



LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Amuria District

(Vote Code: 565)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	3	50%
No	3	50%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
<p>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.</p>	xxx	<p>The District submitted a Draft Performance Contract for FY 2017/2018 on 26th April 2017 and issued with a receipt (No. 0573) by MoFPED; and then a Final Performance Contract on 4th July 2017 (<i>as per Submission Schedule of MoFPED</i>).</p> <p>The submission of the Final Performance Contract was done after the mandatory deadline of 30th June 2017.</p>	No
Assessment area: Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	xxxxx	<p>Amuria District Local Government has a Budget for FY 2017/2018; including a Procurement Plan for FY 2017/2018</p>	Yes
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			
<p>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)</p>	xxxxx	<p>The Annual and Quarterly Budget Performance Report for FY 2016/2017 was submitted on 2nd August 2017 (Receipt No. 0879) issued by MoFPED. The submission was made after the deadline of 31st July 2017.</p>	No

LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)

xxxxxx

All the four Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for FY 2016/2017 were submitted to MoFPED as indicated below:

o Quarter One submitted on 28th November 2016 (Receipt No. 0123) issued by MoFPED.

o Quarter Two submitted on 3rd March 2017 (Receipt No. 0453) issued by MoFPED.

o Quarter Three submitted on 29th May 2017 (Receipt No. 0773) issued by MoFPED.

o Quarter Four submitted on 2nd August 2017 (Receipt No. 0879) issued by MoFPED.

All quarterly reports were submitted late. The requirement is that quarterly reports should be submitted by the end of the following month after the end of each quarter.

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>xxxxx</p>	<p>Responses were submitted to the Permanent Secretary/ Secretary to the Treasury (PS/ST) before 30th April 2017.</p> <p>a. Two queries raised by the Auditor General that is; i) Unaccounted for funds; and ii) Uncompleted civil works were responded to in the response dated 3rd March 2017.</p> <p>b. One query raised by the Internal Auditor General (Unaccounted for funds) was also responded to in the response dated 3rd March 2017.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>xxxxx</p>	<p>Unqualified audit opinion for FY 2016/17</p>	<p>Yes</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Amuria District

(Vote Code: 565)

Score 40/100 (40%)

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: • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 2.</p> <p>• All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2.</p>	0	<p>There is a functional Physical Planning Committee; and minutes of two meetings held on 11th April 2017 and 19th June 2017 were availed.</p> <p>Also, a Registration Book is in place. However, much as the date of submission is indicated, there is no column for 'date of approval'. THEREFORE, it was not possible to establish whether the committee considers new investments within 28 days.</p> <p>There is no District Physical Development Plan for the entire Amuria. Therefore, the consistency of the plans of all new infrastructure investments with the Physical Development Plans cannot be ascertained as some investments are outside areas that have Physical Development Plans</p> <p>Nonetheless, there is / are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Urban Physical Development Plan for Amuria Town Council • Local Physical Development Plans for the Town Boards of Asamuk, Obalang, Kapelabyong, Orungo, Wera, and Akore,
2	<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</p>	<p>• Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.</p>	0	<p>The Budget Conference Report was not availed.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>The capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for FY 2017/2018 are derived from the approved Five-Year Development Plan (2015/2016 – 2019/2020). For example, under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health, there is renovation of maternity ward and construction of staff house at Agonga HC II are derived from the DDP for Amuria (Pages 188 - 190). Education, there is construction of a two-classroom block at Agereger is derived from the DDP for Amuria (Pages 184) .
		<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. 	0	<p>Projects were proposed by respective HoD after receiving the budget circular. However, respective profiles for approved projects were never discussed in DTPC much as it is functional.</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. 	0	<p>The Statistical Abstract for 2016/2017 was not available.</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>The infrastructure projects implemented during 2016/2017 were derived from AWP and Budget approved by the District Council. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction work in Ogwarat Primary School, Construction of a laboratory in Obalang Seed Secondary School <p>(Refer to Budget Performance Report – Pp. 142-184)</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 	2	Not all investment projects implemented in FY 2016/2017 were completed as per work plan by end of FY - 32 projects out of 33 (97%) were completed. For instance, Construction of Water Supply System (P. 175 of Fourth Quarter Performance Report for FY 2016/2017).
5	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	<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	There were thirty-three investment projects implemented during FY 2016/2017. Thirty-two projects were completed. However, one project was not completed i.e. Construction of Water Supply System which had a budget of UGX 140,000,000 but only UGX 38,626,000 had been utilized
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.	<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	Amuria district budgeted UGX 875,724,018, and spent UGX 875,724,018 on O&M during 2016/2017. This is 100% of the budget for O&M [as per Reports and Financial Statements for the Year Ended 30th June 2017 – Pp. 67 - 68]
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				
6	LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some staff files could not be accessed as they were with DSC for purposes of promotion and others to relocate to the new upcoming district of kapelebyong
	Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some HODs were arrested and convicted some have served their term and appealed. So there positions cannot be filled. CAO is following up. Other positions like the senior procurement officer was vacant. The DSC was created in 2016/17, it had been disbanded in 2014/15, so the district could not recruit. They could not recruit because of legal actions Not all the positions of HODs are filled as per the staff structures

