



## LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Gulu District

(Vote Code: 508)

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	Submitted to MOFPED on 07/12/2017.	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	Submitted to MOFPED on 15/May /2017	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)	xxxxxx	The annual performance report was submitted on 02/August 2017 consistent with records at MOFPED. Soft copy dated 31/July 2017 and accountability for submission of said report reviewed at the District.	No
LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)	xxxxxxx	Q1 - Q4 budget performance reports submitted on 25/11/2016; 24/02/2017; 15/05/2017; 02/08/2017 respectively. Submission date for Q4 was after 31 July 2017.	No
Assessment area: Audit			

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by April 30 (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action (PFMA Act 2015; Local Governments Financial and Accounting Regulations 2007; The Local Governments Act, Cap 243).</p>	<p>XXXXX</p>	<p>The LG provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General findings for the previous years as per the internal audit report of 2016/2017 submitted to the Ministry of Finance</p> <p>The Ministry of finance received the 20116/2017 report on 9th March 2017 with 11 responses with actions against each response</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>XXXXX</p>	<p>According to Audit General audit report of 2016/2017 Gulu LG scored a qualified opinion and issues of concern were</p> <p>Unaccounted for funds, unaccounted for medicines and health supplies , theft of District motor cycles , under absorption, low recovery of YLP funds, irregularly incurred domestic arrears</p>	<p>Yes</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Gulu District

(Vote Code: 508)

Score 55/100 (55%)

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>	0	Physical Planning Committee (PPC) is not functional. Whereas it is constituted as evidenced by the letter of 5/07/ 2017. No evidence of PPC considering new investments was provided.
		<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>	0	Infrastructure investments as found in AWP do not have approved plans. PPC has not yet had a formal meeting to consider its business.
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>	0	No budget conference report was provided. However a circular dated 13th March 2017 communicating to all Heads of Department, Gulu District Local Government was seen. The communication was an onward transmission of the Final Budget Call Circular (BCC) from MOFPED and invitation of the District Budget Desk Committee to undertake the process.
		<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>AWP FY 2017/18 under Min.04/COUN/2017 was considered in the 5th Full Council meeting of the 10th Council held on 31st March 2017 and differed to respective Standing Committees.</p> <p>AWP FY 2017/18 under Min.08/COUN/2017 was considered for discussion in the 6th Full Council meeting of the 10th Council held on 30th May 2017 and approved under Min. 09/COUN/2017.</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>	1	<p>Min.11/FIN/2017 of the Planning, Administration and Investment Committee meeting held on 23rd May 2017 provides a basis for the TPC having discussed the project profiles prior to submission through the Presentation and Discussion of Draft Departmental Budget Estimates and Work Plans containing project profiles as presented by the Planning Department.</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>Annual statistical abstract with gender disaggregated data is compiled. It has projections of 2018 and uses 2014 as the base year.</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>5th Full Council Meeting of the 10th Council sitting on 31st March 2017 to discuss among others Draft Budget Estimates of FY2017/18 which included a performance review report for FY 2016/17. 4th Full Council Meeting of 29th December 2016 also considered related matters under Min.29/COUN/2016.</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>	2	<p>92.5% of the investment projects were completed. According to the DDEG supervision and monitoring report for FY 2016/17, out of the 27 investment projects only 2( Construction of Produce Store in Pawel Parish Patiko Sub County and Construction of mini Abattoir in Agonga, Bungatira Sub County) were not completed.</p>

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>	2	According to the consolidated LG Performance Report FY 2016/17, the Cumulative Receipts, disbursements and Expenditure for the District by the end of the fourth Quarter of the FY 2016/17 received UGX 22,633,750,000 against planned total Budget of UGX 26,412,914,000 which represents performance of 86% of the expected revenue outturn.
	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	No dis-aggregated evidence found in the consolidated LG Performance Report FY 2016/17 that LG budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&M for infrastructure in education, health and water.

