



## LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Apac Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 793)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	2	40%
No	3	60%

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 – Apac MC’s APC 2017/18 was submitted belatedly to MoFPED (see Receipt date 1st /8/2017 and Receipt No: 4031), hence submitted after the official deadline of the 30th June 2017.	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 – Only Apac MC had signed and stamped documented evidence as proof that the draft APC/budget 2017/18 submitted to MoFPED on the 7th April 2017 included a Procurement Plan. There was no such evidence at MoFPED.	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 – All 4 quarterly reports for the FY 2017/18 were duly submitted but Q4 submitted late (i.e. Q1 – 31st/10/2016 Receipt No: 0116; Q2 – 21st/2/2017 Receipt No: 0370; Q3 – 5th/5/2017 Receipt No: 0678; and Q4 – 1st/8/2017 Receipt No: 0876).Not Compliant. The Q4 Consolidated Report was submitted late to the MoFPED (as seen in a Receipt dated 1st/8/2017 and Receipt No: 0876). It was submitted after the official deadline (31st July 2017). However, according to the Municipal Planner, the OBT records show that the online submission went in on the 25th/7/2017, thus by definition in time).	No

<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>Not Compliant – All 4 quarterly reports for the FY 2017/18 were duly submitted but the last one submitted late - after 31/7/2017 - (i.e. Q1 – 31st/10/2016 Receipt No: 0116; Q2 – 21st/2/2017 Receipt No: 0370; Q3 – 5th/5/2017 Receipt No: 0678; and Q4 – 1st/8/2017 Receipt No: 0876).</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Assessment area: Audit</p>			
<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>Apac Municipality became operational in Financial year 2016/2017. Therefore, this is not compliant because it had no issues raised and no responses to submit.</p>	<p>N/A</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 FY 2016/17, Apach MC obtained an unqualified audit opinion.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Apac Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 793)

Score 67/100 (67%)

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"> <li>• A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 2.</li> </ul>	2	<p>The Apac District's Physical Planning Committee was formed on Town Clerk's appointment (letter dated 15th/5/2017). The PPC is composed of several members that double as heads of departments too. For the FY 2017/18, the PPC met 7 out of 12 time (i.e. since its date of forming, with signed and stamped minutes seen for the 4th/8/2016, 9th/9/2016, 1st/12/2016, 10th/1/2017, 24th/1/2017, 28th/4/2017 and 28th/6/2017). Only 5 out 7 minutes cite approval of building plans as an area for which the PPC deliberated. With this evidence, one would add a Registration Book that captured dates of applications of new investments but no dates of approval of the applications/investments. A sample of new investments indicated that there was some documented evidence that the PPC was functional (i.e. going by a requirement that calls for the PPCs to meet within 28 days to consider/ approve the submitted applications in line with the approved physical plans).</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2.</li> </ul>	2	<p>Based on selected sample of new investments, there was evidence that the applications cum investments were being approved in time. Also, there was documented evidence (e.g. in form of PPC minutes) to offer proof that the building plans were being approved in terms of their consistency with existing physical plans. Even so, there was no proof that council had approved the Structural Plan and Detailed Plan. According to official records got from MoLHUD, (Status of Physical Planning in Uganda 2017, the MoLHUD Physical Planning Department (2015) only considered physical plans for Apac Municipality (see Page 1 that stated unavailable valid Structural Plans and Detailed Plan because their preparation was in progress. Unfortunately, there was no evidence that Apac Municipality had made any attempts to upgrade the physical plans. In fact, Apac Municipality was still using the old physical plans developed and used by Apac Town Council. The Structural Plan (2006-2016) and the Detailed Plan (2003) had all expired.</p>
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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.</li> </ul>	2	<p>Apac MC held a Budget Conference on 8th/11/2016. Based on the contents of the Budget Conference Report (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 from the AWP 2017/18. For education, supply of desks, construction of latrines and purchase of office furniture are seen on page 73 of the AWP 2017/18 and again seen on page 3 of the BCR. For health, procurement of fuel for garbage collection is seen on page 70 of the AWP 2017/18 and on page 3 of the BCR. Both documents were silent when it came to water mainly because the mandate for supply of water was under the ambit of the NWSC.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	2	<p>There was evidence that the capital investments in the approved AWP 2017/18 were derived from Apac MC's 5-year Development Plan (MDP) 2015/16-2019/20. On the AWP-MDP linkages, the approved AWP (page 72) showed that the education sector investments e.g. construction of staff houses appeared in the DDP on pages 163. For health, the capital investments that were approved and captured in the AWP included purchase of solid waste equipment (page 69) that appeared also in the DDP on page 164. Both documents were silent when it came to water mainly because the mandate for supply of water was under the ambit of the NWSC.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 1.</li> </ul>	0	<p>According to records made available to the assessors, during the FY 2016/17, Apac MC TPC met 10 out of 12 times (i.e. on the 26th/6/2017, 29th/5/2017, 24th/4/2017, 27th/3/2017, 23rd/1/2017, 22nd/12/2016, 28th/11/2016, 31st/10/2016 and 7th/9/2016). However, no TPC minutes on file for FY 2016/17 offered documented proof that the TPC discussed developed project profiles (e.g. those that would be seen in the DDP, 2015/16-2019/20). The TPC appeared focus on the more usual agenda items, mainly departmental briefs or reports. This is a pointer to the less than robust means by which the planning function was supported the Municipal Planning Unit. Unfortunately, being a new LG, Apac MC did not benefit from the FY2016/17 NPA's (2017) Certificate of Compliance with Planning Guidelines (see page 81) for award of scores on the robustness of the planning process as well as the overall average score (when all planning aspects were to be kept into view).</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"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	1	<p>The May 2017 Draft Annual Statistical Abstract (as at the time of the assessment – 14th/2/ 2018) covered more stories than it did statistics (narratives than numbers, respectively). As a result, gender-related and/or gender dis-aggregated data was limited only on demographics (seen on page 8). Indeed, arising from its draft status, there was more evidence that the TPC of the 29th/5/2017 (min:07/MTPC/5/2017) deliberated more on the need to revise the draft "municipal profile" (to come up with better data and information in the statistical abstracts). This means that the TPC did not see the draft as fit for use to influence allocations and decision making. The one-man Municipal Planning Unit appeared to require the assistance of UBOS to help beef up and finalise the draft statistical abstract.</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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	2	<p>As per a sample drawn from the Q4 Consolidated Report FY2016/17 as well as AWP and APC/budget FY 2016/17, most (80%) of the infrastructure projects implemented in FY 2016/17 by Apac MC were derived from the approved AWP and Budget 2016/17. A sample 5 confirmed that most of what was implemented was as per plan and budget. The exception to the rule was in the education sector where purchase of land (see page 90 of the Q4/APR) was never started because of a realization that it was not as per plan. For health, purchase of cleaning equipment is seen on page 58 of the AWP 2016/17 and page 37 of the Q4 Consolidated Report for the FY 2016/17. For roads, road works appear on page 63 of the AWP 2016/17 and page 92 of the Q4 Consolidated Report for the FY 2016/17. In the area of administration, renovation of office block is seen on page 49 of the AWP 2016/17 and page 94 of the Q4 Consolidated Report for the FY 2016/17. Finally, for natural resources, surveying and land titling appears on page 66 of the AWP 2016/17 and page 94 of the Q4 Consolidated Report for the FY 2016/17.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	0	Some investment projects (62.5%) implemented in FY 2016/17 were completed as per work plan – with 5 completed against the 8 budgeted and/or planned. This means, therefore, that as per approved budget and plan, only 3 projects were not completed (i.e. going by the implementation status captured in the Q4 Consolidated Report 2016/17).
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"> <li>Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2</li> </ul>	0	According to details in the Q4 Consolidated Report FY2016/17, only 20% of the investment projects implemented in FY 2016/17 were completed within approved budget.
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	0	According to details in the Q4 Consolidated Report FY2016/17, Apac MC budgeted for O&M and the actual expenditure corresponded with the budget (71%), hence falling below the recommended 80% threshold (NB: O&M budget was 25,000,000/= while O&M actual expenditure was 17,750, 000/= and the variance 7,250,000/=).