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

- Letter to CAO 16th June 2017 for action on minute extraction of the 57th meeting of DSC
 - Letter to CAO for action on minute extraction of the 56th meeting of DSC
 - Minutes of DSC 25 – 28TH April 2017 MIN 03/AMUR/DCS/04/2017
 - Minutes of DSC 19TH/04/2017 , MIN 03/AMUR/DSC/04/2017
 - Minutes of DSC 23RD March 2017
 - Minutes of DSC 14TH Dec 2016. Min 03,04,05,06,
- 100% staff submitted for recruitment were considered

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

1

- Letter to CAO 16th June 2017 for action on minute extraction of the 57th meeting of DSC
 - Letter to CAO for action on minute extraction of the 56th meeting of DSC
 - Minutes of district service commission 8th and 14th June 2017 min 05/AMUR/DSC/06/2017, min 01,
 - Minutes of DSC held on 17th, 22nd 23rd, 30th Nov 2016, minutes of DSC 6TH SEPT 2016
- 100% staff submitted for confirmation were considered

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

1

- Report on rewards and sanctions dated 24th /11/2016
 - Report on rewards and sanctions dated 13th 12/2016
 - Minutes of DSC 8th and 14th June 2017 minute 10/AMUR/DSC/06/2017
 - MIN DSC/AMUR/07/06/2017
- 100% staff submitted for disciplinary action where considered

8	<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • 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 	<p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all staff accessed the payroll because the district had to work with the ministry of public service to create their positions and ministry of finance to create supplier numbers so as to be able to be put on payroll. this takes some time so they were not seen on the payroll two months after appointments • Not all staff accessed the payroll because the district had to work with the ministry of public service to create their positions and ministry of finance to create supplier numbers so as to be able to be put on payroll. <p>these have not accessed the payroll to date</p>
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. 	<p>2</p>	<p>Own Source Revenue increased from UGX 191,835,298 to UGX 206,488,489 in FY 2015/16 and 2016/17 respectively. This translates into 7.6% increase which is between 5% and 10%. Therefore, 2 point score.</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. 	<p>2</p>	<p>Own Source Revenue was budgeted at UGX 203,337,000 in the FY 2016/17 and the actual collection was UGX 206,488,489. This translates into 1.5%. Therefore, 2 point score.</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>The district received a total of UGX 69,507,500 from Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development between July and October 2016 as local revenue (Local Service Tax) for FY 2016/17. Out of this, UGX 24,273,375 (35.3%) was remitted to LLGs. This is contrary to Section 85 (4) of the Local Governments Act, CAP 243, and Regulation 39(2) of the Local Government (Financial and Accounting Regulations) 2007 which requires 65% to be remitted to LLGs. Therefore, zero score.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2 	0	<p>UGX 58,751,000 was spent on council operations during FY 2016/17. It is more than UGX 38,367,060 (20% of actual local revenue of FY 2015/16 - UGX 191,835,298 X 20%). This is contrary to the First Schedule of the Local Governments Act, CAP 243, requires that expenditure on council activities should not be more than 20% of the total local revenue collection of the previous financial year. Therefore, zero score.</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 position of Senior Procurement officer is vacant and not yet recruited. The Procurement officer is present with an Assistant.
		<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"> Minutes are present (9No) and contracts committee reports seen (8 No) for 2016/2017.
		<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"> Minutes are present; deviation was with the renovation of the chairman's house. The committee looked at the submission and rejected the report on the basis of the BOQ price was different from the Bid submission sheet. 14th March 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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AWP is missing in the procurement unit • AWP got planned for 169KM of road including periodic maintenance but only one road Amuria-Wera was included and Rehabilitation of Asamuk-Abarella road. • Most of the missing planned infrastructure is attributed to the Force on account projects.
14	<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invitation of bids in the advert was on 8th September 2017. Committee sat on the 5th of September 2017. 100% of all the bids were done in September and this is beyond the August 30 deadline.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contracts register of 2016/17 is available and up to date. Sampled projects for amount above 50 million included.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opening bidding advert is filed and seen for projects above 50 million. Publishing bid notice is 26th Sept 2016 Selective bidding for projects below 30 and 50 million seen dated 26th Sept 2016 Letter of invitation under selective bidding is presented dated 16th Jan 2017. Rehabilitation of Asamuk-Abarilela road Contract sum 117,577,383 UGX (Open domestic bidding) Low Cost sealing of Amuria-Wera road contract price 438,387,884 (Open domestic bidding) Construction of Kitchen and completion of Theatre contract sum 61,113,439 (Open domestic bidding) Construction of 5 stance pit latrine Amugei primary school contract price 15,840,762 (selective bidding) Construction of 5 stance pit latrine Ogwarat primary school contract price 14,915,918 (selective bidding)
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"> Interim certificates present and signed by the District Engineer. Example payment certificate on 18th May 2017 and Examined on the 22th May 2017 for a road project. Final completion certificated for selected 5 projects and signed by CAO and District Engineer on dates 28th Dec 2016, 10th Jan 2017, 16th May 2017, 30th May 2017 and 16th June 2017.
		<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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No project currently has a site board
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>i. There are up to date bank reconciliation statements up to December 2017.</p> <p>ii. IFMS helps the bank reconciliation process with the system making it easy to identify and report items for reconciliation.</p> <p>Therefore, score 4.</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>While the LG makes timely payments to most suppliers, some bills remain unsettled beyond the mandatory 60 days period as follows;</p> <p>a. Food service provider – Jeremaya Enterprises Ltd;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Date of food supply – 26th June 2017 o Date of request – 13th July 2017 o Date of approval – 17th July 2017 o Not yet paid (as at 17th January 2018) <p>b. Repairs of motor cycles and vehicles – Agaza Motors Ltd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Date of repairs – 25th October 2017 o Date of request – 25th Oct 2017 o Date of approval – 10th Nov 2017 o Not yet paid (as at 17th January 2018) <p>Therefore, zero score.</p>