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	There was no evidence for appraisal of any head of department as per the personnel files reviewed.
	Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3</li> </ul>	0	The district has substantively filled only one post of a District Health Officer. Two more posts of a Planner and Internal Audit had also been filled substantively but were units as per MoPS guidelines. The rest of the Sector heads were on duty assignment except CFO who is an Acting Head of department.

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

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

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

2

The DSC considered all the declared vacancies as noted below:

- a) DSC/EXT 1/03/2017 (Replacement)
- (i) Management & Administration (SHRO & PAS). However, DSC failed to attract a Senior Office Supervisor
- (ii) Finance and Administration 3 declared and considered i.e. SFO, Accountant & Senior Account Assistant
- (iii) Works 2 Declared one considered Water officer. However, the Senior Ass Engineer issue still under IGG investigation before completion.
- (iv) Health all 3 declared and considered i.e. ADHO, Senior Health Educator & Cold Chain Technician
- (v) Production all the i.e. Senior Community Officer
- (vi) Planning; Senior Planner
- (vii) Education; an Education Inspector
- (viii) Community; Senior Labour Officer
- b) DSC/EXT/3/04/2017
- All the 5 drivers were considered.
- c) Education All submissions were considered ( 84 recruited as per declaration of vacancies letters dated 18th December 2016 to DSC).

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

0

The total number of staff that were submitted by office of the CAO Gulu for confirmation were 27 and only 7 were considered (30%) in the financial year 2016/17.

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

1

No disciplinary cases were submitted to DSC for the financial year 2016/17 for action.



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>	0	<p>Majority of the staff recruited in the previous financial year had accessed the payroll within one month. However, there was a case of Monica Olwoc that took 3 months (Recruited on 12th May 2017, acceptance 22nd May 2017 and accessed payroll in August 2017) to access payroll.</p>
		<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	<p>The 3 officers who retired in 2016/17 financial year by the names of Mr Odongo James Ottawa (19/5/2017); Mr Oyat John (10/5/2017) and Mr Omona Justine Obura (14/4/2017) had not accessed the pension payroll within the 2 months after retirement.</p>
Assessment area: Revenue Mobilization				
9	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>The revenue increase stands at less than 1% as per the annual financial statement 2016/2017, the CFO explained that their highest estimate was on compensation by the UNRA that did not materialize and the UNRA assessment has been ongoing for more than one financial year</p> <p>Also they expected to realise local revenue from disposal of scraps that included old vehicles and other office equipments but the government has not valued the items for sale .that explains the no increase of the revenue</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>	0	<p>The local revenue collection ratio against the annual planned budget of 2015/2016 as per the annual plans and budget and Final Accounts stands at -52% ( Budgeted revenue was 870,408,000 , collected was 451,863,100).</p> <p>The explanation to this is that their biggest hope of much local revenue would come from property tax and disposal of assets like vehicle and other office equipment which did not work for them as plan</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>The Lower Local government remits to the Higher local government 35% of the local revenue collected (business licences , trading, market dues etc) as seen from the deposits of 992,792 on 16th Nov/2016, On 19th December remittance of 518,000 20th of December 2016 364,000 was remitted on 20th March 2017 575,000 was remitted and 28th March 2017 1,043,000 was remitted and the HLG remits 65% to the LLG collections from local service tax and other goods and services( forest products) These deposits were recorded in the financial statement 2016/2017</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>According to the minutes dated 25th July 2017 from the Clerk to council and the financial statement of 2016/2017 the LG is not using more that 20% of own source revenue and council activities.</p> <p>They however raised concern that the 20% given to them is not sufficient as they have 12 seating's in a year as the per the requirements of the LG Act therefore they normally exhaust their allocation before the end of the year, so they are asking for the increase</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>There is a Procurement Officer but no Senior Procurement Officer. The current Procurement Officer is still training to obtain a post-graduate Diploma in procurement (which is a requirement for Senior Procurement Officer).</li> <li>The post for Senior Procurement Officer was advertised starting early December 2017</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A clearly labelled "Submission to CC" file was produced and seen. It had reminders to the Contracts Committee of pending payments to be made.</li> <li>The Procurement Officer is secretary to the Contracts Committee.</li> </ul>
		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is evidence that the Contracts Committee sits and considers TEC recommendations and gives written replies. A special File labelled "CC Decisions" was seen kept at the Procurement office.</li> <li>The file has mainly approvals but there was also a 'deferment' in one instance to the DHO where the action has been overtaken by events.</li> </ul>
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>All 15 infrastructural projects included in the approved Annual Work plan were executed. Between April and June, plans are drawn for pre-qualification and Annual Framework Contracts. Between July and Sept, they advertise for bidding – open and selective</li> <li>All procurements done were extracted from the Annual Workplan</li> </ul>

