--	---	---	--

10	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10% : then 2 points. If more than +/- 10% : zero points. 	0	<p>The District Approved budget for FY 2016/17 was Ugx 138,900,000 and the actual Local revenue collected in FY 2016/17 was 56,600,209 Ugx giving a shortfall of Ugx 82,299,791 which is 59%.</p>
11	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	0	<p>From the verbal information given by CFO, the District didn't remit any local revenue to Lower local governments in FY 2016/2017. The reason was that their revenue base is very low so they didn't have local revenue to remit. This was contrary to section 85 (2) of the LG ACT CAP 243. However, lower local governments remitted the 35% to the District as required by the law.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2 	2	<p>From information on the payment vouchers numbers 6/12, 3/2,16/10, 3/9, 3/8, 8/8 and 12/8 also reflected in the cash book for statutory bodies 2016/17, the LG spent Ugx 11,595,000 of local revenue on council activities. Therefore, Ugx 11,595,000/ Ugx 68,622,720 (OSR collected in FY 2015/16) x 100 equals to 16%. Hence the LG used 16% of OSR on council activities which is less than the mandatory 20%.. The figure in the final account 2016/17 included unconditional grants.</p>

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

12	<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG has no position of Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement officer. However there is an assigned officer but with no substantial letter.
----	---	---	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for previous FY ref: Report for framework contract and prequalification of companies dated 5th May 2016 and signed by the evaluation members on 21st Dec 2016.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Contracts Committee considered recommendations from the TEC in a report, 'Decision of members of contracts committee for approval and award of contracts ' Min 04/AMUD 581/CC/01/16/17 for FY 16/17. Signed by the contracts committee on 6/2/2017.
13	<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Procurement and Disposal Plan for current year covers all infrastructural projects in the annual work plan and budget that was submitted to Executive Director PPDA on 18 Aug 17 signed by CAO,Lukwago Anthony Martin and received by PPDA on 21 Aug 2017. <p>The LG made procurements for previous FY in a letter to Executive Director PPDA dated 21/11/2016 signed by CAO, Chelimo Alex</p> <p>Procurements made include; Construction of two kitchens and a two stance Latrine at Achorchor P/S, construction of twin staff house at Lokales HC II, construction of a twin staff house at Katabok PS signed by District Engineer on 7/12/2017,Construction of production store at Amudat production HQs;</p> <p>Construction of chain Link fence at Amudat district HQS signed by District Engineer and CAO completion date 30th June 2016 ,and construction of cattle crush at Karita sub county</p>

14

The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

- For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30: score 2

0

- The LG had prepared 50% of bid documents by Aug 30th due to late approval of contract committee members who were appointed on 24 Aug 2017 in a letter signed by CAO, Lukwago Anthony Martin and took oath on 15/9/2017. There was also delay in acknowledgment of contract committee members by PPDA. The contracts committee was in the process of making recommendations to TEC by the time of assessment.

- For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2

0

- The LG had contracts register for procurement activities but was not updated by the time of assessment.

- For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2.

2

- For previous FY, the LG adhered to procurement thresholds. For works; Open bidding- construction of chain link at Amudat District HQ(134,158,640/-) Selective bidding - Construction of cattle crush at Karita sub county (15,017,500/-) Open bidding- Construction of a twin staff house at Katabok P/S(52,495,800), Selective bidding- completion of construction of a two unit staff house at Nabokotom PS(8,654,800/-) Selective bidding-construction of two kitchens and a two stance latrine at Achorichor P/S(49,893,600/-)

15	<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projects implemented for previous FY had interim and certificate of practical completion which include ; <p>Interim certificate for construction of two kitchens and a two stance Latrine at Achorchor P/S signed by District Engineer on 20/12/2017, construction of twin staff house at Lokales HC II signed by District Engineer on 11/01/2017, construction of a twin staff house at Katabok PS signed by District Engineer on 7/12/2017, construction of production store at Amudat production HQs signed by district engineer on 29/6/2017 and certificate of practical completion for;</p> <p>Construction of chain link fence at Amudat district HQS signed by District Engineer and CAO completion date 30th June 2016 ,and construction of cattle crush at Karita sub county signed by District Engineer and CAO</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG had not yet implemented any infrastructural projects for current FY by the time of assessment
Assessment area: Financial management				
16	<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4 	4	<p>There was evidence that the LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations. Cash books for Natural resources, LDG, CBS, NUSAF III, health, UNICEF, Administration, General fund, Finance and planning, CDD, Education, Production and marketing, CBG, Statutory bodies, NUSAF II Sub project and global fund for FY 2016/17 were all reconciled up to 31/12/2017.</p>