The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.

- Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor and produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 3.

0

i. There is no Substantive Senior Internal Auditor.

ii. Quarterly reports are produced on time but there are significant delays in submitting the reports as follows;

- 4th Quarter – dated 29th August 2017 was submitted on 16th October 2017
- 3rd Quarter – dated 15th April 2017 was submitted on 11th August 2017
- 2nd Quarter – dated 15th January 2017 was submitted on 30th August 2017
- 1st Quarter – dated 15th October 2016 was submitted on 23/12/2016

Therefore, score zero.

- 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

• No evidence of implementation of internal audit findings and therefore, nothing reported to council and LG PAC.

• Reviewed Finance, Administration, Planning and Investment Committee reports of; 30th Sept 2016, 20th December 2016, and 30th March 2017, no such business was discussed in the committee. Therefore. score zero.

- 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

1

Internal audit reports were submitted to CAO and LG PAC on time as follows;

- i. 4th Quarter – 29th August 2017 (CAO) and LG PAC
- ii. 3rd Quarter – 10th August 2017 (CAO) and LG PAC
- iii. 2nd Quarter – 29th March 2017 (CAO) and LG PAC
- iv. 1st Quarter – 22nd October 2016 (CAO and LG PAC)

Therefore, score 1.

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>The LG did not followed the format in the Local Governments Accounting Manual (LGAM) 2007, they keep a detailed assets register, showing details of assets in each department in the district. Therefore, score zero.</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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> unqualified audit opinion: score 4 Qualified: score 2 Adverse/disclaimer: score 0 	4	<p>Unqualified audit opinion for the FY 2016/17</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>Minutes of the Council were availed. These meetings were held on 27th June 2017, 30th May 2017, 30th March 2017, 20th December 2016, and 30th September 2016. Examples of service delivery related issues discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Min. COU/07/27/06/2017 (27th June 2017) o Min. COU/07/30/05/2017 (30th May 2017) o Min. COU/09/20/12/2017 – Presentation of Standing Committee Reports (30th March 2017). o Min. COU/08/20/12/2016 (20th December 2016) o Min. 07/30/09/2016 (30th September 2016).

