



## LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Busia Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 776)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	3	50%
No	3	50%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.	xxx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG submitted a performance contract to MoFPED on 05/07/2017 as a draft and a final one was submitted late on 01/08/2017</li> </ul>	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Budget submitted on 05/07/2017 included a Procurement Plan for the FY 2017/18.</li> </ul>	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG made a late submission of the annual performance report for the FY 2016/17 i.e. 01/08/2017</li> </ul>	No
LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)	xxxxxx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG submitted all the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY2016/17 but the 4th quarter report was submitted late, see below;</li> </ul> <p>Quarter 1 – 31/10/2016</p> <p>Quarter 2 – 22/02/2017</p> <p>Quarter 3 – 03/05/2017</p> <p>Quarter 4 – 01/08/2017</p>	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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG made a submission to the Internal Auditor General on the Auditor General findings and the Internal Audit reports for the year.</li> <li>• The submissions were made on the 24th February 2017 of Reference CR/251/1 on the status of implementation of Internal Audit and Auditor General's findings as per documents inspected from the Internal Auditor's Office and Internal Auditor General's office made by the Municipal Town Clerk.</li> <li>• The Senior Internal Auditor as well made a submission to the Internal Auditor General on the 19th April 2017.</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>XXXXX</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Audit Opinion for the LG Financial Statements is unqualified as evidenced in the Audit Report dated December 2017 released in January 2018.</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Busia Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 776)

Score 35/100 (35%)

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>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>There is a functional physical planning committee constituted on 09/02/2012 chaired by the Town Clerk but according to committee minutes reviewed of 27/07/2017, 21/08/2016 and 27/03/2017 and the plans register, the committee doesn't consider new investments in time. I.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nalubega Amina submitted plan on 5/07/16 but hasn't been considered to date.</li> <li>• Kisakye Monica submitted plan on 4/08/16 and considered on 03/05/2017.</li> <li>• Muhwezi Enock submitted on 15/09/16 but hasn't been considered to date.etc....</li> </ul> <p>The LG has a physical structural plan but got expired in 2017 according to the National Planning board inventory.</p> <p>There are no approved plans for new infrastructure investments.</p>

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

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

0

According to the budget conference report for FY 2017/18 held on 09/11/2016 and AWP FY2017/18 that was approved under MIN.BMC19/2017 during a council meeting held on 30/05/2017, NOT ALL priorities in the AWP are based on the outcomes of the budget conference, i.e. from sector presentations;

- Construction of placenta pit at HC IV. Appears on page 1 of Health sector presentation, Health Sector AWP page 3.
- Redirecting of overhead wire and procurement of dental equipment at HC IV. Appears on page 1 and 2 of Health sector presentation, Sector AWP page 4.
- Rehabilitation of 2 classroom block at Buchicha P/S. – DOESN'T APPEAR in Education sector presentation, Sector AWP page 2.
- Construction of 5-stance Vip latrine at Busia Boarder P/S. - Appears on page 2 of Education sector presentation, Sector AWP page 2.
- Supply of 40 desks at Busia SS. - DOESN'T APPEAR in Education sector presentation, Sector AWP page 3
- Installation of 10 streetlights and repair works. - Appears in Works sector presentation, Sector AWP page 2 and 3.

- 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.

0

Whereas most capital investments approved in the AWP 2017/18 FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. FY 2015/16 – FY2019/20 approved during a council meeting that sat on 27/02/2015 under MIN.BMC 8/2/2015, there are some that were not derived from the DDP: See investments below from DDP FY 2017/18 priorities on page XV;

- Construction of placenta pit at HC IV. DOES NOT appear in DDP, Sector AWP page 3.
- Redirecting of overhead wire and procurement of dental equipment at HC IV. DOES NOT appear in DDP, Sector AWP page 4.
- Rehabilitation of 2 classroom block at Buchicha P/S. – Appears in DDP page XV, Sector AWP page 2.
- Construction of 5-stance Vip latrine at Busia Boarder P/S. - Appears in DDP page XV, Sector AWP page 2.
- Supply of 40 desks at Busia SS. - Appears in DDP page XV, Sector AWP page 3
- Installation of 10 streetlights and repair works. - Appears in DDP page XV, Sector AWP page 2 and 3.

- Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 1.