Assessment area: Human Resource Management

6	LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	0	No Performance Appraisal exercises were conducted for the Municipal staff as all of them were either seconded from Apac district or were former staff of the Apac Town Council and had not yet been appraised by the time of transfer / secondment. When the municipality was established in July 2016, staff were appointed on either Assignment of Duty by the Town Clerk or on Transfer of Service by the CAO of Apac District. However, Performance Appraisals for the FY 2017/18 will be conducted and by the time of the assessment the Performance Agreements for all HoDs had been duly completed and signed.
	Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.			Not all HoD positions were filled by the time of the assessment. Two positions had no wage bill provision, while for one; the selected candidate did not take up the offer.  Six (6) out of the 9 positions were filled substantively by the time of the assessment. Three (3) positions were filled by staff on <i>Assignment of Duty</i> by the Town Clerk. One position of Medical Officer; the selected

candidate declined the offer, while for the other two (Principal Commercial Officer and Senior Agricultural Officer); there was no wage bill provision. The details of appointment are indicated below:

#### Substantive Appointments

1. Municipal Education Officer- Personal File Ref: CR/AMC/10039. Appointed on 30/09/2016 as per ref. CR/AMC/HRD120, DSC Min Ext.no. 108/2016 (b).

2. Principal Comm. Dev. Officer- Personal File Ref: CR/AMC/10037. Appointed on 30/09/2016 as ref. CR/AMC/HRD/120. DSC Min. Ext no. 108/2016 (a)

#### 3. Senior Asst. Town Clerks:

(a) CR/AMC/10029- Appointed on 18/09/2015- CR/163/1. Min Ext no.38/2015 (h)

(b) CR/AMC/10027- Appointed on 30/09/2016-CR/AMC/HRD/120. Min Ext no.108/2016 (b)

(c) CR/AMC/10026. Appointed on 30/09/2016-CR/AMC/HRD/120. Min Ext no.108/2016 (d)

(d)CR/AMC/10028. Appointed on 30/09/2016-CR/AMC/HRD/120. Min Ext no. 108/2016 (b).