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>39 out of 120 (32.5%) projects had bid documents prepared before Aug. 30</li> </ul>
		<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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An updated Contracts Register was seen. The disparity is that the Register is kept by Finance Department whereas the completed procurement activity files are kept by the procurement department. Each department seems to keep strict watch over what is entrusted to them and not peer beyond their domain of influence.</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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Projects sampled as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Construction of Livestock market in Corner Ader (Palaro Sub-county). This was UGX72,468,800. Open bidding.</li> <li>b) Construction of a mini-abattoir in Bungatira sub-county. This cost UGX20,200,174. Selective bidding method was used.</li> <li>c) Consultancy services for Deep Borehole design, siting, and drilling, supervision (various locations – Awach, Bungatira, and Palaro sub-counties). The cost was UGX9,310,200. Selective bidding method was used.</li> <li>d) Supply of 500 pyramidal tsetse fly traps. Cost was 12,500,000. Selective bidding method was used.</li> <li>e) Supply of a double-cabin pick-up vehicle to Education Department. Cost was 151,972,500. Open bidding was used.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reports are certified and payments were made BUT on many occasions one signature is missing. Certification requires, for example, the District engineer, Natural Resources Officer, Auditor and CAO all to sign. But in many cases when the Engineer signs, payments are effected without the other signatures.</li> </ul>
		<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>Labeling is done but not clearly (see photographs in Drop Box). Source and amount of funding is not indicated.</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>Bank reconciliation is update up-to December 2017 and prepared on daily basis by the staff</p> <p>There is however a challenge that emanates from the Ministry of Finance , Gulu local government uses Integrated Financial Management System (TSA) therefore for their bank reconciliation to be complete, Accountant general office in MDA must upload the bank statement and in most cases there is a delay in uploading the bank Statement by Finance. an issue that needs to be addressed by the Finance Ministry</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>Gulu Local government makes timely payment of their suppliers after following all the due process. Most of their payments are made within a period of one month</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> <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> <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>	<p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p>	<p>There is Principal Internal auditor in Gulu LG who does the preparation of the quarterly internal audit report, and all the internal audit reports of 2016/2017 are available</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG provided information to the council and LGPAC on the status of the implementation of the internal auditors finding</li> <li>There were minutes of LG PAC with Clerk to Council</li> <li>Amended reports of actions taken on recommendations for the financial year 2015/2016. 2016/2017</li> </ul> <p>There is evidence of internal audit reports for the previous financial year submitted to LG accounting officer</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>	4	<p>Gulu LG maintains a detailed up to date asset register as per the format of 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>unqualified audit opinion: score 4</li> <li>Qualified: score 2</li> <li>Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</li> </ul>	2	<p>Gulu LG scored qualified report for the financial year 2016/2017 as per the Auditor General Annual reports of 2017</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gulu LG has many issues to respond to that included unaccounted for funds , unaccounted medicines and health supplies, theft of District Motorbikes, irregularly domestic arrears, under absorption, failure to conduct property rate valuation</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>AWP FY 2017/18 under Min.08/COUN/2017 was considered for discussion in the 6th Full Council meeting of the 10th Council held on 30th May 2017 and approved under Min. 09/COUN/2017.</p>
22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2.</p>	2	<p>Deputy CAO is the designated officer to coordinate response to feed-back. This is done quarterly through Barazas where all Heads of Department present their plans and performance reports to the communities.</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>No publication of LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule pinned on notice boards at District HQs.</p>
		<p>• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1</p>	0	<p>No evidence of publication found at District H/Qs noticeboard.</p>
		<p>• 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.</p>	0	<p>“N/A. The Central Government did not conduct the Annual Performance Assessment for LGs in 2016/17”.</p>



24	The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens	<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	Circular Dated 13th March 2017 communicating to all Heads of Department, Gulu District Local Government seen. Communication was an onward transmission of the Final Budget Call Circular (BCC) from MOFPED.
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	<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	Quarterly Baraza(involving all Heads of Department) reports.