17	<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2. 	0	<p>According to information from the financial accounts 2016/17, page 43 “Note 23 categorization of payables”, the LG had overdue bills for Royal Techno industries, Galaxy general supplies, MAC East Africa Ltd and Geo- Max water and mineral consultancy to be cleared in FY 2017/18. Also request for retention from Tosha suppliers and constructors for construction of a five stance pit latrine at Karita Rural growth centre dated 28/6/2016 was paid on 20/12/2016 which was over a period of two months.</p>
18	<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor and produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 3. 	0	<p>The LG doesn't have a substantive senior internal auditor, no district internal auditor and no Internal Auditor. The Internal Audit department is headed by a senior finance officer who produced all the four quarterly internal Audit reports for the previous FY (2016/17). Copies of the Internal audit reports were available.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries: score 2. 	0	<p>There is evidence that council and LGPAC received information on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year. The information is embedded in the quarterly internal audit reports addressed to chairman and received by chairman on behalf of council. Evidence of receipt is on the top cover of the reports where the recipients signed . Copies of letters of follow up on audit queries copied to Ag. District Internal auditor were available dated 23/1/2018 and 22/1/2018 signed by CAO - Amudat. However, there was no follow up in financial year 2016/17.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1 	0	<p>There is evidence that the internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting officer and LGPAC. They signed on the internal audit reports to acknowledge receipt. 1st quarter submitted to CAO on 15/12/2016, to LGPAC on 31/5/2017 and to chairman on 2/3/2017. 2nd quarter submitted to LGPAC on 31/5/2017. 3rd quarter registry received on behalf of CAO, LCV and LGPAC ON 30/4/2017. 4th quarter registry received on behalf of CAO, RDC, LCV and LGPAC ON 31/7/2017. There was no evidence of LGPAC minutes for reviewing the quarterly audit reports. The reason given was that the former clerk to council absconded duty and disappeared in June 2017. The current clerk to council assumed office in October 2017.</p>
19	<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	0	<p>There was evidence of Asset registers maintained by the LG. However, the Asset registers were not updated. Also the LG had just purchased a new asset register a different format recommended by MOFPED in their letter to all accounting officers dated 26/5/2017 and signed by Accountant General. Reference was made to section 13(15)(i) of the Public finance Management Act 2015.</p>
20	<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY: • unqualified audit opinion: score 4 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</p>	4	<p>From the Annual report of the Auditor General, financial year 2016/2017, Amudat District obtained an unqualified Audit opinion.</p>
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				

21	<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2</p>	2	<p>There was some documented evidence that Amudat District Local Council was modestly functional. For instance, it met 3 out of 6 mandatory times (i.e. on the 25th/7/2016, 11th/11/2016 and 14th/10/2016). On a few occasions when the district council met, it deliberated on relevant service-delivery issues e.g. discussion of plans and budgets as well as discussion of matters such as Ownership of Pokot Senior Secondary School (min 138/ADLG/7/2016); the Public University Joint Admission Board (PUJAB) Admission of Students (min.137/ADLG/7/2016) and Back-to-School Campaigns (min.158/ADLG/11/2016); need for Technical School (min. 159/ADLG/11/2016). However, what appeared to be missing in district councils deliberations in the FY 2016/17 were TPC reports, monitoring reports and performance assessment reports. In fact, there were instances when the district council appeared to deliberate on issues that were fairly odd (peculiar agenda items e.g. additional 100 liters of fuel to facilitate LC V Chairperson, increase emoluments to the LCV Chairperson and Speaker, facilitation of the speaker and transportation for District Speaker (e.g. see district council minutes of 11th/11/2016 and 25th/7/2016 respectively).</p>
22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2.</p>	0	<p>No documented evidence that there is a designated official meant to coordinate lower-level feedback on and responses to grievances /complaints in council.</p>

23	The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)	Evidence that the LG has published: • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2	2	Documented evidence seen of publishing unsigned and unstamped payroll register (undated) on CAO notice boards. There was no documented evidence of posting of the pension schedule.
	Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1	1	Documented evidence seen of publishing of signed and stamped procurement register (dated 27th/3/2017) on CAOs notice board.
		• Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications, are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1.	0	Not Applicable (N/A) – There was no LGPA in the FY under review.
24	The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens	• Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1	0	No documented evidence that information relayed through central government agencies' (MoFPED, MoLG, OPM, etc) e.g. circulars, guidelines, policies and procedures (on DDEG, NAADS, NUSAF, etc) are disseminated or remitted to Lower level Local Governments (LLG).
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	• Evidence that LG during previous FY has conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc..) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1.	1	Some documented evidence existed to prove use of radio talk shows (e.g. on the back to school campaigns) but with no documented evidence of supporting downward accountability practices through barazas, etc.
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				