4. Principal Treasurer: Personal File Ref: CR/AMC/10020: Appointed on 1/05/2017 as per ref. CR/AMC/156 and DSC Min Ext no.08/2017 (a).

5. Municipal Engineer (Ag. Superintendent of Works). Personal File Ref- CR/AMC/10057. Appointed on 30/09/2016. Ref CR/AMC/HRD/120 DSC Min Ext no.108/2016 (b).

6. District Environment Officer – Personal File Ref: CR/AMC/10064. Appointed on 1/05/2017. Ref CR/AMC/156. DSC Min Ext no.08/2017 (a)

#### Appointments by Assignment of Duty

7. Principal Commercial Officer (Ag. Commercial Officer). Personal File Ref- CRMC/10031: Appointed on 01/05/2017 ref. CR/AMC/156. DSC Min Ext no. 08/2017 (a).

8. Medical Officer for Health Services (Ag. Senior Environment Officer). Personal File

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

0

				<p>Ref. Appointed on 30/09/2016, ref. CR/AMC/HRD/120. DSC Min no.108/120/2016 (c).</p> <p>9. <u>Senior Agricultural Officer</u> (Agricultural Officer). Personal File No.CR/AMC/10044. Appointed on 30/12/2016. ref. CR/AMC/HRD/120</p>
7	<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>The DSC considered all (100%) submissions made by the Town Clerk (TC) to the DSC for recruitment of staff.</p> <p>Verified evidence included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A review of the Approved Staff Structure by MoPS on the 23/12/2016 as per letter for the PS MoPS ref. ARC 135/306/01 in response to the Town Clerk's request for approval dated CR/AMC/45/78</li> <li>• Approved Staff Structure by the Municipal Council as per Min Ext no. 05/02/AMC/MC/10-2016</li> <li>• Request by the TC to MoPS dated 30/08/2016 ref. AMC/ADM/ 001 for approval of 54 positions with a Wage Bill provision.</li> <li>• Letter of Approval from MoPS clearing the municipality to recruit for 54 positions with Wage Bill provision dated 15/09/2016, ref. ARC6/ 293/05.</li> </ul> <p>The TC made one submission to the DSC with 24 individual Declarations for new staff recruitment ( 34 out of the 54 staff planned for recruitment were staff absorbed on transfer from Apac district and assignment of duty by the TC as former staff from Apac Town Council)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DSC ( 18th sitting) sat on 10th April to 2nd May 2017 and handled 28 cases as new recruitments ( appointment on Probation) and 9 cases of Transfer of Service as per Minute Extract no. 2/05/2017 ref. DSC/APC/156. The same DSC meeting handled cases of appointment of attainment of higher qualification (1 case) and 2 cases of appointment on promotion.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>All (100%) of the submissions made by the TC for confirmation of staff were duly considered. The TC made one submission to the 15th DSC sitting of the 29th September for confirmation of the one staff as reflected in DSC minutes ref. DSC/APC/212/4 (other staff had not yet completed their probationary period and appraisal). Their confirmation will be handled in February 2018 and the HRM and TC have already prepared the submissions/declarations for the next DSC meeting.</p>												
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>100% Score. No disciplinary cases were experienced during the previous FY and therefore the Town Clerk made no submissions to the DSC for action.</p>												
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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	3	<p>All staff (100%), that were recruited during the previous FY (28 staff) managed to access the Salary Pay Roll within two months after appointment. The staff were appointed on 1st May 2017 and they all appear on the June 2017 Pay Roll (print out available at the HRM office duly stamped and signed by the HRM). A random sample of 5 personal files of staff on probation was taken and the staff were traced by their personal file reference numbers and IPPS numbers and were all reflected on the June 2017 Pay Roll. See details below:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>Personal File Ref.</th> <th>IPPS No.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. CR/AMC/10077 -</td> <td>1007428</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. CR/AMC/10068 -</td> <td>1005900</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. CR/AMC/10076 -</td> <td>1006084</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. CR/AMC/10065 -</td> <td>1006086</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. CR/AMC/10060 -</td> <td>1007414</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Personal File Ref.	IPPS No.	1. CR/AMC/10077 -	1007428	2. CR/AMC/10068 -	1005900	3. CR/AMC/10076 -	1006084	4. CR/AMC/10065 -	1006086	5. CR/AMC/10060 -	1007414
Personal File Ref.	IPPS No.															
1. CR/AMC/10077 -	1007428															
2. CR/AMC/10068 -	1005900															
3. CR/AMC/10076 -	1006084															
4. CR/AMC/10065 -	1006086															
5. CR/AMC/10060 -	1007414															