22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2. 	0	<p>There is no person designated to coordinate response to feedback. The Chief Administrative Officer himself has been handling this, and in his absence the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer handles it.</p>
23	<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published: • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</p>	2	<p>The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule were displayed on the Public Notice Board in the Production building at the district headquarters.</p>
	<p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1 	1	<p>Information on the awarded contracts is displayed on the Public Notice Board in the Production building at the district headquarters.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>Not Applicable.</p> <p>The Central Government did not conduct the Annual Performance Assessment for LGs in 2016/17.</p> <p>Noted also was that the district website is down.</p>
24	<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>The district utilised various methods to communicate and explain guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during FY 2016/2017, which include written communication and Emails.</p> <p>No evidence was availed to ascertain this.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	0	<p>It was reported that the discussions conducted with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation; were majorly organised and supported by development partners (e.g. FOWEDE, and Germany Foundation for the World's Population [DWS]). The reports of such meetings were written by the partners, and shared with the district later.</p> <p>No copy of these reports was provided.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

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"> No filed guidance reports are presented, No gender related reports to sector departments are presented No gender related minutes presented Community based reports were presented with a section of GBV in soft form are presented. Gender activities presented included GBV support and supervision, sensitisation on laws of GBV, creation of a GBV forum
		<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. 	0	<p>No planned activities seen and is planned in Community Based services as noted by the GFP.</p> <p>No Gender budget of current year was authentically presented, the one given was in soft form totalling to 14,800,000 UGX.</p>

LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

- 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

0

- Screening forms presented are for the small infrastructure projects such as renovations of buildings and construction of school pit latrines.

- Monitoring reports are provided are for the small infrastructure projects such as renovations of buildings and construction of school pit latrines

- No budget is provided for the activities.

- No EIA reports

- Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1

1

- Selected projects integrated ESMP involving tree planting, restoration of borrow pits are present in the bids.

- Environmental mitigations measures on the construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Odindeng P/S 20th May 2017

- Environmental compliance report monitoring report of Amuria Asamuk road 12th June 2017

- Environmental compliance report in the rehabilitation of 17KM Asamuk Abarilela road 16th May 2017

- Environmental mitigation report for Amuria integrated P/S 31st May 2017

- Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1

1

- Copies of Consent of land signed by the affected people are present but under the NUSAF project. This is so because they are the projects that have affected people.

- Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2

0

- No completion certificates are presented.



LGPA 2017/18

Educational Performance Measures

Amuria District

(Vote Code: 565)

Score 18/100 (18%)

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 	0	<p>According to the LG Performance Contract 2017/2018, the district has a wage provision of 6,749,145 billion for primary teachers.</p> <p>The LG, where each of the 108 schools has the minimum of 7 teachers, intends to recruit 30 Head Teachers in 2017/2018 but even after this, the LG will still have a deficit of 48 substantive Head Teachers</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4 	0	<p>All the 108 Government aided schools have a minimum of 7 teachers but 78 schools (LG Performance Contract 2017/2018) have no substantive Head Teacher. After the pending recruitment in 2017/2018, this gap will be reduced to 48 schools without substantive Head Teachers</p>
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 o If 100% score 6 o If 80 - 99% score 3 o If below 80% score 0 	3	<p>The approved establishment for teachers is 1473. Currently, there are 1032 teachers and 187 are due to be recruited.</p> <p>This translates into 82.7%</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	<p>According to the approved structure, there is 1 position of a Senior Inspector of Schools and 2 County Inspectors.</p> <p>The position of Senior Inspector is not filled while the 2 positions of County Inspectors are filled.</p> <p>The previous Senior Inspector left on retirement in January 2017 but he wasn't replaced.</p>
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	<p>The recruitment plan indicates that 187 Primary Teachers are due to be recruited. Head Teachers (30), Deputy Head Teachers (20), Senior Education Assistants (23) and 114 Education Assistants.</p>
		<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>	0	<p>There is no provision for recruitment of School Inspectors in the recruitment plan.</p>

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One personnel file for the inspector of schools was seen without the appraisal of 2016/ 2017.
		<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>	0	<p>Only 19% of the primary school head teachers were appraised the other personnel files presented did not have performance reports</p>
Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection				

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 0

The Department received several circulars and the guideline on school feeding.

The subjects on the circulars include; Invitation to attend remedial training on teacher presence and time on task from MOES (dated 22nd November 2017), Unlicensed/ Unregistered Schools from MOES dated 22nd September 2017, Teacher Support Supervision in schools dated 30th June 2017 from MOES

The other subjects were; Guidelines on School Charges dated October 24th 2017, from MOES, School feeding program in Education Institutions dated 15th May 2017 from MOES, Mass Registration of Learners in all Primary, Secondary Schools and Post Primary Institutions starting 29th May 2017 dated 25th April 2017.

