



## LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Iganga Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 773)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	2	33%
No	4	67%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	xxx	<p>No, the LG Annual Performance Contract for the FY 2017/2018 was not submitted by 30th June according to the required evidence from MoFPED.</p> <p>Refer to 'Acknowledgement Receipt of Submission of Budget Documents' serial number 2809 dated 01 Feb 2018.</p> <p>Note: The current Town Clerk Mr Kimbowa Joseph was transferred from Kabale DLG where he served as the CAO, and appointed as TC Iganga MC on 7th June 2015 as per the MoFPED letter signed by the PSST. Ref BPD/77/222/02.</p> <p>The appointment started 1st July 2017/2018. As such the current period assessment period is not aligned to the time of service for the Accounting Officer.</p>	No
Assessment area: Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			

<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	<p>xxxxx</p>	<p>No, there is no evidence to indicate that the Performance Contract/ Budget includes a copy of the Procurement Plan.</p> <p>Note: The current Town Clerk Mr Kimbowa Joseph was transferred from Kabale DLG where he served as the CAO, and appointed as TC Iganga MC on 7th June 2015 as per the MoFPED letter signed by the PSST. Ref BPD/77/222/02.</p> <p>The appointment started 1st July 2017/2018. As such the current period assessment period is not aligned to the time of service for the Accounting Officer.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports</p>			
<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>xxxxx</p>	<p>No, Iganga MC did not submit her annual performance report on 31st July 2017. The report was submitted on 9th August.</p> <p>The Annual performance Report for the period FY 2016/2017 was received by MoFPED on 11th Aug 2017 as per the 'Acknowledgement Receipt of Submission of Budget Documents' serial number 4552.</p>	<p>No</p>

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

XXXXXX

No. Despite the fact that the FY 2016/2017 performance report was submitted and included all the four quarters, quarter 4 report was submitted late after 31 July.

Refer to Quarter 1 Report submitted on 7th November 2016 to MoFPED as per the 'Acknowledgement Receipt of Submission of Budget Documents,' serial number 0006

Refer to Quarter 2 Report submitted on 20th March 2017 to MoFPED as per the MoFPED dated stamp on the cover letter of the submission.

Refer to Quarter 3 Report submitted on 19th May 2017 as per the 'Acknowledgement Receipt of Submission of Budget Documents,' number 0733

Refer to Quarter 4 Report submitted on 11th Aug 2017 to MoFPED as per the 'Acknowledgement Receipt of Submission of Budget Documents,' serial number 4552

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>From the Internal Auditor General's findings the Municipality had eight issues that it was required to address.</p> <p>All the eight issues were addressed in a letter to the PSST (Ref. No. CR/IMC/251/20) that was received in the office of the Internal Auditor General on 17th/03/2017</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>XXXXX</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Municipality received an unqualified audit opinion. This was verified from the District audited financial statement for FY 2016/17 that was obtained at the Office of the Auditor General</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Iganga Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 773)

Score 39/100 (39%)

773 Iganga Municipal Council Crosscutting Performance Measures

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	<p>No. while the Municipal has a Physical Planning Committee which was set up in 2011 when the seven members were appointed, however the committee is not functional. For example the committee takes longer than 28 days to review building plan applications.</p> <p>The committee is missing one person namely the Architect from the private practise. Refer to official letter written by the Ag Town Clerk, on 17th January 2011 Ref Number LAN/1 written to all member who should form part of the Committee as per the Physical Planning Act 2010.</p> <p>The Committee has been meeting quarterly. Refer to minutes from the Physical Planning Committee meeting held 23rd March 2017.</p> <p>The MC has a Building Plan Registration Book which was opened on Sept 1999. The committee meets to review and approve among others lease application and building plans.</p> <p>For examples of applications reviewed and duration of application review, refer to:</p> <p>Sample 1. Application made by Kawala Robinah on 23 March 2017 Ref DP/03/17. The application was submitted to the Committee on 23 March 2017 under Minute MIN: PPC/05/03/2017 Page 5 where application was deferred pending payment of application fees. Review turnaround time was 1 day.</p> <p>Sample 2. Application made by Haminsi Siira on 27 Sept 2016 Ref DP/36/16. The application was submitted to the Committee on 23 March 2017 under Minute MIN: PPC/05/03/2017 Page 5 where application was deferred pending payment of application fees. Review turnaround time was more than 70 days.</p> <p>Sample 3. Application made by Mastula Tikabula on 27 Sept 2016 Ref DP/32/16. The application was submitted to the Committee</p>