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	2	100% Score. No staff retired during the Previous FY.
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"> <li>• If increase in OSR from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10% : score 4 points</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5 -10% : score 2 point</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5% : score 0 points.</li> </ul>	0	<p>Apac Municipal Council became operational in financial year 2016/2017 on 1st July, 2016. The MC didn't collect any local revenue in FY 2015/16. However, the LG collected Local revenue amounting to Ugx 113,630,928 in FY 2016/17.</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"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	2	<p>The approved budget for the LG for FY 2016/17 was Ugx 120,000,000. However, the actual local revenue collected in FY 2016/17 was Ugx 113,630,928 giving a shortfall of Ugx 6,369,072 which was 5% shortfall.</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"> <li>• Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>There was evidence from the bank statement dated 1st/10/2016- 31st /10/2016 that the MC remitted 50% of local revenue to the Divisions as required by law. There were transfers to Arocha Division, Akere Division, Agulu Division and Atik Division General fund Accounts of Ugx 1,270,954 per Division. The Divisions also remitted 50% to the MC as evidenced from the general fund cash book dated 5th/12/2016 i.e. 50% transfer from Arocha Division to Apach MC of Ugx 3,374,045.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>From the trial balance, allowances and airtime was what was paid from local revenue to council activities. Allowances were Ugx 21,815,800 and Telecommunication was 2,250,000 giving a total of Ugx 24,065,800. This was 20% of local revenue spent on council activities. when calculating the 20% of local revenue used on council activities, the MC based on the figure for the Town council of local revenue collected in FY 2015/16.</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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MC does not have position of Procurement officer or Assistant procurement officer. The position has been advertised in the newspaper dated 5/2/2018</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>The TEC produced and submitted reports to contracts committee;</p> <p>Rehabilitation of Municipal Council Office block at Apac Municipal signed by evaluation members on 02/5/17,</p> <p>Construction of a single staff house at Alerweng PS Atik division signed by evaluation members on 2/12/2016,</p> <p>Construction of an office block at Apac Municipal council HQs signed by evaluation members on 12/05/2017.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>The contracts committee considered recommendations of the TEC for the following;</p> <p>Rehabilitation of Municipal Council Office block at Apac Municipal Min CC/26/05/2016-17 signed by Contract committee members on 05/19/17,</p> <p>Construction of a single staff house at Alerweng PS Atik division Min CC/13/01/201617- signed by contract committee members on 13/01/2017,</p> <p>Construction of an office block at Apac Municipal council HQs CC/29/06/2016-17 signed by Contracts committee members on 08/06/2017</p>
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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The procurement and disposal work plan for current yr covers all infrastructure projects and was signed by Ag Procurement officer and Town clerk on 9/Aug/2017 and received by PPDA on 31 Aug 2017.</li> <li>• The MC made procurements through submission of quarterly reports on 4th quarter to the Executive Director PPDA dated 14/07/2017 and received by PPDA on 31 Aug 2017</li> </ul>

<p>14</p>	<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The MC had not yet prepared bidding documents by Aug 30 2017 due to delay of budgets and inadequate knowledge of bidding process by user departments.</li> </ul>
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The contracts register is in place for Apac Municipal Council 2016/2017 and updated showing; name of contractor, location and address of business, subject of procurement, contract sum, start date end date by 30th 06/2017.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The MC adhered to procurement thresholds for the previous FY;</li> </ul> <p>Approval of procurement method for construction of office block Min CC/20/04/2016-17 signed by contract committee members on 5/4/2017 for open bidding 779,239,438/=, Rehabilitation of Municipal Council Office block at Apac Municipal Min CC/12/01/2016-17 signed by Contract committee members on 11/1/17 for selective bidding at 22,971,060/=</p> <p>Construction of a single staff house at Alerweng PS Atik division Min CC/07/11/201617- signed by contract committee members on 18/11/2016 under selective bidding at 49,000,000/=</p>

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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects for previous FY were appropriately certified, interim and completion certificates issued for;</li> </ul> <p>Certificate of practical completion for construction of single staff house at Alerwang Primary school in Atik Division signed by Town clerk and superintendent of works(SOW) on May 3 2017.completion date-3 /5/2017,</p> <p>Certificate of practical completion for rehabilitation of office block at Apac MC signed by Town clerk and SOW on 28th June 2017.completion date 28/6/2017.</p> <p>Interim payment for construction of Apac Municipal office block(certIFICATE No1 Voucher No DDO/3/6/2017</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	2	<p>There were no projects implemented for current FY at the time of assessment due to the delay in bidding process.</p>
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"> <li>Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>There was evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to date from the cash books assessed. I.e. cash books for DDEG, YLP Recovery, UWEP fund, Property rates, UWEP Recovery, YLP fund, Production and marketing, Operations, Health and CBS accounts were all reconciled as at 31st/1/2018.</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"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	2	<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers according to the only request for capital projects from administration. Request from Mid north builders and civil engineering works Ltd for construction of an office block at Apach MC dated 28/6/2017 forwarded by TC on 30/6/2017 and paid on 30/6/2017 voucher No. DD03/3/2017. Even payment requests from the departments show that there was timely payment of suppliers.</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"> <li>Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor and produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 3.</li> </ul>	3	<p>The LG has a Substantive Senior Internal Auditor appointment letter on transfer of service dated 1st /5/2017, minute No. 08/2017(a) , ref CR/AMC/156 and a substantive Internal Auditor appointment on promotion letter dated 30/9/2016,minute No. 108/2016 (a), ref No. CR/AMC/HRD/120. The senior internal auditor produced all the quarterly audit reports for the Previous FY. The reports were dated 1st /11/2016, 30th /1/2017, 3rd /5/2017 and 9th /8/2017. The 1st quarter, 2nd quarter, 3rd quarter and 4th quarter internal audit reports were all submitted to MoLGs, OAG, MOFPED and Directorate of Internal Audit on 4/11/2016, 3/2/2017, 12/5/2017 and 4/9/2017 respectively.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	2	<p>There is evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LGPAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings in the quarterly audit reports submitted to them as per the delivery book.</p> <p>A copy of summon to the different officers to appear before LGPAC dated 4th /6/2017 signed by Town clerk with list of queried officers was no file. Also copies of management letters for all the quarterly internal audit reports were available. All audit queries in 2nd and 3rd quarter were responded to as seen in the LGPAC reports FY 2016/17.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	0	<p>There was evidence that the internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer and LGPAC as follows; 1st quarter, 2nd quarter, 3rd quarter and 4th quarter internal audit reports for FY 2016/17 were submitted to Mayor, LGPAC, RDC, CAO, Town clerk and other ministries on 1/11/2016, 30/1/2017, 3/5/2017 and 9/8/2017 respectively. LGPAC reviewed second and third quarter internal audit reports for FY 2016/17. The LGPAC report reviewing 2nd quarter internal audit report was dated 15/8/2017 and LGPAC report for review of 3rd quarter report was dated 5/10/2017. However, the first and fourth quarter internal audit reports were not reviewed by LGPAC.</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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	0	<p>The LG had an Asset register but it was not up to date and not as per the format in the Accounting manual.</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 FY 2016/17, Apac MC obtained an unqualified audit opinion.</p>
<p>Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>				