Meanwhile, there is no evidence that all these circulars and the guideline was communicated to schools

All schools visited i.e Amuria PS, Kuju P/S, Abuket P/S and Opot did not present any circulars from the national level channelled through the district save for Opot P/S that had at least two circulars from the National Level. Meanwhile, these were different from those presented to the assessor by the district

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	0	<p>The minutes of the Head Teachers meetings seen at the time of assessment were dated 13/3/2017, 29/3/2017, 31/5/2017 and 16/6/2017.</p> <p>The meetings did not communicate the issues in the circulars except for the meeting held on 31st May 2017 that presented issues on registration of learners</p>
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. 	1	<p>In 2016/2017, in Term 2, 113 schools were inspected and a report produced, dated 20/11/2016</p> <p>In Term 3, 71 schools were inspected. The report was dated 12/1/2017</p> <p>In Term 1, 70 schools were inspected. The report produced was dated 23/5/2017</p> <p>Which translates into 53.5%</p> <p>(drawn from 108 Government Aided Schools and 50 Private schools)</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 <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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4 	<p>0</p> <p>2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>There were no minutes in place to indicate that the Department met and discussed school inspection reports</p> <p>Information obtained from DES indicates that the Department submitted all four quarterly inspection reports as is required .</p> <p>There was no evidence that there is systematic follow-up of recommendations drawn from the inspection reports. The follow-up of recommendations could not be traced at district or from the schools visited during assessment.</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 	<p>0</p>	<p>The LG submitted statistical returns for both private and primary schools to MOES on 24th May 2017</p> <p>The list from the district is inconsistent with EMIS and with OBT.</p> <p>For instance Ogangai and Ogwarat P/S are in OBT but not on the list from the district</p> <p>Also, private schools such as; Agape Aloysius, St. Silver P/S, St. Michael Standard Junior Nursery and Primary School, St. Joshua Primary School, St. John P/S Arubela, St. Clere P/S, Saviour P/S, Owoikimai P/S are not on the list from the district but are captured in EMIS</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

0

The enrolment data submitted to MOES by the district 24th May 2017 is inconsistent with EMIS in some cases and with both EMIS and OBT in others

For instance, Arute PS has 768 pupils according to the district submission and OBT but EMIS data indicates that the school has 582 pupils

Ongutoi PS has 518 pupils according to the district submission 510 according to OBT and 483 according to EMIS

Abarirela PS has 715 pupils according to the district submission, 728 according to OBT and 768 according to EMIS

Akamuriei PS has 1034 pupils according to the district submission, 1029 according to OBT and 932 according to EMIS

Katine Wera PS has 753 pupils according to the district submission, 742 according to OBT and 739 according to EMIS

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 	2	<p>The Education, Health, and Community Based Services Committee sat to discuss service delivery issues. For example, during the meeting held on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 22nd May 2017, under Min. 05/05/2017 o 28th March 2017, under Min. 05/03/2016 o 28th September 2016, under Min.05/9/2016
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2 	2	<p>The Committee presented reports to Council on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Min. COU/07/27/06/2017 (27th June 2017) • Min. COU/07/30/05/2017 (30th May 2017) • Min. COU/09/20/12/2017 – Presentation of Standing Committee Reports (30th March 2017). • Min. COU/08/20/12/2016 (20th December 2016) • Min. 07/30/09/2016 (30th September 2016).
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)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80% schools: score 0 	0	<p>At the time of assessment, the LG did not avail the School Management Committees (SMCs) files for the schools, Therefore, the functionality of the SMC's could not be ascertained.</p>

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>At the time of assessment, there were no postings of schools receiving the non-wage recurrent grants on any public notice boards at the district. In addition, the website of the district is not functional</p> <p>In all the schools visited i.e Amuria PS, Kuju P/S, Abuket P/S and Opot, only Abuket P/S displayed information on the grants publicly. The rest posted it in the head teachers office</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 	0	<p>The investments submitted to PDU for procurement include; Latrine construction in 5 schools, Construction of 2 classes in 1 school and procurement of school furniture for 4 schools.</p> <p>Submission was made to PDU on 17/7/ 2017 which was a late submission.</p>
----	---	--	---	---

14

The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time

Maximum 3 for this performance measure

• Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points

3

There are no delays in certification, recommendation and payment to suppliers as seen in the 2 suppliers below, who were selected randomly;

I. Elgonia Two Builders Ltd for Contract to Jamara Company for construction of 4 classrooms at Rhoda Acen P. S

a. Award dated – 14th Nov 2016

b. Contract signed – 22nd Nov 2016

c. Certificate – 11th April 2017

d. Request for payment – 16th Jan 2017

e. Approval – 18th Jan 2017

f. Payment – 18th Jan 2017

II. Jaemmas Techno Crafts Ltd for Contract to construction of 5 stance Pit Latrine at Odiding P.S

a. Award dated – 14th March 2017

b. Contract signed – 16th March 2017

c. Request for payment – 24th May 2017

d. Certificate – 12th June 2017

e. Approval – 12th June 2017

f. Payment – 16th June 2017

Therefore, score 3.