				<p>on 23 March 2017 under Minute MIN: PPC/05/03/2017 Page 5 where application was deferred pending payment of application fees. Review turnaround time was more than 70 days</p> <p>Sample 4. Application made by Balikowa Musa on 27 Sept 2016 Ref DP/30/16. The application was submitted to the Committee on 23 March 2017 under Minute MIN: PPC/05/03/2017 Page 6 where application was deferred pending payment of application fees. Review turnaround time was more than 70 days</p> <p>Sample 5. Application made by East View Guest House on 24 March 2016 Ref DP/19/2004/16. The application was submitted to the Committee on 23 March 2017 under Minute MIN: PPC/05/03/2017 Page 6 where application was deferred pending payment of application fees.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2.</li> </ul>	0	<p>No, there is no evidence that all new infrastructures with approved plans were built according with the approved plans.</p> <p>This is because the Committee had not been keen to follow up with approved applicants, which will now be revised.</p> <p>The committee undertakes site visits on a weekly basis every Tuesday and Thursday for development control – sensitization to community on the need to secure approved building plans and to pay the building plan approval fees.</p>
2	<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p>			<p>Yes, there is evidence that the priorities in the AWP for the current FY were based on the outcomes of the budget conference for FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>Note: The Budget Conference was held on 18th November 2016 as per budget conference report Ref Number IMC/156/1/16 shared and developed by the Office of the Town Clerk. This report contains annexes from each department which detailed the performance of the last FY, as well as the planned activities and investments of FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>For example one sampled priority development investments for Iganga MC</p>



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

2

discussed during the Conference within the Health Sector was the expansion of the Iganga MC Health Center III to accommodate ANC/ Maternity Ward, Minor Theatre and Immunisation. Refer to page three of the Annex submission for the Health Sector developed by Medical Clinical Officer Kiwanuka Paul on 18th Nov 2016.

These same priorities are clearly reflected in the 2017/2018 Budget Framework Paper for FY 2017/2018 on Page 13 in the Health Department Work plan under the section Mid Term Plans for FY 2017/2018. The MC planned for expansion of the Iganga MC Health Centre to accommodate more in patients and a maternity ward.

*(NOTE: The AWP for the FY 2017/ 2018 was only available online in draft form on the OBT format. The hard copy was not available for review. This was because the former planner was interdicted and did not carry out a proper handover. Refer to appointment letter drafted 4th May 2015 by the TC where the Accountant was assigned extra duties as the acting Senior Planner. Also refer to Disciplinary letter written by the Town Clerk on 16 Nov 2017 to the Accountant / Ag Planner where he was dismissed.*

*However there is evidence that the AWP and Budget for the FY 2017/2018 for Iganga MC was developed, reviewed and approved by the Municipal Council at a council meeting held 23rd May 2017 under Minute MIN/IMC/FC/005/05/2017 on Page 4. )*

Comparisons for this parameter have been done using the Budget Framework Paper for FY 2017/2018 and the Budget Conference reports. The Budget Framework Paper for the FY 2017/2018 was submitted to MoFPED on 10 March 2017 as per the dated stamp on cover letter.

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

2

Yes, there is evidence that indicates that the capital investments in the Budget Framework Paper for FY 2017/2018 were derived from the DDP.

For example a review of the Iganga MCDP on Page 100 under the development priorities for the Admin Sector for the FY 2017/2018 indicates that the district planned to secure land titles for the council pieces of land.

A review of the FY 2017/2018 Budget Framework Paper on Page 7 under the Work Plan for Administration indicates the MC also planned to secure land titles for the council pieces of land.