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.	<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>GFP trained all Sector Heads and Heads of Departments on Gender mainstreaming at a Workshop held 30th July 2017</li> <li>There is a report on Gender mainstreaming in development planning and budgeting in Gulu LG.</li> <li>There is a report on Gender responsive budgeting for Gulu district for 2017</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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A 2017/2018 Workplan exists where 11 Gender activities for Gulu district are catered for.</li> <li>Out of the UGX8 million budgeted in FY 2016/2017, Gulu Gender Sector received a paltry 1.4 million for yearly project activities and UGX3 million for Women's Day celebrations (totalling 55% of planned value). So, actual money for yearly implementation of activities under gender is 17.5% and for Women's day is 37.5% totalling to 55% of planned budget.</li> </ul>



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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

• Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 2

2

- Seven screening reports seen for 2017, namely:
  - Soy bean farming project in Paicho sub-county
  - Sorghum beer farming project in Bungatira sub-county
  - Fish pond and recreation Centre in Ongako sub-county
  - Soy bean farming in Unyama sub-county
  - Reforestation of Pamanyi Forest in Awach sub-county.
  - Awach-Pugwinyi Access Road in Awach sub-county.
  - Two access roads in Bungatira sub-county

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

0

- Social management guidelines exist at the Environment office but no bid document seen deliberately included them.

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

0

- Process of land registration for project implementation still in preliminary stages. Many projects, including government projects under LG have no proof of Land ownership. Of schools, only Gulu Secondary and Ongako Seed Secondary school have Land Titles. No Health Centre has a Land Title. Of the six sub-counties that constitute Gulu District, three have Land titles for the land occupied by the Sub-County Headquarters (Bungatira, Patiko and Palaro). The other three sub-counties (Awach, Paicho and Unyama) have no Land Titles for the areas where the sub-county Headquarters are located. Other LG establishments that have Land Titles include The District Headquarters, Land leased to UMI (Uganda Management Institute), District Council offices, District Water office and BOMA ground. The rest of the LG establishments have no Land Titles.

		<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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Six certificates seen (and more were available) issued as “Certificate of Environmental Restoration” fully signed by DLG Environmental Officer, District Engineer, Chief Administrative Officer and Contractor. Three copies of each Certificate are signed and one copy given to the Developer, one copy kept by the Project beneficiary and a third copy retained by the DLG at the Environment Office.</li></ul>
--	--	---	---	---



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Educational Performance Measures

Gulu District

(Vote Code: 508)

Score 60/100 (60%)

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>Budgets are in place for all the 55 schools in the LG</p> <p>The LG has deployed the required number of teachers to all the 55 schools in the LG.</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>100 % of the primary school teacher positions have been filled.</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>All the two positions of senior inspector of schools and inspector of schools have been filled</p>

4	<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of Primary Teachers: score 2</p>	2	<p>The school inspectors had already been recruited in the previous financial year</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>The school inspectors had already been recruited in the previous financial year</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	<p>The school inspector was not appraised in the financial year 2016/17</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised head teachers during the previous FY. • 90% - 100%: score 3 • 70% - 89%: score 2 • Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<p>The district had 39 substantively appointed head teachers of which 19 ( 49%) Head teachers had been appraised at the time of the assessment.</p>

Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection

6	The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools	<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>	1	guidelines were communicated as evidenced by the Education Act 2008, the Education Ordinance and the school feeding programme. The Lg supported by Save the Childrens Fund have developed a Gulu District school feeding programme policy to be used in schools.
	Maximum 3 for this performance measure	<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>	2	The district has held meetings out of which the Gulu school feeding programme policy was developed. This policy is well documented by the department.
7	The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all private and public primary schools	<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>	6	The LG has 55 public and 35 private primary schools giving a total of 90 schools as evidenced by the posting on the board of the DEO. out of these 77 have been inspected making 74%.
8	LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations	<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>	0	The department discusses school inspection reports. Minutes seen for 01/06/2017 where it was reported that both nursery and primary schools were inspected. In the minutes there was no evidence of making recommendations for corrective action.
	Maximum 10 for this performance measure	<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	The was no evidence that the reports were submitted to the Directorate of Education Standards. there was no evidence at the DES offices and there was no evidence at the departmental level

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4</li> </ul>	4	The head teachers in the sampled schools reported that inspection recommendations were being followed up especially in classroom teaching and instruction of learners. Copies of inspection reports were produced in Bungatira and Gulu PTC demonstration where the inspector of schools inspected the classes in progress and made comments which they are now using
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: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5</li> </ul>	5	Copies of EMIS forms submitted to the MoES seen.
		<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5</p>	5	The department has a comprehensive list of enrollment per school by gender and by close of 2017 the enrolment was 18,615 males and 17,438 females giving a total of 36,053
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				
10	<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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	Social Services Committee sat on 16th May 2017 to discuss among others Q2 & Q3 Departmental reports for FY 2016/17 under Min. 10/SSC/2017- B. Matters considered included: improving school inspections; deployment of teacher's to schools with acute shortage; parent sensitisation on feeding children; and reallocation of funds to procure desks.

		<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>Social Services Committee at the 4th Full Council meeting of the 10th Council held on 29th December 2016 under Min. 29/COUN/2016-C(iii) presented issues that require approval which inter alia included the Draft District Strategic Plan to Revamp Quality of Education Service Delivery in Gulu for the period 2017-2019.</p>
11	<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO) • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80% schools: score 0</p>	0	<p>Of the 55 public primary schools in the district by the time of the assessment only 27 files for SMCs had minutes of the school management committee meetings (49%).</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>LG has published all school receiving non-wage recurrent grants on notice boards at Departmental 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>Procurement plans were in place evidenced by a procurement plan for 2016/17 prepared on 17/05/2017 which is beyond the mandatory deadline of by 30th April.</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>The is evidence that the LG education department timely certified and recommended suppliers for payment for example requisition was made on 16th of June 2016 and went through all the due process and by 21st payment was made</p> <p>Supply of 68 seater desks was paid with two weeks</p>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				
15	<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>No evidence was provided. Only submission of performance report was seen through the availed extract of the Output Budgeting Tool (OBT) dated 14th June 2016.</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	<p>The education sector provided information to the internal audit on the status of audit findings,The sector has audit queries and did not respond to all audit queries</p> <p>The CAO directed one head of school to DSC for disciplinary action</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>Guidelines have been disseminated and used in training of pupils by senior women teachers as evidenced by the training and meetings between the senior woman teacher and pupils in Gulu PTC Demonstration school dated 27/06/2017</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>There was no evidence at the time of assessment that the LG education department and the gender department issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls</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 school management committee has followed gender guidelines . In Bungatira PS the SMC has four females and nine males and in Gulu PTC demonstration school there are there are four females and nine males</p>

18	<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 department has collaborated with the environmental department in issuing guidelines on environmental management as evidenced by the schools having woodlots eg. in Gulu Bethel Christian School, Bungatira PS and Gulu PTC demonstration school</p>
----	--	---	---	--



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Health Performance Measures

Gulu District

(Vote Code: 508)