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>The Education Department submitted all the four quarterly reports electronically (mainly on flash disks) to DPU.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the date of submission could not be established.</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 	2	<p>The few audit queries in education sector involved unaccounted for UPE funds in Primary Schools. However, all the affected Head Teachers submitted detailed account abilities. Therefore, score 2.</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 	0	<p>There is no evidence of dissemination of guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills</p>
		<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 	0	<p>There is no evidence of issue and explanation of guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	1	<p>The requirement of the gender composition as per the 2nd Schedule of the Education Act 2008 is at least 2 women on the Foundation Body which has a total of 6 people.</p> <p>The schools visited were Amuria P/S, Kuju P/S, Abuket P/S and Opot P/S. All meet the guideline on gender composition for SMC's</p> <p>The Foundation Body of the SMCs in each of the 4 schools had 2 women and 4 men which is consistent with the gender composition guideline of SMC's</p>
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 is no evidence of issue of guidelines on environmental management to the schools by the Education Department in collaboration with the Environment Department</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Health Performance Measures

Amuria District

(Vote Code: 565)

Score 26/100 (26%)

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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 80% filled: score 6 • 60 – 80% - score 3 • Less than 60% filled: score 0 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The structure for primary health workers not filled . The recruitment did not take place in 2016/17 because the district wage bill was in negatives
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>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A copy of recruitment plan 2017/18 was presented to this assessment as an evidence and the plan covers all the vacant posts, the proposed salary scales and the budget. The plan was signed and stamped by the CAO as having been received but no date was indicated on the document. The DHO office claimed that the date was 27 September 2017
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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The appraisal forms were returned to the in charges. However those that signed the book are below 70%. • No performance reports was seen.

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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No recruitment was done and this is not yet done according to the statement from the DHO office
---	--	--	---	---

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>DHO presented two documents to justify communication relating to guidelines, however one of the communication was done on 28 August 2017 and this is outside this period of assessment. The second evidence is a checklist of distribution of guidelines on “immunization practice in Uganda, dated July 2016. This was a one time event that happened in July 2016 to distribute immunization guidelines. Although the event relates to guidelines, it does not justify that it is a routine practice that the DHO office communicates to health facilities regarding all guidelines, policies etc from National level</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence presented over any meeting that was held relating to explaining guidelines to health facility in-charges.

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report presented on support supervision visit dated 23rd May 2017. Supervision was conducted to 6 facilities of level HCII, (Asamuk, St Micheal wera, Acumet and Obalangal Wera) , And HCIV.(Kapelebyong) . Again DHO office claims the mandatory quarterly supervision visits was affected by limited funds to do the activity
		<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>	2	<p>One Quarterly support supervision report was presented as evidence, dated 8th may 2017. Activities implemented were focusing on improving performance on timely reporting and supervisions and were conducted in 15 health facilities. However DHO office said that the office had limited funds and could not do all the 4 mandatory quarterly supervision visits in the year.</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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A visit to Amuria HCIV did not pick any evidence on support supervision because the health facility in-charge and staff were not available at the facility by the time this assessment was done and time limited this response.

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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No evidence picked because of non-response or non availability of the respondents.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 	0	<p>No evidence picked because of non-response or non availability of the respondents.</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"> o List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence presented to the assessor and the DHO biostatistician was unavailable at the time of assessment. There was no information picked to justify accuracy and consistency in Amuria HMIS reporting

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 	2	<p>The Education, Health, and Community Based Services Committee sat to discuss service delivery issues. For example, during the meeting held on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22nd May 2017, under Min. 05/05/2017 • 28th March 2017, under Min. 05/03/2016
----	---	---	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	2	<p>The Committee presented reports to Council on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Min. COU/07/27/06/2017 (27th June 2017) • Min. COU/07/30/05/2017 (30th May 2017) • Min. COU/09/20/12/2017 – Presentation of Standing Committee Reports (30th March 2017). • Min. COU/08/20/12/2016 (20th December 2016) • Min. 07/30/09/2016 (30th September 2016).
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 	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DHO office presented a lists of active HUMC for OLwa HCII, six members Wera HCIII 9 members, Amolo HCII, 6 members and St Micheal HC III 9 members. The minutes held in 2017 indicated that committees approved budgets and are currently functioning
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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No lists of PHC funds seen on the DHO notice board , Cao notice board and the notice board of Amuria HCIV