*(NOTE: The AWP for the FY 2017/ 2018 was only available online in draft form on the OBT format. The hard copy was not available for review. This was because the former planner was interdicted and did not carry out a proper handover.*

*Refer to appointment letter drafted 4th May 2015 by the TC where the Accountant was assigned extra duties as the acting Senior Planner. Also refer to Disciplinary letter written by the Town Clerk on 16 Nov 2017 to the Accountant / Ag Planner where he was dismissed.*

*However there is evidence that the AWP and Budget for the FY 2017/2018 for Iganga MC was developed, reviewed and approved by the Municipal Council. This was done at a council meeting held 23rd May 2017 under Minute MIN/ IMC/FC/005/05/2017 on Page 4 )*

Comparisons for this parameter have been done using the Budget Framework Paper for FY 2017/2018 and the Budget Conference reports. The Budget Framework Paper for the FY 2017/2018 was submitted to MoFPED on 10 March 2017 as per the dated stamp on cover letter.)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 1.</li> </ul>	0	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that the project profiles for investments have been developed and discussed with the TPC for the FY 2017/2018 as per the LG Planning Guidelines.</p> <p>There were only two project profiles under Roads Sector within the Municipal Development Plan and these were for the period FY 2015/2016.</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>	0	<p>No, there is no evidence that a statistical abstract for FY 2016/2017 was developed for Iganga MC and that it contains gender disaggregated data.</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>	0	<p>No there is no evidence to indicate that the infrastructural projects implemented by Iganga MC in FY 2016/2017 were derived from the Annual Work plan for FY 2016/2017.</p> <p>Note: The AWP and Budget for the FY 2016/2017 for Iganga MC was approved by the Municipal Council at a council meeting held 28th April 2016 under Minute FC04/04/2016</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>	0	<p>No, data reviewed indicates that the investment projects implemented in FY 2016/2017 were not completed as per the FY work plan.</p> <p>A review of the Highlights of Revenue and Expenditure in the 11 departments for the FY 2016/2017 of the Annual Performance report indicates 75% cumulative annual average absorption under the Domestic Development, and Donor Development grant.</p> <p>Refer to pages 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 18, 20, 22, 23 of the 2016/2017 Annual Performance Report. The main reason for discrepancies in the implementation of investment projects is listed as delays in the release of budgeted amounts for example in the Community Bases Services Department (Refer to Page 20.)</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>No, data reviewed indicates that investment projects in the previous FY were not completed within the approved Budget – plus or minus 15%.</p> <p>A review of the Annual Performance Report for the FY 2016/2017 under the tabular Highlights of the Revenue and Expenditure of the 11 departments indicates a cumulative absorption rate of 75% which is a cumulative variance of 25% below the budget for total expenditures under Domestic Development Expenditures and Donor Development Expenditures specifically.</p> <p>To review the data used to calculate the percentage of total expenditure in comparison to the approved Budget, look at the tabular highlights of the Revenue and Expenditure of the 12 departments Refer to pages 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 18, 20, 22, 23 of the 2016/2017 Annual Performance Report.</p>
		<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>	2	<p>Yes, the MC has budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O and M budget on infrastructure.</p> <p>A review of the tabular Cumulative Department Work plan Performance for the FY 2016/2017 indicates that the O and M expenditure for the only two O and M activities identified were absorbed up to an average of 97.9%.</p> <p>For example refer to Page 73 under Roads and Engineering, Budget for periodic maintenance of Urban roads was utilized by up to 100%. Refer again to Page 73 again under Roads and Engineering, Budget for Maintenance, Machinery, Equipment and Furniture was utilized by up to 95.7%.</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	<p>Only (2) out the (7) Acting heads of departments were appraised for FY 2016/17 as evidenced by the Annual Performance Reports on file for Acting Municipal Engineer (Nyangweso) and Acting Deputy Town Clerk (Mitala Ruth) respectively. There was no evidence of annual performance reports for FY 2016/17 on file for the other (5) Ag.HoDs</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<p>All the (7) positions of HoDs are not substantively filled as per the approved structure. All the (7) positions are filled with staff in acting capacity including Deputy TC, Municipal Engineer, Principal Treasurer, Principal Education Officer, Principal CDO, Medical Officer of Health Services and Principal Commercial Officer respectively. The MC has advertised internally and failed to attract suitable candidates for some positions e.g. the position of PEO was advertised internally on 10/2/17 and failed to attract the right candidates.</p>
7	<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>The Town Clerk submitted to DSC (13) posts to be filled in FY 2016/17 (refer to submission letter dated 2/2/17 and MoPS clearance letter dated 6/1/17). All the posts were advertised both internally (advert dated 10/2/17) and externally in Red pepper of 20/2/17. The review of the DSC minutes and a letter to TC dated 5/4/2017 confirmed that all (13) posts were considered as evidenced by: • Minute extracts of the 932nd meeting of IDSC held on 30/5/17 dated 31/5/17 under adverts: IDSC/001-005/156/2017; and Minutes of the 926th meeting of IDSC held on 8/5/17 under Min.390/2017. It was noted that interviews for Town agents were not held because the job descriptions and specifications of 2011 were not provided for (see letter to TC by Secretary DSC dated 5/4/2017). Also noted that the failure to attract qualified candidates for the post of the PEO was partly attributed to the internal advert for the post</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>There was no evidence of submission list to DSC for confirmation in FY 2016/17 by the Town Clerk</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>There was no evidence of submission list for disciplinary action in FY 2016/17. However, there was a submission letter for a disciplinary case (Municipal Engineer &amp; Senior Procurement Officer) dated 7/6/17 but received by the Secretary of DSC on 4/7/17 (current FY).</p>
8	<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<p>No. All the (7) LG staff recruited in FY 2016/17, were not accessed on the salary payroll within 2 months after appointment as evidenced here below: • #4 staff appointed on 7/6/17 accessed the payroll in September 2017 while the remaining (3) accessed in October 2017 Refer to IPPS numbers checked for staff appointed in FY 2016/17: 1011936, 1011938, 1011943, 868141, 1011949, 1011947 and 1011944</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 MC had two cases of LG staff that were meant to have retired on 29/8/14 and 31/10/2015 but applied for retirement benefits on 26/4/2016 and 27/4/16 respectively after they were discovered and removed from the salary payroll by HRO. One accessed the pension payroll in July 2017 (IPPS no.368354) while the second one is yet to access the pension payroll.</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>	2	<p>Form the review of the annual final accounts of FY 2015/16 &amp; 2016/17 it was found out that the Municipality increased its local revenue collections by 6% from UGX 426,917,211/= that was collected in FY 2015/16 to UGX 451,106,909/= that was collected in 2016/17.</p> <p>This revenue includes local revenue collections from the Divisions.</p>