Score 65/100 (65%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human resource planning and management				
1	<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than 80% filled: score 6 points,</li> <li>• 60 – 80% - score 3</li> <li>• Less than 60% filled: score 0</li> </ul>	6	84.2% (252) of the 299 health workers the current wage bill on the payroll.
2	<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 4</p>	0	<p>Recruitment plan was submitted but no hard copy was recorded in the registry. The hard copy available in the DHO's office did not have the date of receipt by the HRM.</p>
3	<p>The LG Health department has ensured that performance appraisal for health facility in charge is conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the health facility in-charge have been appraised during the previous FY: o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The performance appraisal reports for all the In-Charges (One Health Centre IV; 3 Health Centre III and 20 Health Centre IIs) were not provided to the assessor for review.</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>	0	<p>The staff list available did not match the OBT list. For example:</p> <p>Awach HCIV staff list has a Senior Clinical Officer yet the submitted list does not have.</p> <p>Awach HCIV staff list has three Nursing Officers (Midwifery) yet the submitted list had only one.</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>There was evidence of the DHO's communication of the circulars, policies and guidelines received. For example, the following guidelines were disseminated:</p> <p>National Technical Guidelines for Integrated Disease Surveillance and Response – April last year in a meeting;</p> <p>Guide for reaching every district and reaching every child in Uganda on email.</p> <p>Uganda Clinical treatment guidelines – disseminated to the lower facilities on 20th December in a meeting;</p> <p>Meningitis guideline – 9th January 2017 on email.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilisation of PHC non-wage guidelines through email on 12th November 2016</li> </ul>
---	--	--	---	---

		<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>The DHO held the following meetings attended by facility In-charges and communicated related aspects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A regional dissemination meeting for revised HIV prevention and treatment was held on 17th February 2017.</li> <li>A mentorship meeting to roll out HIV guidelines for the revised HIV prevention and treatment was conducted on 30th December 2016.</li> </ul>
6	<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3</p>	3	<p>.100% (Awach HCIV, the only one in the district) was supervised as reflected in DHT's supervision reports for all the quarters.</p> <p>The reports had voucher numbers; 81623; HEL/27/5/2015; 81618; and the one of end of September 2017.</p> <p>There was no district hospital.</p>
		<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY: • If 100% supervised: score 3 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	3	<p>Minutes of DHT meetings availed showed supervision of 100% (22 government and 2 private) lower facilities.</p> <p>The minutes included the ones for meetings held on; 9th May 2017; 25th July 2017; 7th June 2017; 26th February 2017; 24th February 2017; 10th March 2017; 20th September 2016; 31st August 2016; 30th August 2016; 14th September 2016; 2nd December 2016; 1st November 2016; 14th September 2016; 11th October 2016; and 5th October 2016.</p>