25	<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG gender focal person has provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities score 2. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG Gender focal person provided gender mainstreaming through; <p>Reports on gender mainstreaming issues dated 23 Aug 2017 at Karita sub county and Amudat SC (86 people in attendance), reports on sensitization of sub county leadership on gender mainstreaming dated 20/6/17, orientation of technical staff and sub county members dated 2/08/17, support to openly and publically declare support to for abandonment of FGM, prevention and response to GBV.</p> <p>However there was no evidence of guidance to sector departments by the time of assessment.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that gender focal point has planned activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and that more than 90% of previous year's budget for gender activities has been implemented: score 2. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG has planned activities for current FY in gender mainstreaming according to the LG Work plan which includes; <p>Support to 2 youth councils, gender mainstreaming training conducted for all sub county staff, 2 women councils supported in mobilization and sensitisation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For previous year's budget the LG utilised funds over 90% which was for assisting CDOs on gender mainstreaming to STPC and SEC . (617,000/-) of funds received was used for allowances fuel, .airtime,mobilisation in 4 sub counties
26	<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was evidence of site identification, environmental screening and report for construction of production store/plant clinic signed and stamped by Senior Environment officer on 19th Jan 2017 <p>Environmental and social screening form for water and safety in mining sites at Chepkarat Gold mining signed and stamped by Senior Environment Officer on 14/04/2017.</p> <p>Mitigation measures were planned for in the screening forms for the above projects.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG did not integrate environmental and social management plans in contract bid documents that were viewed at the time of assessment Example the BOQ for construction of production store/plant clinic at Amudat district HQs for FY 16/17 did not have environmental and social safeguards integrated.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proof of land ownership and land titles of projects implemented on land were not available at the time of assessment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were no environmental and social mitigation Certificate forms that were available at the time of assessment



LGPA 2017/18

Educational Performance Measures

Amudat District

(Vote Code: 581)

Score 45/100 (45%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				
1	<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Amudat Local Government Performance Contract FY 2017/18, 131 teachers for 16 schools have been budgeted for. Some schools have less than 7 teachers due to the gap left by the 33 teachers as reported by the DEO in his status report of 18/10/17 to the CAO.
2	<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% score 6 If 80 - 99% score 3 If below 80% score 0 	3	<p>Wage bill provides for 131 teachers for 16 schools but Amudat has filled 73% of teachers positions as evidenced in the letter of 22nd June from DEO to the CAO requesting for replacement</p>

3	<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only 1/5 of the Inspector of Education positions provided for in the approved structure is filled. This is evidenced by the letter from the DEO to the CAO on 8/10/17
4	<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of Primary Teachers: score 2</p>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Verified the evidence from the letter of 22/06/17 from the DEO to the CAO requesting for replacement of 33 teachers and Minute 7 of the agenda the District Technical Planning Committee (DTPC) meeting of 29/01/18 approving the request
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of School Inspectors: score 2</p>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Verified the evidence from the letter s of 02/05/17 from the DEO to the CAO respectively requesting for replacement of1 Inspector of Schools who was replaced in May 20 Minute 7 of the Agenda of the District Technical Planning Committee (DTPC) meeting of 29/01/18 approving the request

5	<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY • 100% school inspectors: score 3</p>	0	<p>No appraisal of Inspector of Schools had been done by the time of the assessment. There is only 1 Inspector of Schools at Amudat District, file ref. no: CR/156/1, appointed on the 18/04/2017 as per DSC minute extract no: 189/ADSC/2017.</p> <p>By the time of the assessment exercise, the probationary appraisal for the Inspector of Schools had not yet been done.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised head teachers during the previous FY. • 90% - 100%: score 3 • 70% - 89%: score 2 • Below 70%: score 0</p>	2	<p>There are 11 government aided schools in Amudat district with 11 head teachers. Four (4) schools are headed by Substantive Head Teachers while 7 are headed by Head Teachers Appointed by CAO on duty by Assignment.</p> <p>The 4 Substantive Head Teachers were duly appraised for calendar year 2016 and were in the process of completing their appraisal forms for calendar year 2017 in readiness for appraisal. Their appraisal reports for calendar year 2016 (PS Form 5) were endorsed by the Sub-county Chiefs, Chairmen School Management Committees and reviewed and approved by the DEO. A sample of 4 files of Head Teachers performance appraisal forms (PS Form 5) were verified as indicated below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CR/AMT/166/098 2. CR/NPT/166/1634 3. CR/AMT/166/070 4. CR/AMT/166/033
Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection				

6

The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools

Maximum 3 for this performance measure

• Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1

1

Verified evidence from the following communications:

- Guideline to School charges of 24/10/17 by the P/S MOES forwarded to DEO on 24/10/17
- Warning against non-declaration private (non- UPE) candidates in schools of 25/04/17 by the Executive Secretary UNEB to Head Teachers forwarded by the DEO.
- Release of 2017 PLE results of 12/01/18 to all Head Teachers with PLE exam Centres through the DEO (This communication was received by the HT of Kalas Girls P/S on 22/01/18)
- National Registration for all learners in all schools and institutions aged 5 years and above during holidays by the P/S MOLG on 4/12/17 CAO for onward forwarding to DEO and H/Ts

Verified evidence from the following communications:

- Invitation to attend DEOs dialogue of 13/06/17 by P/S MOES
- National Integrated Early Childhood Development Program monitoring and support supervision activity of 10/05/17 by the P/S MOES that took place on 15/05/17.
- Teacher support supervision in schools of 30/06/17 by the P/S MOES.
- School feeding program Education Institutions circular of 15/05/17 by the P/S MOES to CAOs.
- Meeting with the Primary /School Head Teachers about guidance to schools curriculum on 19/01/17 for the purpose of discussion of the following policies