0

Project profiles were not developed

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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No annual statistical abstract, with gender disaggregated data was compiled.</li> </ul>
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>According to the annual budget performance report FY 2016/17, the LG implemented only 2 infrastructural projects and from the LG approved AWP and budget FY 2016/17 that was approved by council on 28/04/2016 under MIN.BMC 04/4/2016, it was established that these infrastructure projects were derived from the 2 documents For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of 5-stance pit latrine at Busia integrated P/S. – Health Sector AWP page 2, Budget page 16.</li> <li>Construction of main office block. – Works sector AWP page 4, Budget page 19.</li> </ul>
		<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	<p>At the time of assessment, It was hard to establish whether these projects were completed as per work plan by end for FY because all completion documents couldn't be accessed. I.e. that they had been handed over to the IGG's office. Yet the only completion certificate seen for Construction of 5-stance pit latrine at Busia integrated P/S didn't bare a completion date.</p>



5	<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects and assets during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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	<p>Whereas one of the two investment projects implemented in the FY 2016/17 was completed within the approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget, the other was NOT implemented within the above budget limits.</p> <p>See project s budget performance below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of 5-stance pit latrine at Busia integrated P/S. – 107.8%</li> <li>Construction of main office block. – 76.8%</li> </ul>
		<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	<p>Apart from the roads and engineering sector that budgeted and spent 107.3% of their routine maintenance of district roads, other sectors didn't provide any budget under O&amp;M for their infrastructural projects.</p>

Assessment area: Human Resource Management

6	<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The following HoDs were not appraised in accordance with MoPS appraisal guidelines during FY 2016/2017: Production, and Community Based Services.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The following HoD positions were not occupied substantively during FY 2016/2017: Education, Works, Production, and Finance.</li> </ul>

7	The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DSC Minute No. 10/2017 and job advert run in the Monitor of Friday December 23, 2016 (page. 32) indicate consideration for submissions for recruitment during FY 2016/2017.</li> </ul>
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DSC Minute No. 15/2017 and 48/2016 indicate consideration for submissions for confirmation during FY 2016/2017.</li> </ul>
		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were no cases for disciplinary action submitted during FY 2016/2017 for consideration by the DSC.</li> </ul>
8	Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months	<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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Of the staff appointed during FY 2016/2017 one staff (Mbiwa Paul) did not access the salary payroll within two (2) months of assumption of duty.</li> </ul>
	Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.	<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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no evidence provided that the only staff to retire during FY 2016/2017 (Ofwono Kenneth) accessed the pension payroll within two (2) months of retirement.</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Revenue Mobilization				
9	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)	<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Revenue (OSR) decreased from UGX. 1,347, 764,588 in 2015/2016 to UGX. 548, 569, 113 in 2016/2017. The percentage decrease was about 59%.</li> <li>The source of information is the Audited Financial Statements for 2015/2016 &amp; 2016/2017, Auditor General's Reports for 2015/2016.</li> </ul>
Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.				

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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Local Revenue Collection ratio for actual against budgeted in 2016/2017 was 86% derived from UGX. 548, 569, 113 actual against the planned UGX 637, 454, 755 in the year.</li> <li>• The source of information was the Audited Financial Statements for the Financial Year 2016/2017.</li> </ul>
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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG made LST collections amounting to UGX.27, 340,005 in the Financial Year 2016/2017. Information sourced from the Audited Financial Statements for 2016/2017.</li> <li>• It did not make any remittances to the LLGs during the year.</li> </ul>
		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the FY 2016/2017, the LG spent UGX. on council activities. The expenditure was within the Limit of the 20% (UGX. 269, 552, 917) of 2015/2016 actual Local Revenue collection of UGX. 1, 347,764, 588.</li> <li>• Therefore the LG spent within the 20% Limit.</li> </ul>

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>	2	<p>Busia Municipality has the position of Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer substantively filled. The Procurement Officer was appointed under Minute No. DSC. Min. 96/2015(i); and Assistant Procurement Officer appointed under DSC. Min. 84/2016</p>
----	---	---	---	--

		<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	The TEC committee meetings held on 7th and 8th December 2016 produced a technical evaluation report with recommendations for consideration by the Contracts Committee
		<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	Min CC 42/16/04 of the 42nd contracts committee meeting held on the 21st December 2016 considered and approved the recommendation by the TEC to award the contract for the construction of a 2 five stance pit latrine at Busia Integrated p/s and Arubaine p/s
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>	0	<p>a) All the infrastructural projects in the annual work for the Busia Municipality for the FY2017/18 approved by Busia Municipality Council on 30t/03/2017 under Minute No. BMC 19/2017, are presented in the Procurement and Disposable plan for the FY2017/18</p> <p>b) According to the quarterly reports for the FY 2016/17, Busia Municipality never made all the planned procurements for the FY 2016/17. The construction of the 2 classroom block at Busia Integrated p/s was not done because less financial support was provided than anticipated.</p>
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"> <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>	0	The bid documents for the FY 2017/18 were found to have been prepared late on 8th/12/2017.