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>A copy of procurement plan for the health sector investment was presented as evidence and it shows that the plan was submitted on 10th April 2017 and covers health facility equipment motor equipment and office equipment</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 procurement request form PP5 was submitted on 15th July 2017</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: • 100% - score 8 • 70-99% – score 4 • Below 70% - score 0 	0	<p>No evidence presented that the DHO office supported HF to health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time.</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 are no delays in certification, recommendation, and payment of suppliers in the health sector for example, the major contract in sector during the year was;</p> <p>a. Name of Contractor – Light Investments and contractors Ltd</p> <p>b. Nature of Contract – Renovate a General Ward at Obalanga HC III</p> <p>c. Award dated – 14th March 2017</p> <p>d. Contract signed – 3rd April 2017</p> <p>e. Request for payment – 9th May 2017</p> <p>f. Certificate – 30th May 2017</p> <p>g. Approval – 19th June 2017</p> <p>h. Payment – 27th June 2017</p> <p>Therefore, score 2.</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>The Health Department submitted all the four quarterly reports electronically (mainly on flash disks) to DPU.</p> <p>Notably, the date of submission could not be established.</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>Status of implementation on the following queries had not been provided to Internal Audit</p> <p>a. UGX 1,247,000 had not been accounted for in the 3rd Quarter of FY 2016/17</p> <p>b. Unfenced health centres for example, Orungo HC III - there were no enough beds, one pit latrine which is shared between staff and patients</p> <p>Therefore, zero score.</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>	<p>• Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2</p> <p>• Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2</p>	2	<p>DHO office presented a lists of functioning HUMC for OLwa HCII,six members Wera HCIII 9 members,Amolo HCII, 6 members and St Micheal HC III 9 members and all lists contain men and women</p> <p>• No evidence presented to ascertain that guidelines were issued by the DHO office on management of sanitation in health facilities</p>
19	<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LGs has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal : score 2 points.</p>	0	<p>No evidence presented by the DHO office regarding issuing of guidelines. The office stated that this is done by implementing partners</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Amuria District

(Vote Code: 565)

Score 43/100 (43%)

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 	10	<p>Four (4) boreholes were planned and budgeted for Akeriau sob county with water coverage of 8.0% below district coverage of 80%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Approved annual work plan of Amuria district Local Government financial year 2016/2017 page 22. Amuria district work plan approved budget 2016/2017 National safe water coverage map
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"> Amuria district local government approved budget for the previous financial year 2015/2016 to provide safe water coverage to sub counties below the district safe water coverage page 18 dated 1/10/2015 Annual progress report of water and sanitation for the financial year 2015/2016 page 24 where the four sub counties with water coverage were reported to have received boreholes. Namely Okungur, Willa, Akeriau, and Wera sub counties
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>	<p>3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No supervision and monitoring plan for the previous financial year 2015/2016 • Fourth quarter supervision report for the FY2015/2016 titled assessment and verification of boreholes drilled by Nile company dated 12/08/2016. Only 4 water projects were monitored in the district yet other civil society organisations built boreholes in schools e.g. IDI Uganda at Kuju seed secondary school in Kuju sub county • Other partners implemented projects in the district but monitoring progress reports did not indicate case in point is world vision Uganda that responded to post floods of 2016. The justification of 50%-59% stems from the number of water facilities constructed but not monitored 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MIS water access reports by sub county data indicates that Akeriau s/c has 59% yet the district data of water accessibility by sub county it is 8.0% which is inconsistent. This applies to even district access at the district level reported at 80% yet national MIS data reports Amuria 82%. Inconsistence is also seen in the sub counties of Abarilele, Kuju, Kapelbyongo, Obalanga, Ogolai, Okungur, Orungo, Wera and Willa (souce MIS website) with varying figures at the district level Performance contracts not obtained at the district level.
---	--	---	---	---

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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No submission reports on procurement from DWO to DPU AWP and Budget for the current financial year has sections on procurement but its implementation couldn't be certainly verified at DWO records.
---	---	---	---	---