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 evidence that Council for Apac MC was functional, broadly speaking. For example, it met 6 out of 6 mandatory times in FY 2016/17 (i.e. on the 22nd/8/2016, 21st/10/2016, 22nd/12/2016, 15th/2/2017, 29th/3/2017 and 25th/5/2017). On a few occasions when the district council met, it deliberated on relevant service-delivery issues e.g. discussion of budgets, plans and reports. Most of the time, the council meetings deliberated on committee reports and recommendations for its approval. It is worth noting that committee issues featured prominently in council deliberations, the council minutes were often silent when it came to covering aspects such as TPC reports, monitoring reports, LG PAC reports and performance assessment results/reports.</p>
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"> <li>Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2.</li> </ul>	2	<p>Documented evidence was seen in form of Town Clerk's letter (dated 3rd/8/2016) to the Municipal Planner as the designated focal point person on the budget website and meant to coordinate lower-level feedback on and responses to (grievances /complaints).</p>
23	<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Documented evidence seen of publishing payroll register on the notice board near the HR Office but with no evidence of the posting of a pension register/schedule.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>Documented evidence seen of publishing of procurement register on the HR's notice board.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	0	Not Applicable (N/A) – There was no LGPA in the FY under review. However, Apac MC posted findings from the internal/mock LGPA 2017.
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"> <li>Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	1	Documented evidence seen to prove that information relayed through central government agencies (MoFPED, MoLG, OPM, MDAs, etc) e.g. circulars, guidelines, policies and procedures (on DDEG, NAADS, NUSAF, etc) was disseminated or remitted to Lower level Local Governments (LLG). A municipal planner’s letter date 34th/9/2017 communicates DDEG info.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	1	Documented evidence seen (dated 24th/9/2017 and in form of a reporting template to summarise proceedings of Community Group Discussions/Dialogues, Barazas and Radio Talk Shows).
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"> <li>Evidence that the LG gender focal person has provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities score 2.</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MC Principal CDO –GFP provided guidance on gender for training report for mentoring Municipal and division staff on cross cutting issues dated 14/12/2016 signed by the PCDO. Attended by HODs for Administration, Finance, production and marketing, Health, Education, Roads and Engineering, Natural resources, community based services ,planning Unit, IT and internal Audit(20 members in attendance)</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	2	<p>Planned activities for Current FY include;</p> <p>Workshops and seminars for skills enhancement for women group leaders support to youth councils and disabilities to monitor youth and identify problems.</p> <p>There was one activity in the previous budget for Gender issues;</p> <p>Gender issues identified for mentoring municipal and division staff for cross cutting issues at 1,600,000/= which was used for the activity. Therefore 100% of funds were used.</p>
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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were no screening forms for activities, plans at the time of assessment. The environment officer was new in office and arrived in May 2017</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>The MC integrated environmental plans in contract bid documents for;</p> <p>Construction of office block at Municipal HQs, environmental safeguards in BOQ was for removal of plant rubbish etc.</p> <p>Construction of single staff house at Alerwang PS, in BOQ disposal of excavated material as an environment plan costing 26,000/=</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>No proof of land ownership either land title, land agreement by the MC at the time of assessment</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2</li></ul>	0	No environmental certification forms completed projects and signed by environment officer. The environment officer is assumed office in May 2017
--	---	---	--



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Educational Performance Measures

Apac Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 793)

Score 77/100 (77%)