? Utilisation of UPE funds

? Management of Food provided by WFP

• Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level, including on school feeding: score 2

2

? Determining the Parents' contribution towards education costs

• Was attended among others by:

? Head teachers

? Dean of students

? Deputy Head Teacher

? District Secretary for Education

? Chairperson Education Committee

? RDC

? LC5 Chairperson

? Deputy CAO

? DEO

Verified the evidence from the following District inspection reports of 2016/17 submitted by the CAO received by the SIS/DES on the following dates:

• 14/10/16 Quarter 1 report, 82% of school were supervised

• 17/01/17 quarter 2 report 73 % of schools submitted 73%

• 7/07/17 Quarter 3 report % of schools supervised was not given.

• 7/7/17 Quarter 4 report 66 % of schools inspected 66%

On average 73.7% of schools were inspected

Verified evidence from the following disciplinary cases which were as a result of recommendations from the inspection reports

• Letter of warning from the DEO on 16/12/17 to HT Kalas Girls P/S for locking up an alleged defiler in his house

• Letter of warning from the DEO on 5/10/16 for absconding duty

7	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all private and public primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all private and public primary schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59% score 1 o Below 50% score 0. 	6	<p>Verified the evidence from the following District inspection reports of 2016/17 submitted by the CAO received by the SIS/DES on the following dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 14/10/16 Quarter 1 report, 82% of school were supervised 17/01/17 quarter 2 report 73 % of schools submitted 73% 7/07/17 Quarter 3 report % of schools supervised was not given. 7/7/17 Quarter 4 report 66 % of schools inspected 66% <p>On average 73.7% of schools were inspected</p>
8	<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence of any departmental meetings to discuss the recommendations from the inspection reports
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 	2	<p>Verified evidence by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The letter of acknowledgment by DES for receipt of annual school census report 2015 Letter of acknowledgement of 11/01/18 for receipt of data on students enrolment by P/S MOES from the CAO

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4 	4	<p>Verified evidence from the following disciplinary cases which were as a result of recommendations from the inspection reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter of warning from the DEO on 16/12/17 to HT Kalas Girls P/S for locking up an alleged defiler in his house <p>Letter of warning from the DEO on 5/10/16 for absconding duty</p>
9	<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5 	0	<p>Amudat District did not submit EMIS statistical forms in 2016/17 because NIRA had taken up this responsibility as evidenced by the following communications between P/S ST, NIRA, OPM and MOES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ref Submission of Education Sector Budget Frame Work for 2017/18 to NIRA dated 7/12/17 by P/S MOES Ref: BPD/48/179/01, Preparation of data for preparation of IPFs for 2018/19 to all accounting officers by P/S ST Ref: NIRA/ED/25/11/1 on 24/11/17 by ED NIRA to P?S ST
		<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5</p>	0	<p>Amudat District did not submit EMIS statistical forms in 2016/17 because NIRA had taken up this responsibility as evidenced by the following communications between P/S ST, NIRA, OPM and MOES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ref Submission of Education Sector Budget Frame Work for 2017/18 to NIRA dated 7/12/17 by P/S MOES Ref: BPD/48/179/01, Preparation of data for preparation of IPFs for 2018/19 to all accounting officers by P/S ST <p>Ref: NIRA/ED/25/11/1 on 24/11/17 by ED NIRA to P/S ST</p>

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc... during the previous FY: score 2 	0	<p>No documented evidence that the Social Services Council Committee (responsible for education on top of other social sectors) met in FY 2016/17 to discuss education service delivery issues including departmental quarterly updates on challenges and recommendations, priorities and plans, budgets and expenditures, results from performance assessments, inspection and monitoring.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2 	0	<p>No minutes of the district council meetings (25th/7/2016, 11th/11/2016 and 14th/10/2016) showed deliberations that indicated that representatives of the Social Services Council Committee presented education sector issues to council for approval.</p>
11	<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO) • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80% schools: score 0</p>	5	<p>Verified evidence from the minutes of the SMC meetings that are signed by the H/T and were conducted on the following dates at KALAS Primary school visited during the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 14/07/17 14/11/17 07/12/17
12	<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	0	<p>No evidence of any publications was seen at the district nor at the notice boards of any of the individual schools visited during the assessment.</p>

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

13	<p>The LG Education department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	<p>4</p> <p>Verified evidence from the following procurement requests for FY 2016/17 submitted by the DEO to the DPU and confirmed by the CAO on 18/01/17;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a two units teachers' house, installation of a water harvesting tank of 6000 litres and lightening arrestors at Katikit P/S • Construction of VIP Latrine at Karita Primary School with an office, installation of a water harvesting tank of 6000 litres at a lightening arrestor at Nabitoktom P/S. • Construction a 3 stance VIP latrine at Kalas Girls School • Completion of a two classroom block installation of water harvesting tank of 6000 litres and lightening arrestor of Loped P/S • Supply of 72 desks to Lobedok P/S • Supply of 72 desks to Nabokotom P/S • Supply of 72 desks at Katabok P/S
----	---	--	--