10	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10% : then 2 points. If more than +/- 10% : zero points.</li> </ul>	2	<p>In 2016/17 FY the Municipality had budgeted to collect UGX 454,481,000/= in 2016/17 and actually collected UGX 451,106,909/= in 2016/17 translating into a budget collection ratio of -1%</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>	0	<p>The two Divisions of the Municipality collected a total of UGX 517,500,000 of this the LLG were supposed to remit 50% (258,500,000) to the Municipality but the Division only remitted UGX 158,265,541 and in turn the Municipality had to remit 30% (77,500,000) to the Division as per the guidelines.</p> <p>The Municipality however only remitted UGX 35,456,754 which is 22% which is less than the allowable 30% that is supposed to be sent back to the division off the 50% share.</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>	0	<p>The Municipality spent UGX 82,706,500/= on financing Council activities in 2016/17.</p> <p>In 2015/16 the Municipality collected (after deducting the portion of Division Local Revenues) UGX 237,997,500/=</p> <p>From the above it is observed that Council expenditure was 35% of the local revenue which is above the threshold of 20%</p>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				

12

The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.

- Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2

0

Yes , there was evidence of a transfer of service as a Senior Procurement Officer appointed under Min.DSC/348/2013(a)/dd 21/5/2013 dated 3rd June 2013 but due to some reasons was submitted to Rewards and sactions committee on 8th June 2017, interdicted form duty Ref CR/IMC/157/1/17 by Ag. TC Luyimbazi James on 21st February 2017. There is a case Iganga Public Prosecutions Ref IGA-CO -421-2017 and IGA-CO-422-2017 dated 16/05/2017. Finally on file is a submission to DSC for dismissal due to lack of qualification, experience and competence dated 27th December 2017 Ref CR/IMC/159/1 by Town Clerk , Kimbowa Joseph

The Ag Head PDU was appointed and confirmed in service at the 656th meeting under Min.No.293/2014(a) as a procurement Officer dated 14/July/2014 and signed by Benon Yiga as the TC.

Summarily the procurement assistant was not in place at the time of the assessment according to the Indicator the assessor notes a change in the structure to have a SPO and a PO.