6

The DWO has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts

Maximum 8 points for this performance measure

• 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

0

• No substantive contract manager is appointed at the DWO as such the under mentioned records couldn't be obtained at the district water office: contract management records, and contract management plans this renders a sample of 5 wss projects irrelevant for verification in the files and or reports that do not exist

• If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2

0

• Records on BOQs for both water and sanitation infrastructure weren't obtained at DWO

• If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2

0

• No handover report was obtained at DWO of Amuria district local government

• If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2

0

• No completion reports was certified and obtained in 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 	<p>There are no delays in certification, recommendation, and payment of suppliers in the water sector for example, the major contract in sector during the year was;</p> <p>a. Name of Contractor – KLR (U) Ltd,</p> <p>b. Nature of Contract – Borehole siting, drilling, casting installation and pump testing (4 boreholes)</p> <p>c. Award dated – 28th March 2017</p> <p>d. Contract signed – 29th March 2017</p> <p>e. Request for payment – 14th June 2017</p> <p>f. Approval – 16th June 2017</p> <p>g. Payment – 19th June 2017</p> <p>Therefore, score 3.</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 	<p>DWO submitted all the four quarterly reports electronically (mainly on flash disks) to DPU.</p> <p>The date of submission could not be established.</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 	3	<p>a. UGX 3,205,000 which had been queried/ unaccounted for in the 4th Quarter of FY 2016/17 was subsequently accounted for.</p> <p>b. There were no other audit queries.</p> <p>Therefore, score 3.</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 	3	<p>The committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues, such as during a meeting held on 15th December 2016 (under Min. WTSC/03/15/12/16).</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	3	<p>The Committee presented reports to Council on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Min. COU/07/27/06/2017 (27th June 2017) • Min. COU/07/30/05/2017 (30th May 2017) • Min. COU/09/20/12/2017 – Presentation of Standing Committee Reports (30th March 2017). • Min. COU/08/20/12/2016 (20th December 2016) • Min. 07/30/09/2016 (30th September 2016).

11

The LG Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency

Maximum 6 points for this performance measure

• 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

0

• On the district notice boards there was no information on AWP, Budget water grant releases and expenditure s was displayed, duly dated and stamped was obtained to enhance transparency as per the procurement Act of parliament. The same information wasn't obtained at Amuria district local government website.

• All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2

2

• From a sample of 5 WSS projects name of the project, source of funding and date of completion were all inscribed as here under:

Kaju seed secondary school borehole

Constructed by E Plus

Funded by IDI Uganda

Dated 6/09/2015

- CD 535 Katakwi

Funded by MoWE

Construction by VPL

30/06/2017

- DWD 25271

Constructed by LWF

Funded by BMZ

Dated 16/11/2007

- DWD 38262

Funded by PRDP 2012/2013

Kuju sub county head quarters

Constructed by Nile Drilling Co ltd

Dated 09/09/2013

- KujuCommunity bore hole

Constructed by FOL

Funded by Wells of Life

Dated 104/2014

		<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"> No contract award information , name of contract and contract sum was obtained at the district notice boards / website of Amuria district local government at the time of assessment
12	<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<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 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community application files were obtained at DWO. examples of villages that have applied for water source points observed include Ojulai village application for a bore hole dated 22/6/2015, Ocorikoit B village bore hole application dated 9/11/2016, Apero village application for bore hole dated 22/3/2016 Community meeting minutes were obtained at the district water office including commitment to contribute towards o and m
		<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"> No sector MIS was obtained at DWO indicating management of O&M funds. In fact, it was reported in one of the progress reports that WUCs of most boreholes weren't functional hence leading to their mismanagement and breakdown
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				

13	<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<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 Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1 Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No EIA reports/ screening templates was obtained for WSS projects at the DWO to ascertain inclusion of social and environmental safe guard in project implementation No mitigation plans or reports for wss projects at the DWO were obtained to ascertain follow up support for cases of cases of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY From a sample of 3 contracts it was observed that they hardly had a clause on environmental protection as a critical requirement for environmental protection. However, there was no environmental template to ascertain if recommendations and mitigation measures were put in place.
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 software progress reports and a list of WSC membership obtained at the DWO indicate no single water facility has at least 50% membership composition as women.

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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From a sample of 5 public places visited it was clear that equity and inclusion was observed in respect to gender and PWD. The institutions visited are: Rhoda Acen P/S Kuju S/C head quarters, Angorom P/S in Kuju S/c, Kuju seed secondary school in Kuju s/c, Abket P/S in Kuju s/c and Kuju moslem primary school in Kuju s/c
----	--	--	---	---