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"> <li>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</li> <li>Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>Apac MC has budgeted for a Head Teacher and 7 teachers per school as evidenced in approved budget estimates FY 2017/18 (work plan 6)</p> <p>Apac MC has made the required deployments as evidenced by the placement list for Primary Schools 2017/18.</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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	3	<p>Apac MC has filled 217 out of 221 (98%) of the positions in structure for primary school teachers. Verified the evidence from the staff list of 2017/18</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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>APAC MC has substantively filled the 1 position of inspector provided in the approved structure 2017/18 of the education department staff list.</li> </ul>
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 MEO submitted a recruitment plan for 16 Education Assistants (teachers) as evidenced by his communication of 14/12/17 to the DEO.</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>	2	<p>There is no recruitment plan made for the positions of inspector. This is because the positions of other inspectors are yet to be approved by the Ministry of Public Service.</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>	3	<p>The current Inspector of Schools: Personal File Ref.No. CR/AMC/10043 was appointed on 30/09/2016 and his appointment was premised on the date of secondment from the district, while the actual date of assumption of duty was in December 2017 and therefore he was not yet confirmed in appointment during the previous FY, hence was not eligible for appraisal as an Inspector of Schools.</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

0

While all the Head Teachers (100%) of the 12 Government Aided primary schools in the municipality had duly completed their Performance Agreements for the Calendar Years 2016 and 2017, and were endorsed by the Assistant Town Clerks, SMC chair persons and the Municipal education Officer, there was no record on file in form of Performance Appraisal Reports to indicate that the Performance Appraisals were conducted.

A random sample of 6 files was taken as per personal reference numbers below and checked against the details on the Performance Agreement files and it was established that there were no accompanying Performance Appraisal Reports.

1. CR/AMC/10081
2. CR/AMC/10086
3. CR/AMC/10084
4. CR/AMC/10083
5. CR/AMC/10087
6. CR/AMC/10085

On checking with the Municipal Inspector of Schools, he confirmed that there was lack of knowledge by the Assistant Town Clerks and the SMC chairpersons that they did not go ahead to appraise the Head Teachers after completing the Performance Agreements at the beginning of the two financial years. This anomaly will be corrected for the FY 2017/18.

Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection

<p>6</p>	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>	<p>Apac MC received several circulars and guidelines and communicated them to the schools' They include the following seen by the assessor in the DEO's office :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy of School feeding program by P/S MOES on 30/10/16</li> <li>• Policy of mass registration of learners by P/S MOES on 15/06/17</li> <li>• Circular on adherence to UPE guidelines by P/S MOES on 7/06/17</li> <li>• Circular on Secondary school teachers teaching in Primary Schools on 25/07/17</li> <li>• Circular on operation of unlicensed /unregistered schools by PS/MOES</li> <li>• Dressing code for ununiformed civil servants</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>		<p>2</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"> <li>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"> <li>100% - score 12</li> <li>90 to 99% - score 10</li> <li>80 to 89% - score 8</li> <li>70 to 79% - score 6</li> <li>60 to 69% - score 3</li> <li>50 to 59% - score 1</li> <li>Below 50% - score 0.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	12	<p>APAC MC made the requisite inspection for all (100%) private and public schools during 2016/17. Verified the evidence from the</p> <p>Q1 report of 16/10/16</p> <p>Q2 report of 15/01/17</p> <p>O3 report of 15/03/17</p> <p>Q4 report of 15/07/17</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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	4	<p>Apac MEO discussed the findings and recommendations of inspection reports as evidenced in the minutes of the Departmental meeting of 19/07/17.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	2	<p>Apac MEO duly submitted inspection reports to the DES/MOES as evidenced by the acknowledgement notes by the DES on the following dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9/02/17 for Q1 and Q2 reports</li> <li>8/08/17 for Q3 and Q4 reports</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>MEO appropriately followed up inspection recommendations as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The minutes of the meeting of 24/03/17 between the MEO and SMC of Awiru P/S regarding guidance on how to nominate SMCs.</li> <li>MEOs letter of 01/09/17 to the H/T and SMC of Apac Model P/S regarding formation of SMC/PTA for Apac Model P/S</li> <li>Report of 08/09/16 by MEO on settlement of a land conflict between Angajiki P/S and Arocha Annex Caatholic Chruch School</li> </ul>

9	The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	5	The data submitted by the DEO of 12 schools for 2016/17 government aided primary schools is consistent with the EMIS (12) and OBT (12) data
	Maximum 10 for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	0	The data of 2016/17 government aided primary school enrolment of 14,162 submitted by the DEO is not consistent with EMIS (14199) and OBT (14664)

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	2	The Production, Marketing, Health, Education and Community-based Services (PMHEC) Committee is responsible for education on top of other social sectors. The committee met 5 out of the 6 mandatory times (i.e. on the 6th/1/2017, 7th/3/2017, 9th/9/2016, 24th/11/2016 and 26th/7/2016). A review of the committee minutes made available confirmed that sometimes (e.g. on the 6th/1/2017 pages 2) the standing committee discussed education service delivery issues including departmental quarterly updates on priorities and reports as well as challenges and recommendations. Even so, there was no evidence in the minutes of discussion of results from Performance Assessments, LG PAC Reports, inspection and monitoring.
	Maximum 4 for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	2	The council meetings on the 21st/10/2016 (pages 8) min: 06/02/AMC/MC/2016 deliberated on PMHEC Committee reports with education issues that required council's approval.