7	<p>The Health Sub-district(s) have effectively provided support supervision to lower level health units</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities have been supervised by HSD and reports produced: • If 100% supervised score 6 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 4 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 2 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	<p>2</p> <p>.76.1% (16 out of 21) facilities were supervised by the HSD as reflected in the following reports:</p> <p>Facility focused reports by the HSD 26th September 2016; 28th September 2016; 2nd October 2016; 12th February 2017; 12th March 2017; 19th March 2017; 14th April 2017; 8th May 2017; and 15th May 2017. These covered 9 facilities.</p> <p>HSD quarter one combined report 2016/17, which covered 7 facilities.</p>
8	<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</p>	<p>4</p> <p>Basing on supervision reports including the HSD's quarter one report, discussions and recommendations were made including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under Minute 4/5/2016 of the DHT / health cluster meeting held on 14th September 2016, absenteeism of staff including at Rwotobilo HCII was discussed.</li> <li>• Under Minute 5/5/2016 of the cluster meeting held on 14th September 2016, the need to inform the CAO about absenteeism, his joint monitoring with political leaders and DHT's special supervision were recommended.</li> <li>• The DHT held a feedback meeting to discuss the draft quarter one supervision report on 14th September 2016 focusing on each facility. On page two the unnumbered minutes, challenges discussed included: absenteeism; late reporting; lack of meetings for HUMCs and staff.</li> <li>• Minute 3/3/2016 of the DHT meeting held on 31st August 2016 stressed the need to address absenteeism.</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>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a special supervision of Rwotbilo HCII following absenteeism and indiscipline conducted 4th October 2016 by DHT as a follow up on the first quarter HSD supervision report.</li> <li>• There was special supervision of Cwero HCII by the RDC and CAO following up absenteeism at work conducted 17th January 2017.</li> <li>• The DHT held a meeting Acwero HCIII staff on 3rd Feb 2017 as a follow up.</li> <li>• Supervision was limited due to limited vehicles and fuel; limited staff structure and unfilled gap.</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>	10	<p>The OBT list had 24 (22 government and 2 private) facilities, which was consistent with HMIS list. The rest of the facilities in the HMIS including; 3 private and 35 that were in the Municipality (16 government and 19 private) genuinely missed from the OBT list since they do not receive PHC funds. The HMIS 105 list also had 17 deactivated facilities which had been left there due to system complications and not reflected in the OBT list since they no longer existed.</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>Social Services Committee sat on 16th May 2017 to discuss among others Q2 &amp; Q3 Departmental reports for FY 2016/17 under Min. 10/SSC/2017-A.</p> <p>Matters considered included: low absorption of funds attributed to increased supplementary PHC wage, donor funds and development grants; need for Rwot-Obilo HC to obtain user rights for IFMS code so as to access PHC grants.</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>Social Services Committee at the 4th Full Council meeting of the 10th Council held on 29th December 2016 under Min. 29/COUN/2016-C(i) presented its report to council which inter alia included: delayed access to the payroll by health workers; and staff absenteeism.</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>100% (3) sampled facility HUMCs including; Awach HCIV; Pabwo HCIII; and Angaya HCIII were active and discussed different aspects including; budgets; facility maintenance; and staff attendance.</p> <p>For instance, the Awach HCIV HUMC meetings were held on; 20th December 2017; 29th June 2017; 18th May 2017; 21st September 2016; and 17th March 2016.</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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No list of facilities that received PHC funds was posted at any external public notice board.</li> <li>A list of facilities that received PHC funds for quarter one 2017/18 was posted only in the Biostatistician's office.</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>	0	<p>A procurement plan covering all items apart from drugs available but not recorded in registry. This made ascertaining timeliness difficult.</p> <p>PDU does not get a copy of the procurement plan for medicines.</p>
		<p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	2	<p>Seven Forms PP1 were submitted to the PDU on 11th September 2017. They covered various items including; Construction of a latrine at Lugore HCII; renovation of OPD at Lugoro HCII; and construction of a latrine at the DHO's office.</p> <p>The local governments use Form PP1. The one provided in the tool (PP5) is for central government.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The drugs procurement plan was submitted to NMS on 12 March 2017 though the NMS stamp was not dated.</li> </ul> <p>100% (22) facilities were supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The procurement plan was prepared and submitted with guidance of the Drugs Inspector with support from technical staff from the DHOs office and NMS' regional representative.</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	<p>The DHO and all the concerned officers certified and recommended for timely payment of the suppliers. For example renovation of Awach Health centre, the requisition process started on 24th June 2016 and by 28th July 2017 payment was made. Also for payment of service provider OMATALA women group, a request was made on 14th March and by 16th May payment was made</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>No evidence was provided. Only submission of performance report was seen through the availed extract of the Output Budgeting Tool (OBT) dated 14th June 2016.</p>

17	<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year • If sector has no audit query score 4 • If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points • If all queries are not responded to score 0</p>	0	<p>The department of Health provided internal audit information to the internal audit on the status of the implementation of all audit findings, Not all queries were responded to, Some officers have been instructed to pay back the money</p> <p>The officers who failed to adhere to internal control were cautioned and particular ones asked to refund the money</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>	0	<p>Only Awach HCIV HUMC members met the 33% gender requirement since it was composed of 33,3% females. However, one of them was inactive since she had never attended any HUMC meeting.</p> <p>Angaya HCIII HUMC had 29% and Pabwo HCIII HUMC had 16% females.</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>• General guidelines from MoH on waste management including sanitation were provided to health facilities as seen Awach HCIV wards.</p> <p>• Pit latrines for females and males were separated.</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>• General guidelines on waste management issued by MoH were seen in wards at Awach HCIV.</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Gulu District

(Vote Code: 508)