		<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>	0	<p>Busia was found to have an updated contract registers covering all the works projects in the implemented in the FY 2016/17, including financial information, contractor, procurement reference number, project name, and commencement and completion date.</p> <p>However the procurement files were found to be incomplete with interim and completion certificates, and commissioning reports not on file.</p>
		<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>	2	<p>The Municipality adhered with the procurement threshold and conducted the procurement of works to construct a 2 5 stance pit latrine at Busia Integrated p/s (Contract value – Ugx. 22,500,000) under selective bidding process. Invitation for bids was sent to the pre-qualifies firms on 1st November 2016</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	<p>Both the Interim and Completion Certificates for works project, BMC 776/WRKS/2016 – 2017/00001 - Construction a 2, 5 stance pit latrine at Busia Integrated p/s were available. This was the only works project implemented in the FY 2016/17.</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>	0	<p>The implementation of the works projects for the FY 2017/18 hasn't yet started; and thus no site boards. At the time of assessment, the procurement process was still on on-going</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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG does not make timely monthly Bank reconciliations on the TSSA with last Reconciliation reported in the first quarter.</li> </ul>
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG made timely payments to Suppliers during the Financial Year 2016/2017 as evidenced from payments documents (vouchers, requisitions, invoices) evidenced from the Accounts of Health, Education, Works, Statutory Bodies, Finance examined. The payments time ranged from one to Fifteen days.</li> </ul>
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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG has no Substantive Senior Internal Auditor.</li> <li>The Internal Audit produced all the quarterly Internal Audit reports for 2016/2017 dated the 8th December 2016 , 6th March 2017, 2nd June 2017 and 31st July 2017 for First, Second, Third and Fourth Quarters respectively.</li> </ul>
		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG has provided information to the Council and LGPAC on the status of the implementation of the Audit findings evidenced through the submissions by the Internal Auditor to LGPAC as per the above dates of submissions.</li> <li>There were also submissions from the Internal Audit Department submitted to Internal Auditor General (IAG) copied to LGPAC &amp; Council to prove this.</li> </ul>

		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were submissions to LGPAC and Accounting officer as seen in the Internal Audit Reports, however, the LGPAC did not discuss the Internal Audit Reports for 2016/2017</li> </ul>
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG only maintains a stores Ledger and not Assets Register.</li> <li>• Therefore not compliant.</li> </ul>
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG had unqualified Audit Opinion for the FY 2016/2017.</li> <li>• Evidenced from the Auditor General's Report of 2016/2017 dated December 2017.</li> </ul>
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>According to the minutes available for FY2016/17, there is evidence that council sits i.e. sat on 23/07/2017, 30/05/2017, and 31/03/2017 e.t.c... and during the council meeting of 30/11/2016, the following were service delivery issues discussed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Customisation of the new staff structure under MIN.BMC 19/2016.</li> <li>• Adoption of the SAN TO PAN Technology for improvement of sanitation and hygiene. Under MIN: BMC 20/2016.</li> </ul>

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 feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2.</li> </ul>	2	<p>LG assigned the ATC as the complaints officer in a letter dated 05/07/2016 from the Town Clerk.</p> <p>There is also a file in place on reports /responses to 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: • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</p>	0	<p>The LG Payroll was seen but no Pensioners Schedule was displayed on public notice boards.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>Although there was a list of best evaluated bidders for various procurements, procurement plan was not seen published anywhere.</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	<p>N/A, Central Government didnt conduct any performance assessment for LGs during the FY 2016/17.</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"> <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	<p>There is evidence of an email dated 17/10/2017 from the senior planner sent to all Division Town clerks communicating DDEG/PRDP guidelines.</p>
		<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>	0	<p>No documentation in form of an activity report at least to prove action taken to this effect.</p>
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				



25

The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.

• Evidence that the LG gender focal person has provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities score 2.