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>All primary schools have functional SMCs as evidenced by the minutes of the SMC meetings of the sample from the DEOs office:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apac Primary School</li> <li>• Alerwang P/S</li> <li>• Odokmae P/S</li> <li>• Apac Model P/S</li> <li>• Owang P/S</li> <li>• Awiri P/S</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>There were lists of schools that received UPE funds for 2016/17 that were seen publicized on the MEO's notice board</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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	0	<p>The procurement requests seen were submitted on 1/12/16.</p>

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"> <li>Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	3	<p>There was evidence that the DEO timely certified and initiated payment for suppliers in FY 2016/17. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request from Robling Enterprises Ltd for payment for construction of a single staff house at Alerwang P/S dated 20/2/17 was certified and forwarded on 21/2/2017 and paid on 21/2/2017.</li> <li>Request from Robling Enterprises Ltd for payment for construction of a single staff house at Alerwang P/S dated 14/3/17 was certified and forwarded on 17/3/2017 and paid on 21/3/2017.</li> <li>Request from Robling Enterprises Ltd for payment for construction of a single staff house at Alerwang P/S dated 15/4/17 was certified and forwarded on 3/5/2017 and paid on 4/5/2017.</li> <li></li> </ul>
----	---	---	---	--

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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	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 – 31st/10/2016 Receipt No: 0116; Q2 – 21st/2/2017 Receipt No: 0370; Q3 – 5th/5/2017 Receipt No: 0678; and Q4 – 1st/8/2017 Receipt No: 0876), 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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	2	<p>There was evidence that the education department provided information to the internal audit department on the status of implementation of audit findings; all audit issues raised in second and third quarter were responded to cleared and dropped as evidenced in the 2nd and 3rd quarter LGPAC report FY 2016/17 e.g. copy of response to audit recommendations on UPE schools on management of accounts, DEO responded by organizing Management training in a letter dated 6/6/2017 and a report after the training of head teachers dated 7/6/2017 was on file. Also the LGPAC reports show response like Maruzi seed school had audit query of redundant funds and the 3rd Quarter LGPAC review report shows that the query was responded to and cleared.</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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	2	<p>The Apac MC disseminated guidelines on gender as evidenced in the report on the workshop of 08/08/17 organised by the MEO for senior women and male teachers on how to provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	0	<p>The was no evidence to show dissemination of guidelines on sanitation for girls and PWDs</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>The Apac MC school management committees meet the guidelines on gender composition as evidenced by the minutes of the meetings by the following sampled SMCs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apac Primary School 2/6 ( COU as foundation body members) are women</li> <li>• Alerwang P/S 2/6 ( Catholic Church as foundation body members) are women</li> <li>• Odokmae P/S 2/6 (Catholic foundation body members) are women</li> <li>• Apac Model P/S 2/6 ( COU as foundation body members) are women</li> <li>• Owang P/S 2/6 ( COU foundation body members) are women</li> <li>• Awiri P/S , 2/6 (Catholic Church as foundation body members) are women</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• 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:</li> </ul>	3	<p>The MEO in collaboration with District Environmental Department issued guidelines on environment management as evidenced in the 12/09/17 workshop report of the sensitisation meeting on environment management</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Health Performance Measures

Apac Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 793)

Score 83/100 (83%)

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>	3	<p>Municipal Health Office is headed by a Principal Environmental Health Officer and only one Health Facility Biashara HC II is run under this municipality. 7/9 (78%) staff for Biashara Health Center II, the only health facility under the municipality are filled with staff whose wage bill is available.</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>	4	<p>There is no planned recruitment of the current FY according to the annual work plan. This is because one of the vacant posts was originally filled by the Nursing assistant (N/A) who left and this cadre has been removed from the MOH staffing structure and by law, any such staff who retires or dies in this capacity cannot be replaced. The second vacant post, the Askari, opted to remain under the district after formation of the Municipality and this post remains vacant.</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>	8	<p>100% Score. There is no HC IV in the municipality and hence the indicator was not applicable to Apac municipality.</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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	4	<p>All the 7 staff including the Enrolled nurse, Enrolled Midwife, Heath Assistant, Nursing assistant, 2 support staff and an askari have been deployed to Biasahara HC II with a wage bill available.</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"> <li>• Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>Guidelines received from the MOH go through the DHO to the Municipal Council. These guidelines are communicated to the health facility by way of letters or orientation training, e.g the guidelines for <i>national integrated early childhood development policy of Uganda</i> were communicated through a letter, date 29/11/2016. Guidelines for <i>injection safety and health care waste management</i> were communicated through a meeting with the health facility staff invited on 26/05/2016, and guideline for national implementation plan for <i>long acting reversible contraceptives and permanent methods</i> were communicated on the 13/03/2017. These communications are filed at the Municipal Health Office.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	3	<p>A meeting between the Municipal Health office and health care workers of Biashara HCII to communicate guidelines for national integrated early childhood development policy of Uganda was invited on 26/05/2017.</p>