Score 33/100 (33%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: score 10</li> </ul>	0	<p>There was No evidence seen where S/Counties below the district safe water coverage from the AWP 2017/18 was targeted. Hence no evidence</p>
2	<p>The LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY: score 15</li> </ul>	15	<p>Evidence seen for targeted Drilling of Five (5) Shallow wells at Agung,Lakwatomer,Nyara Kwany,Otum Pili and Aremo seen from AWP 2016/17, below the district average</p>
Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision				

3	<p>The LG Water department carries out monthly monitoring and supervision of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually. • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15 • 80 - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10 • 70 - 79%: score 7 • 60 - 69% monitored: score 5 • 50 - 59%: score 3 • Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored -score 0</p>	0	<p>No supervision nor monitoring reports seen although the DWO claimed that Supervision by DWO &amp; Technical staff is done and by county water officer (asst Eng officer).</p>
4	<p>The LG Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: o List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10</p>	0	<p>• The information submitted is inconsistent, with Ministry MIS figures not consistent with OBT</p>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				
5	<p>The LG Water department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	4	<p>• No specific request seen. There was only the submission letter and attachment (for whole district, with water under works and technical services line) by CAO to District Chairman</p>



6	The DWO has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the DWO prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2</li> </ul>	2	Seen contract management plan as evidenced from the submission by CAO to Chairman
	Maximum 8 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2</li> </ul>	0	No Evidence seen, although BoQs carry the design drawings
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2</li> </ul>	0	no handover reports seen
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2</li> </ul>	0	no certificates seen
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	3	<p>The DWO and all the concerned officers certified and recommended for timely payment of the suppliers.</p> <p>For example a requisition for bore hole drilling was made on 5th June Certified by DWO , CAO and payment was made on 25th June 2016 which is within the acceptable time frame</p>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				
8	The LG Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit	<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 5</li> </ul>	0	No evidence was provided. Only submission of performance report was seen through the availed extract of the Output Budgeting Tool (OBT) dated 14th June 2016.
	Maximum 5 for this performance measure			

9	<p>LG Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 5 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 If queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	0	<p>There were 5 issues raised, these were, unaccounted for funds, micro procurement not recorded anywhere in the stores record, doubtful supplies. ,Vouchers not authenticated by the accounting Officers and these queries were not all responded to</p>
---	--	--	---	---

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>Works, Water &amp; Roads Committee sat on 12/12/2016 to consider FY 2016/17 Q1 report (Min.7/WC/2016-B). It also sat on 11/05/ to consider FY 2016/17 Q2 &amp; Q3 (Min.12/WC/207-B)Departmental reports.</p> <p>Q1 report considered issues of delayed payment processing. Q2 report issues considered included non-payment of staff wages and lengthy procurement processes which delayed service delivery.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>Works, Water &amp; Roads Committee at the 4th Full Council meeting of the 10th Council held on 29th December 2016 under Min. 29/COUN/2016-b(i) presented its report to council which inter alia included: reactivation of non-functional Water Source Committees and community sensitisation on ownership of water points in their areas.</p>

11	The LG Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2</li> </ul>	0	This is reported as done, as per requirement. However there was no evidence seen on the district notice board at the time of the assessment
	Maximum 6 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2</li> </ul>	2	The boreholes are labeled, with critical information, especially DWD number, construction date, financial year, contractor and funding source
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2</li> </ul>	0	There is information on the DPU notice board, but contract sum missing
12	Participation of communities in WSS programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1</li> </ul>	0	no applications seen at the district
	Maximum 3 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O&amp;M funds and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, for the current FY: score 2</li> </ul>	0	not collected

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

13	The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2</li> </ul>	0	not all, • looked at a sample not well labelled. construction of latrine contracts have no provision for EIA whilst boreholes do have. No evidence of followup seen
	Maximum 4 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1</li> </ul>	0	not all, • no followup minutes seen
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1</li> </ul>	1	they do, contract docs have a clause on Environment protection, for boreholes

14	<p>The LG Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If at least 50% WSCs are women as per the sector critical requirements: score 3</li> </ul>	0	No evidence seen
15	<p>Gender- and special-needs sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/RGCs.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3</li> </ul>	0	no evidence seen