2

The GFP gave support and technical advice on gender mainstreaming at the Municipality at various avenues. These are done. There's no specific budget, but these activities are into other projects that have a training component;

• During the TPC meeting for Busia Municipality held on 20th April 2017 at the Community Hall, the GFP made a presentation on Sensitisation on Gender Mainstreaming. Minutes of the meeting are available.

• Conducted a gender mainstreaming workshop on 21st/12/2016 for participants from the TPC and Divisions Executive Committee. A report addressed to the Assistant Town Clerk is available.

• Conducted a gender mainstreaming and sensitisation workshop for both councillors and technical team on 12th – 13th April, and a report is available.

• Provides technical support on gender mainstreaming in various projects such as UWEP and YLP

		<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>a) The GFP has planned activities on strengthening women's roles in the department plan, including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitation of women council meetings</li> <li>• Facilitation of m day celebrations</li> <li>• Support women activities and projects</li> </ul> <p>b) Activities to strengthen women's roles where budgeted for and received Ugx. 2,859,550 from the local revenue which was fully (100%) utilised on supporting women's activities and facilitating women's council meetings.</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>	2	<p>The environment screening form, plans and mitigation measures and budget for the two works investment projects for the FY 2017/18 were prepared and available. These projects are the construction of 2, five stance pit latrine each at Arubaine p/s and Busia Border p/s.</p>
		<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>	0	<p>There were no environmental and social management plans that were integrated into the contract bid documents and BOQs according to the reviews made on these documents. The environment officer claims not to be integrated into the preparation of BOQs and the subsequent bidding processes.</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>The LG has no land titles or agreements on file for the land where the works projects in schools are being implemented.</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	There was no have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form for the completed project. According to the environment officer, the form is still being processed.
--	--	---	---	--



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Educational Performance Measures

Busia Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 776)

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>A budget of UGX. 1,132,296,793/= was in place for 181 teachers across 7 schools. On average, each school has 26 teachers. Implying that, the threshold of 8 teachers per school exist.</p> <p>The 181 teachers were rationally distributed. The school with lowest staff had 19 teachers while the highest had 41 teachers thus meeting the thershold of 8 teachers per school.</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>	6	<p>The staff ceiling for the municipality is 181 teachers with a wage bill in place. Teachers in post are 181 [100%].</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	<p>By structure 2 inspectors should be in place but 1 is in post substantively. However, submission for appointment was in place and the process is on going.</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>Since the posts of teachers were up to capacity there was no need for a recruitment plan for the teachers.</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>Since the process of filling the vacant post of the inspector was in progress as per submission of 04/10/2017, the work plan in place was being implemented.</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"> <li>The two (2) school inspectors during FY 2016/2017 were not appraised in accordance with MoPS appraisal guidelines.</li> </ul>
		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Of the seven (7) primary school headteachers during FY 2016/2017 only two (2) constituting 29% namely Mugeni Martin Mathias and Agaba William were appraised.</li> </ul>

Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection

6	<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> <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>1</p> <p>2</p>	<p>Circulars from MoES: On the Ball Ltd. - 24/02/2017; Teacher support supervision inschools.- 30/06/2017; Circular No. 05/2017- Performing art festival. Circulars from Municipality to schools: Workshop on e-registration; Stakeholders meeting - 02/01/2017; Kids Athletics - 11/04/2017; Registration of PLE candidates- 23/03/2017; and Performance Agreements /Reports - 23/03/2017.</p> <p>A record of minutes and attendance lists for 3 meetings held on 31/05/2017; 12/07/2017; and 24/07/2017 were in place with traces of policy issues discussed.</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: 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.</li> </ul>	10	<p>47 schools [7 government &amp; 40 private] were inspected as follows: quarters 1-4 , 47 [100%]; 47 [100%]; 46 [97.7%]; and 42[89.4%] respectively, giving an average of 96.8% schools inspected.</p>