6	The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services	Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3	3	The municipal Council has no HC IV. This indicator is therefore not applicable.
	Maximum 6 points for this performance measure	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	3	There is only one health facility under the municipal council. The Municipa Health office carried out support supervision quarterly supervision to Biashara HC II on the following dates; 10/08/2016, 15/11/2016, 17/02/2017 and 18/05/2017. support supervision reports are filed at the municipal Health Office at the time of the assessment.
7	The Health Sub-district(s) have effectively provided support supervision to lower level health units	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	6	The only HC II under this municipality was supervised quarterly in the previous FY (Q1 10/08/2016, Q2 15/11/2016, Q3, 17/02/2017, Q418/05/2017). Support supervision reports are available for verification.
8	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	• Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4	4	According to the support supervision reports, findings are discussed and recommendations generated to guide corrective actions. For example, a support supervision exercise on 10/08/2016 found stock outs of RDTs, poor time management by staff, not displaying guidelines for which recommendations were drawn for subsequent follow up.
	Maximum 10 points for this performance measure	• Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6	6	Recommendations were followed up in meetings between the health facility team and the Principal Environmental Health Officer. For example a meeting held on 12/08/2016 discussed the way forward and actions recommended from the support supervision exercise conducted on 10/08/2016.

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"> <li>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	10	<p>The only health facility is included in the district annual work plan where its budget is included. This facility however still reports through the district HMIS system as it is not logistically efficient to higher a biostatistician manage data from only one facility more so at HC II level.</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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	2	<p>The Production, Marketing, Health, Education and Community-based Services (PMHEC) Committee is responsible for health on top of other social sectors. The committee met 5 out of the 6 mandatory times (i.e. on the 6th/1/2017, 7th/3/2017, 9th/9/2016, 24th/11/2016 and 26th/7/2016). A review of the committee minutes made available confirmed that sometimes (e.g. on the 6th/1/2017 pages 3) the standing committee discussed health service delivery issues including departmental quarterly updates on priorities and reports as well as challenges and recommendations. Even so, there was no evidence in the minutes of discussion of results from Performance Assessments, LG PAC Reports, supervision and monitoring.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>The council meetings on the 22nd/12/2016 (pages 7) min: 06/03/AMC/MC/12/2016 deliberated on PMHEC Committee reports with health issues that required council's 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"> <li>• If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5</li> <li>• If 80-99% : score 3</li> <li>• If 70-79%: : score 1</li> <li>• If less than 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	5	<p>The HUMC of Biashara, the only health facility in the municipal council is functional. Minutes HUMC meetings for dates 10/03/2016, 9/12/2016, 7/04/2017 and 1/6/2017 are available in a counter book at the health facility.</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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	3	<p>Release of PHC funds received at the Municipality for 3rd quarter, (Ugx 2,717,334/=) for Biashara HC II, was displayed on the municipality notice board at the time of the assessment.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	0	<p>No copy of the procurement request was available at the office of the DHO at the time of the assessment although it was confirmed from the un signed PP form 1 that the district has planned to procure a motor cycle worth Ugx 5,000,000/=</p>
	<p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</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>	0	<p>Although this PP form was available (17/08/2017), it was only signed by the Municipal Health officer. No approval /authorization was signed. In addition, this document was not stamped.</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"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time:</li> <li>• 100% - score 8</li> <li>• 70-99% – score 4</li> <li>• Below 70% - score 0</li> </ul>	8	<p>The Municipal health office so far plays no role in the procurement of medicines that come to Biashara. After establishment of the Municipal Council, the role of medicines management was retained by the district.</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"> <li>• Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points</li> </ul>	0	<p>The health department had no capital development projects in FY 2016/17 as explained by the DHO. There were no suppliers for supplies, works or services. The department used micro procurement.</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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	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 – 31st/10/2016 Receipt No: 0116; Q2 – 21st/2/2017 Receipt No: 0370; Q3 – 5th/5/2017 Receipt No: 0678; and Q4 – 1st/8/2017 Receipt No: 0876), 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>	2	<p>The Health sector had audit queries as per the quarterly internal audit reports for example a copy of follow up letter from Town clerk to Health department to respond to 2nd quarter internal audit query on lack of accountability dated 14/6/2017 was on file in the health department. Also on the file was response to the above query from the health department and all accountability documents attached and it was cleared. Furthermore, audit query of V No. HL01/02/2017 and V No. HL01/03/2017 for paying porters for garbage had no daily attendance for the porters (page 10 3rd quarter internal audit report). The officer gave response to the above and query was dropped.(page 10). All audit queries were responded to as seen from the LGPAC Reports FY 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>	<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>2/5 (40%) members of the HUMC at Biashara HC II are females, therefore fulfilling gender composition requirements.</p> <p>Guidelines to manage sanitation in health facilities were not issued to health facilities by the LG.</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>	2	<p>The LG had issued these guidelines (Approaches for Health Care Waste Management, Health Workers' guide 2013) to Biashara HC II. A copy of these guidelines is available at the Municipal Health Office and Biashara by the time this assessment was conducted.</p>