14	<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	3	<p>There was evidence that the LG education department timely certified and recommended suppliers for payment as per contract. For example;</p> <p>Request from Omaniman agencies and suppliers Ltd for retention fees for construction of a 4 unit staff house at Akorikeya P/S dated 24/10/2016, was certified on 27/10/2017 and paid on 21/11/2016.</p> <p>Also request from Lim mip United enterprises for retention for building a two classroom block at Karita P/S dated 15/2/2017 was forwarded on 1/3/2017 and paid on 1/3/2017.</p> <p>Furthermore, request from MRAF Enterprises for retention of construction of a two unit staff house and kitchen at Lokales P/S dated 26/1/2017 was forwarded for payment on 7/2/2017 and paid on 9/2/2017.</p> <p>Most of the documents for capital development in the education department were certified and initiated for payment by the DEO on time.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				
15	<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	0	<p>According to the LG Planner's records and evidence from the Q4 Consolidated APR for the FY 2016/17, while the education department submitted inputs to the planning unit for all 4 quarters for FY 2016/17 (i.e. Q1 - 21st/11/2016 Receipt No: 0092; Q2 – 6th/3/2017 Receipt No: 0457; Q3 – 25th/5/2017 Receipt No: 0766; and Q4 – 18th/8/2017 Receipt No: 4561), the submissions were sometimes slow, hence the late submission of the Q4 APR (meant to be submitted before 31st/7/2017).</p>

16	<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 4 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points o If all queries are not responded to score 0 	0	<p>The education sector had a number of Internal audit queries in FY 2016/17. E.g. Ichumar Lawrence driver education department had un accounted for funds of 870,000 Ugx and Benton Luke (DEO) had un accounted for funds of Ugx 3,229,000. However, there was no evidence that the queries were responded to by the education department. . Copies of letters of follow up on audit queries copied to Ag. District Internal auditor were available dated 23/1/2018 and 22/1/2018 signed by CAO -Amudat. However, there was no follow up of internal audit queries in financial year 2016/17.</p>
----	---	---	---	--

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

17	<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc....: Score 2 	2	<p>Verified the evidence from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circular No. 01/2015 of 24/01/15 to CAOs by P/S MOES regarding menstrual hygiene management in schools
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2 	2	<p>Verified the evidence from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report of meeting of H/Teachers & Deputies at the beginning of 1st term 2017 • Joint schools monitoring report of 23/11/ 17 by the District Speaker
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	1	<p>Verified evidence from the sample of the two schools visited namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kalas Girls P/S P/ 3/6 member the Founding body (Catholic Church) are female • Kalas Boys P/S 3/6 members from Founding body (COU) are female

18	<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 3:	0	<p>There was no evidence to show that Education Department in collaboration with Environment department had issued any guidelines on environmental management.</p>
----	--	---	---	--



LGPA 2017/18

Health Performance Measures

Amudat District

(Vote Code: 581)

Score 45/100 (45%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human resource planning and management				
1	<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY • More than 80% filled: score 6 points, • 60 – 80% - score 3 • Less than 60% filled: score 0</p>	0	<p>Only 36% (42/153) of the positions health facilities of Amudat district are substantively filled with a wage bill. Remaining positions with no wage bill have not been advertised</p>
2	<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 4</p>	0	<p>No recruitment plan or request was available at the office of the DHO or the HR.</p>
3	<p>The LG Health department has ensured that performance appraisal for health facility in charge is conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the health facility in-charge have been appraised during the previous FY: o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<p>There is no government aided hospital in the district. The district is served by Amudat Hospital which is a PNFP facility under the Church of Uganda. The Medical Superintendent however, was appointed as Vote Controller by CAO. Under this arrangement, the CAO is supposed to appraise the DHO, but by the time of the assessment exercise, the performance appraisal had not yet been conducted</p>

4	<p>The Local Government Health department has equitably deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers equitably, in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY: score 4 	4	<p>Health workers are deployed equitably at sampled health facilities (Amudat Hospital, Amudat Health Center II and Alakas Health Center II. Although the staff on the deployment list matched with staff in the PBS, gross staffing gaps existed at the sampled health units.</p>
---	--	--	---	--

Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision

5	<p>The DHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 	0	<p>Guidelines including Malaria management guidelines 2016, National HIV/AIDS monitoring and evaluation 2015/2016-2019-2020, Uganda Clinical guidelines 2016, Consolidated guidelines for prevention and treatment of HIV in Uganda 2016, Integrated Disease surveillance and response (IDSR) guidelines 2016 had been provided. However there was no documentation at the DHOs office showing communication of these guidelines provided in the 2016/2017 FY to health facilities</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	0	<p>No minutes of DHT or quarterly review meetings meeting minutes during the previous FY were accessible at the Office of the DHO. We could therefore not establish if guidelines, policies and circulars were explained to health facility in charges.</p>
6	<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3</p>	3	<p>This is not applicable. Below Amudat Hospital are the two HC IIIs, Karita and Loro. There is no HC IV in Amudat. No support supervision report was available at the office of the DHO at the time this assessment was carried out to at least the HSD located at Amudat Hospital.</p>