8	<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>Departmental meetings' minutes of: 14/03/2017; 28/06/2017; 24/04/2017;/05/05/2017;and 24/04/2017 indicated that discussions were done, decisions and actions taken on issues related to inspection findings.</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>	0	<p>Records available indicated that inspection reports for quarters 1-4 dated 03/02/2016; 03/01/2017; 03/04/2017 and 03/07/2017 respectively were all submitted to MoEs PS's office on 13/02/2018. Implying, they were submitted late - 8 months after FY 2016/2017 had ended.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>Follow-up reports for quarters 1-4 dated 08/10/2016; 25/01/2017; 10/04/2017; and 26/06/2017 respectively were in place with issues related to inspection among others but not submitted to MoES as required.</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"> <li>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	5	<p>According to OBT, list of schools and statistical forms both at school and municipality. the names and number of schools in EMIS data base at MoES do tally.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5</li> </ul>	5	<p>The enrolment figures in OBT, statistical forms at both municipality and schools do tally with those in EMIS data base at the MoES. Schools, for example: Madibira [12307] - 1103 boys &amp; 1357 girls; Buchicha [12303] - 560 boys &amp; 692 girls; and Busia Boarder [12301] - 557 boys &amp; 647 girls, had enrolment figures tallying with EMIS data.</p>
<p>Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>				



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"> <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> <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	<p>From the committee minutes, it was established that a committee sat and discussed service delivery issues for example during a committee meeting that sat on 20/07/2017, under MIN.15/2017, presentation by Inspector of schools and discussion of departmental progress report was done.</p> <p>During a committee meeting that sat on 27/10/2016, under MIN. 7/2016, the following were some of the issues recommended for approval in council;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land acquisition for Arubaine P/S extension should be halted due to some challenges pending further consultations.</li> <li>• The next budget for FY 2017/18 should have the component of monitoring under local revenue fixed within 20%.</li> </ul>
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 schools [100%], had SMCs in place but appointed as need arises for renewal on expiry. For example, appointment letters for Busia Borders of 15/04/2016 and for Buchicha and Madibira dated 08/02/2018 demonstrated this.</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"> <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>UPE funds for all schools had been displayed on notice board for public viewing.</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>	4	<p>Procurement requests for FYs 2017/17 and 2017/18 dated 25/08/2016 and 14/09/2017 respectively were in place.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG Education department made timely certification and recommendations for payments to suppliers in time. This was evidenced from the payments documents (vouchers, funds requisition forms, interim certificates) for the following Supplies &amp; Projects in 2016/2017; Construction of a FIVE STANCE VIP LATRINE at BUSIA INTEGRATED PRIMARY SCHOOL, Construction of 2 Two Classroom Blocks at BUSIA BORDER &amp; MARACHI Primary Schools, Retention for the Construction of a FIVE STANCE Latrine at BUCHICHA Primary School, Retention for the construction of a TWO Classroom Block at ARUBAINE Primary School and Retention for the construction of a Four Classroom Block at MADIBIRA Primary School. The Certification ranged from one and twelve days.</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>From the annual performance report, the department acknowledged submission of the annual performance report for FY 2016/17 on 27/07/2017 which is a late submission.</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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• • The sector had one (1) query for the Financial Year 2016/2017 evidenced with the Internal Audit Reports on unaccounted funds by the Municipal Education officer on activities of monitoring and supervision of schools.</li> <li>• There was no evidence of formal responses to Audit findings (Internal Audit Reports and Management letters) availed for examination.</li> </ul>

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>Records of 21/02/2017 showed that guidelines on gender based issues were issued to schools.</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	There was no evidence of collaboration with with gender department to issue guidelines to schools.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>	1	According to appointments and attendance lists to meetings, there was evidence that at least 3 women were members to each SMC.
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>	0	There were no guidelines on the management of environment in schools although there was a distribution list of trees to schools dated 04/10/2017. A visit to schools indicated lack of trees and flowers in some schools and unstructured compounds with a lot of dust due to bear grounds.



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Health Performance Measures

Busia Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 776)

Score 52/100 (52%)

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>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of wage IPFs in performance contract for FY 2017/18 revealed a wage provision of 287,319,000 million shillings which is way below the require an IPF of about 311,189,616 million per year for the 36 health workers in post FY 2017/18 as per the same performance contract</li> <li>• There is communication from the Town clerk to Ministry of Public Service and the Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic development communication request for revised wage IPF for health workers</li> </ul>
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 a comprehensive staff recruitment plan for the health department in the district performance contract 2017/18 – covering the vacant positions of health workers</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The in-charge of the only HC IV in the municipality (Busia HC IV) during FY 2016/2017 was appraised. The MC had no health facility at hospital level.</li> </ul>
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The list of health workers deployed at Busia HC VI is consistent with the staff lists submitted together with the budget 2017/18</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision				

5

The DHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities

Maximum 6 for this performance measure

• 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

• There were no communication letters to indicate that the DHO communicated ALL of the following guidelines issued by the national level in the previous year:

1. PHC grants guidelines 2016/17
2. MoH guidelines for eye care – October 2016
3. Uganda Clinical Guidelines – 2016
4. Essential Medicines & Health Supplies List – 2016
5. MoH Resettlement Policy Framework – 2016
6. Health Sector Quality Improvement Framework and Strategic Plan 2015/16 – 2019/20, June 2016

• 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

• No meetings minutes between the Principle Medical Officer at the municipality and the in-charge of Busia HC IV were presented for the period 2016/17



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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Health department at the municipality did not avail the mandatory quarterly integrated support supervision reports for the year 2016/17</li> <li>• The Supervision log books at Busia HC IV had no logs of ALL the mandatory quarterly integrated support supervision by the health department at the municipality during FY 2016/17</li> </ul>
		<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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Health department at the municipality did not avail the mandatory quarterly integrated support supervision reports</li> <li>• There is only one health facility (Busia HC IV) in the municipality and NO lower level health facility</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• The HSD (Busia HC IV) did not avail the mandatory quarterly integrated support supervision reports by the HSD for FY 2016/17. Busia HC IV is the only health facility in the municipality – there are no other health facility to supervise</li> </ul>

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"> <li>• Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The mandatory quarterly integrated support supervision reports were not availed for this assessment.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The mandatory quarterly integrated support supervision reports were not availed for this assessment.</li> </ul>
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: o List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lists of facilities in OBT and HIMS are not consistent with each other – The HIMS list from MoH does not have a specific list of HFs for Busia Municipal Council.</li> <li>• The only HF in Busia Municipal Council OBT is listed under Busia district on the HIMS list</li> </ul>

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>From the committee minutes, it was established that a committee sat and discussed service delivery issues for example during a committee meeting that sat on 20/07/2017, under MIN.15/2017, presentation by PMO and discussion of health sector performance report for 4th quarter FY 2016/17 was done.</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>During a committee meeting that sat on 20/07/2017, under MIN.15/2017, the following were some of the issues recommended for approval in council;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upgrading of HC IV to a community hospital.</li> <li>• Increase of funding for the health sector during the next budget.</li> </ul>
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Busia Municipality has only one health facility (Busia HC IV) and it availed all the mandatory quarterly meeting minutes for 2016/17</li> <li>• All the mandatory quarterly meeting minutes held on the 19th September 2016, 17th November 2016, 27th January 2017 and 13th June 2017 had discussions of budget and resource issues</li> </ul>
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a posting of PHC non-wage recurrent grant received by Busia HC IV on the public notice board at the Municipality</li> <li>• The Public notice board at Busia HC IV had postings of the PHC non-wage received</li> </ul>

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"> <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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was a submission letters to DPU that covered all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget dated 26th April 2017</li> <li>The plan had items like the construction of a placenta pit at Busia HC IV, procurement of a printer and accessories.</li> </ul>
		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was a copy of the procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY 2017/18 availed.</li> <li>This was a fuel request authorized by on the 21st September 2017</li> </ul>
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>100% - score 8</li> <li>70-99% – score 4</li> <li>Below 70% - score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were Procurement Plans for Busia HC IV for 2016/17 signed and forwarded to NMS by the In-charge on behalf of Busia Municipality health department on the 10th February 2016</li> </ul>

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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MHO made timely certification and recommendations for payments to suppliers in time. This was evidenced from the payments documents (vouchers, funds requisition forms, interim certificates) for the following projects and Supplies in 2016/2017; Fuel for the Department. The certification ranged between one and two days.</li> </ul>
----	--	--	---	---

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>From the annual performance report, the department acknowledged submission of the annual performance report for FY 2016/17 on 27/07/2017 which is a late submission.</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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If sector has no audit query score 4</li> <li>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</li> <li>If all queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sector had three (3) queries for the Financial Year 2016/2017 evidenced with the Internal Audit Reports on lacking accountabilities for support supervision by the department In charge, suppliers of stationery and fuel for the department Quarters.</li> <li>There was no evidence of formal responses to Audit findings (Internal Audit Reports and Management letters) availed for examination.</li> </ul>
----	---	--	---	--

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

18	<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The list of Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) members at Busia HC IV had more than two females members</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating toilet facilities for men and women were found at Busia HC IV</li> <li>• However toilets were separated for men and women at Busia HC IV</li> </ul>
19	<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LGs has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal : score 2 points.</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No medical waste management guidelines, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal were found at Busia HC IV</li> </ul>