		<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY: • If 100% supervised: score 3 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	3	<p>According to facility records, supervision to lower level health facilities from the DHT doubled as the HSD supervision. The very low staffing levels at the LG does not provide enough flexibility for the DHT and HSD to carry out this activity independent of each other. At the time of the the assessment, the acting DHOs office was located at the HSD (Amudat Mission Hospital) which had carried out supervision to Alakas HC II and Amudat HC II.</p>
7	<p>The Health Sub-district(s) have effectively provided support supervision to lower level health units</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities have been supervised by HSD and reports produced: • If 100% supervised score 6 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 4 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 2 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	6	<p>The HSD in Amudat is located at the <i>Amudat Mission Hospital</i>. Due to the very long distance to Karita HC III (70 km away), it was not logistically feasible to sample and visit this facility. According to the support supervision book at Amudat Health Center II and Alakas Health Center II (in the supervision book on 24/08/2016 and 22/02/2017) health facilities were supervised by members of the DHT. However this could only be accessed at the health facilities. Reports at the HSD were not accessible.</p>
8	<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</p> <p>• Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</p>	0	<p>Both support supervision reports and minutes of DHT meetings were not available at DHOs office which also doubled as the HSD located at Amudat Hospital. Proof of follow up of these discussions was therefore not possible.</p> <p>We could not confirm the follow up of recommendations from support supervision reports since there was no report to act as a reference point for this indicator and minutes of DHT meetings or any equivalent documentation was not available.</p>

9	<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for health facility lists as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10 	10	<p>A list of health facilities was found at the office of the HR although this missed at the DHOs office. However the consistency was verified by comparison of health facilities reporting to the LG through DHIS2 and the list at the HR's office.</p>
---	--	---	----	--

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	0	<p>No documented evidence that the district council and the Social Services Council Committee (responsible for health on top of other social sectors) met in FY 2016/17 to discuss health service delivery issues such departmental quarterly updates on challenges and recommendations, priorities and plans, budgets and expenditures, results from performance assessments, supervision and monitoring.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	0	<p>No minutes of the district council meetings (25th/7/2016, 11th/11/2016 and 14th/10/2016)) showed deliberations that indicated that representatives of the Social Services Council Committee presented health sector issues to council for approval.</p>
11	<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 5 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5 If 80-99% : score 3 If 70-79%: : score 1 If less than 70%: score 0 	0	<p>Only Alakas HCII had record of HUMC meetings held over the FY 2016/2016 among the sampled health units. These meetings were not held quarterly as required by the guidelines due to lack of funds (Amudat HCII and Amudat Hospital) had no record HUMC meeting minutes according to the officer delegated.</p>

12	<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	3	<p>A copy of all funds released to the LG during first and second quarter 2017 were displayed at the door of the CFO. This included PHC release worth Ugx. 42,527,589./= signed 08/09/2017 by the CAO. Ugx 39,064,150/= of which were for lower level health facilities.</p>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				
13	<p>The LG Health department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2 	2	<p>The procurement plan for completion of a maternity at Karita health center III estimated at Ugx. 76,537,700 was submitted on 30/06/2017. This is the only planned investment for the current FY.</p>
		<p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	2	<p>The submission and approval of procurement of a maternity ward at Karita HC III was submitted to PDU and approved on 21/08/2018. The copy of the request is available at the Procurement and disposal Unit of the LG.</p>
14	<p>The LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% - score 8 70-99% – score 4 Below 70% - score 0 	8	<p>Receipts/ delivery notes available at the office of the district stores, managed by the store keeper were available. The delivery notes indicated that supply of medicines was made on 20/09/2016, 21/10/2016, 20/11/2016, 22/01/2017, 20/03/2017, 22/05/2017. The store keeper at the LG headquarter signed off delivery notes whose copies were available at the medicines stores at the district headquarters.</p>

15	<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 2 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points 	2	<p>There was evidence that the DHO timely certified and recommended suppliers for payment as per contract. For example; Request for funds for completion of a theatre at Karita Health centre III dated 21/4/2017 was forwarded for payment by DHO on 26/4/2017 and paid on 26/6/2017.</p> <p>Furthermore, request for payment by Amudat small scale traders of retention on construction of maternity ward at Loroo H/C III dated 19/12/2016 was cleared and forwarded on 11/1/2017 and paid on 15/2/2017.</p> <p>Request for payment by Kawama general enterprises for completion of 2 kitchen and 2 stance latrine at Achorichor dated 2/11/2016 was forwarded by DHO on 8/11/2016 and paid on 10/11/2016.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				
16	<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	0	<p>According to the LG Planner's records and evidence from the Q4 Consolidated APR for the FY 2016/17, while the health department submitted inputs to the planning unit for all 4 quarters for FY 2016/17 (i.e. Q1 - 21st/11/2016 Receipt No: 0092; Q2 – 6th/3/2017 Receipt No: 0457; Q3 – 25th/5/2017 Receipt No: 0766; and Q4 – 18th/8/2017 Receipt No: 4561), the submissions were sometimes slow, hence the late submission of the Q4 APR (meant to be submitted before 31st/7/2017).</p>

17	<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year • If sector has no audit query score 4 • If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points • If all queries are not responded to score 0</p>	0	<p>The health sector had many internal audit queries as seen below; Echulu Jimmy (Ag. District engineer) had unaccounted for funds of Ugx 24,400,000, Chemutai Alfred (enrolled nurse) unaccounted for funds of 9,530,000 Ugx, and Elimu Simon (District health inspector) unaccounted for funds 19,802,000 Ugx and Doctor Sagaki (Ag. DHO) unaccounted for funds 6,432,000 Ugx. However, there was no evidence of responses to these internal audit queries. . Copies of letters of follow up on audit queries copied to Ag.District Internal auditor were available dated 23/1/2018 and 22/1/2018 signed by CAO -Amudat. However, there was no follow up in financial year 2016/17.</p>
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				
18	<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2 • Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2 	2	<p>Although the HUMCs were not fully functional, they met gender composition of at least a contribution of 30% females. This can be verified at Alakas HC II and Amudat HC II.</p>
19	<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LGs has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal : score 2 points. 	0	<p>The LG had not issued guidelines on medical waste disposal to health facilities. The team could not establish if these had been issued by the Ministry of Health since the DHO was not at the office at the time of the assessment and the delegated staff could not confirm this.</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Amudat District

(Vote Code: 581)

Score 61/100 (61%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: score 10 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Annual Work Plan and Budget of Amudat for FY 2017/18 was not found on file in the District Water Office.
2	<p>The LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY: score 15 	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Safe Water Coverage data for Amudat District LG show that the district has safe water access of 51%. Hence, only two sub counties were below district safe water access coverage; Loroo S/C-43%, and Karita S/C-48%. In the annual progress report for quarter one of FY2016/17 submitted to MoWE on 10th November 2016, Amudat DLG allocated drilling of boreholes in both Loroo S/C and Karita S/C; Kakough LC.1 village, Loroo S/C Lopoyin LC.1 village, Loroo S/C Ngorpiliomogh LC.1 village, Loroo S/C Kanganoi LC.1 village, Karita S/C
Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision				

3	<p>The LG Water department carries out monthly monitoring and supervision of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually. • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15 • 80 - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10 • 70 - 79%: score 7 • 60 - 69% monitored: score 5 • 50 - 59%: score 3 • Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored -score 0</p>	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring of WSS facilities in Amudat is done by both political and technical team for instance, the works committee monitored water facilities in Amudat S/C, Loroo S/c and Karita S/C on 18th December 2017. • Also, inspection report for the construction of solar powered mini piped water supply at Alakas Amudat S/C by the Assistant Water Engineering Officer was submitted to DWO on 8th august 2017. • From the assessor's analysis, 98% of the WSS facilities were monitored annually by the DWO.
4	<p>The LG Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: o List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Safe Water Coverage data for Amudat District LG show that the district has safe water access of 51%, Amudat S/C-53%, Amudat TC-73%, Loroo S/C-43%, and Karita S/C-48%. • This was similar to the MIS report that shows that Amudat DLG has safe water coverage of 50%, Amudat S/C-53%, Amudat TC-73%, Loroo S/C-43%, and Karita S/C-48%.

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

5	<p>The LG Water department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement requests from DWO were submitted on time before April 30th 2017 for instance; • Construction of a 4-stance pit latrine at Alakas Rural Growth Centre in FY 2017/18 was initiated by the District Water Officer on 10th March 2017 and received by the Procurement Office on the same date. • Also completion of Alakas piped water system was initiated and submitted by the DWO to the Procurement Office on 10th March 2017. • Also drilling of 2 production wells in Amudat district was initiated by DWO and submitted to Procurement office on 10th March 2017. • Drilling and installation of 5 deep wells in Amudat district was initiated by DWO and submitted to Procurement Office on 10th March 2017. • Rehabilitation of 20 boreholes in Amudat district was initiated by DWO and submitted to Procurement Office on 10th March 2017. • Lastly, siting of 7 deep wells in Amudat district was initiated by DWO and submitted to Procurement Office on 10th March 2017.
6	<p>The DWO has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the DWO prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DWO prepared a contract management Plan and was submitted to Amudat District CAO on 17th January 2018 and is referenced CR/116/ • The plan shows a list of activities conducted since the procurement advert was run in the New Vision on 6th December 2017 up to commissioning of projects by the RDC in May 2018.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through field visits on 31st January 2018 at Alakas piped water supply system, Alakas borehole and Naremit boreholes all found in Amudat S/C, it was found out the designs were found similar with what is mentioned in their Bills of Quantities.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No hand over reports of completed projects were found on file.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only 1 interim payment certificate dated 08th January 2018 for the construction of Alakas Solar powered mini piped water supply system phase 1 in FY 2016/17 was seen by the assessor. Contractor: Geomax Water and Mineral Consultants Ltd under contract No.Amud 581/Wrks/16-17/ 00010. • No payment certificates or completion reports for other WSS projects were found on file in the DWO.
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	3	<p>There was evidence that the DWOs timely certified and recommended suppliers for payment as per contract. For example; Request from Kaalo hand pump mechanic association for payment for rehabilitation of 15 boreholes dated 22/9/2016, was forwarded for payment by DWO on 23/9/2016 and paid on 30/9/2016.</p> <p>Other payment vouchers were mainly for facilitation and could not qualify for comparison.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				

8	<p>The LG Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	0	<p>According to the LG Planner's records and evidence from the Q4 Consolidated APR for the FY 2016/17, while the water department submitted inputs to the planning unit for all 4 quarters for FY 2016/17 (i.e. Q1 - 21st/11/2016 Receipt No: 0092; Q2 – 6th/3/2017 Receipt No: 0457; Q3 – 25th/5/2017 Receipt No: 0766; and Q4 – 18th/8/2017 Receipt No: 4561), the submissions were sometimes slow, hence the late submission of the Q4 APR (meant to be submitted before 31st/7/2017).</p>
9	<p>LG Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 5 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 If queries are not responded to score 0 	0	<p>There was no evidence that the sector had provided information to internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year. Also there was no evidence of responses to internal audit queries by the water department. Copies of letters of follow up on audit queries copied to Ag.District Internal auditor were available dated 23/1/2018 and 22/1/2018 signed by CAO -Amudat. However, there was no follow up in financial year 2016/17.</p>

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3 	0	<p>No documented evidence that the Technical Services and Works Committee (responsible for water on top of other works related sectors) met in FY 2016/17 to discuss water service delivery issues including departmental quarterly updates on challenges and recommendations, priorities and plans, budgets and expenditures, results from performance assessments constructions and O&M, supervision and monitoring, etc.</p>
----	--	--	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	0	No minutes of the district council meetings (25th/7/2016, 11th/11/2016 and 14th/10/2016) showed deliberations that indicated that representatives of the Technical Services and Works Committee presented water sector issues to council for approval.
11	<p>The LG Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Assessor saw on Amudat DLG noticeboard, information on Water Development Grant releases. From a copy on noticeboard, it can be seen that Uganda Central Government releases for Quarter 1 of FY2017/2018 published by the office of the district CAO was Ugshs 140,677,363 for District Water Grant while the Sanitation & Hygiene Grant was Ugshs 6,879,300.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two boreholes were visited on Wednesday 31/01/2018 and the assessor found out that they were clearly labelled i.e During the field visits on Tuesday 30th January 2018, the assessor visited 4 boreholes that is; Alakas village, Amudat S/C and Naremit S/C in Amudat S/C.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on tenders and contract awards was not seen on Amudat LG noticeboard.

12	Participation of communities in WSS programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One application letter for a borehole was seen for Tokoghogn village, Katobok parish, Amudat S/C dated 17/08/2017. However, there was no evidence of payment of community contribution fee of Ughshs 200,000 as per the sector critical requirements.
	Maximum 3 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O&M funds and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, for the current FY: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no physical report seen confirming the functioning of WSCs with evidence of O&M funds being collected in the current FY 2017/18.

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

13	The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Assessor found out from the office of Environment and Natural resources had done environmental screening on 3rd August 2017 for many water projects for FY 2017/18 forinsatance; Ngaripimogli bore hole of Loroo S/C, Tingas borehole of Amudat TC, Pamba borehole of Amudat S/C, Lopoyiri borehole of Loroo S/C, Dingdinga borehole of Amudat S/C, Chepoi borehole of Amudat S/C, Kangekenoi borehole of Amudat S/C
	Maximum 4 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DWO indicated that there has never been cases of unacceptable environmental concerns in the FY 2016/17.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction contracts never had a clause on environmental protection for instance; A contract No.Amud 581/Wrks/16-17/ 00010 for construction of a solar powered mini piped water supply at Alakas awarded to Geomax Water and Mineral Consultants Ltd on 26th June 2017 never had the above clause.
14	<p>The LG Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If at least 50% WSCs are women as per the sector critical requirements: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessor never saw a list of WSCs at both the District Water Office and field visit.
15	<p>Gender- and special-needs sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/RGCs.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No public sanitation facilities was budgeted for and constructed in the FY 2016/17. In the AWP for the current FY 2017/18, a public latrine has been planned and procurement works are ongoing. Hence, it was not possible to visit any public sanitation facility to verify access and separate stances for men, women & PwDs.