However, the Town clerk in process of dismissal of the SPO



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>Yes, there was evidence of TEC reports dated 12/7/2016 with submissions to the 12 DCC sets of minutes as below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On 3rd DCC of 12/8/2016 under Min No.15/03/CC/IMC/08/2016 the DCC discussed and approved technical inspection report for the sanitary land fill</li> <li>On the 10th DCC of 8th May 2017 under Min.53/10/CC/IMC/05/2017 received a request to consider and approve the evaluation report for the construction of a storied block for IMC HCIII and double cabin for Education on pages 2 and 3.</li> <li>On 10th November 2016 at the 5thDCC meeting under Min.27/05/CC/IMC/11/2016 the DCC received a request for consideration and approval of award and of contract for tender for revenue collection from advertisement, bill boards and promotions. Because the DCC felt they had not discussed this item the Chairman refused to sign the minutes. Page 5.</li> </ul> <p>Generally, the assessor found submissions with elaborate discussions on file by the DCC.</p>
--	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TEC recommended the supply of culverts as call off orders to be issued to Kasokoso services ltd and BUmaga General investments ltd on page 8 of Ref CR/213/6 dated 12/7/2016. In same was upheld at a DCC meeting of 18th July 206 under Min no. 04/01/cc/IMC/07/2016 On Pg 11</li> <li>• Igan773/srvcs/16-17/00003 Revenue from advertisemens , bill boards was recommended for Dhaalas at a price of 1,804,010. But the DCC after delving into the 3 company documents as advised dy TEC awarded to Ms Bumaga as the second best at a 1,650,000/= with reasons forged documents.</li> <li>• Igan773/Srvcs/16-17/00004 revenue collection from Hotel Tax in Central division on page 5 was recommended to be re advertised or managed by the division. Still at the1st DCC of 18th July 2016 on page 6 opted to award to RMF engineering with all documentation provide since the user departments had previously not produced good results.</li> </ul> <p>Other than the above sited scenarios there were no variations and more so the above had reasons as shared.</p>
13	<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>			<p>Yes, from PDU there was evidence of infrastructure projects Igan773/wrks/17-18/00013 to Igan 773/wrks/17-18/00024 as signed by Ag. Head of PDU and Town Clerk Kimbowa Joseph on 22nd September 2017. From the 2017/18 Annual Work plan and budget as laid in the performance contract submitted to MoFPED on 30th March 2017 by the Planner provided for the HC construction on page 15 under health, and for the roads and drainage channels on page 19. However the change under education to use SFG funds to procure a vehicle is reflected in the Performance contract outputs 2017/18 on page 16 as it is igan773/Supls/17-18/00030 in procurement plan.</p> <p>In conclusion the infrastructure plans were all captured in the AWP and budget as in the Procurement plan.</p> <p>Yes, there was evidence from the initial</p>

• a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2

2

Procurement plan signed by PDU and CAO on 2/8/2016 on page 3 -4 had

- Igan773/wrks/16-17/00018 drainage channel along old market street.

- Igan773/wrks/16-17 00019 tarmacking /resealing roads Balunywa road 0.533km

- Igan773/wrks/16-17 construction of foundation of Iganga MC HCIII

- Igan773/wrks/16-17/00022 Periodic maintenance of roads

From the revised and updated consolidated procurement work plan for FY2016/17 signed by Town Clerk Luyimbazi James on 2nd June 2017 and received by PPDA on 16th June 2017 were 00018, 00019, 00021,000022,000047 which were all evident in the approved budget and work plan for FY16/17 as signed by Mayor Hajji Siraj Katono as laid before council on 24th March 2016.

On page 1 of the health department explanatory notes under capacity development DDEG.

Under Education explanatory notes School Facilitation grant was 67,001,520 intended for UPDF renovation works of Iganga MC primary school which did not appear in the Proc. Plan 16/17. It was changed via Min No. 07/12/2016 on page 7 had been discussed as accepted at the council meeting of 22nd December 2016. with guidance from MoES Circular No. 09/2015 dated 15th Dec 2015,

MoPS Ref; ADM/99/100/01 dated 15th July 2016

MoFPED, Ref: AGO/99/77/01 dated 2nd January 2017 by PS.

All in response to request from IMC by TC Iganga, Luyimbazi James Ref: CR/IMC/157/1/16 dated 29th November 2016 .

Otherwise the projects were on file and seen in the previous FY work plan and budget.

Under works explanatory notes item 312204 worth 578,388,145 Road Fund was a plan to improve condition status of roads with details as found in the procurement plan.

14	The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.	<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	No evidence of 80% of the bids prepared by 30th August was available. The advert for 2017/18 was in the Daily Monitor of 15th September 2017. Secondly the PDU lacked logistical support to print the bid documents since the request of August has not been honoured to date.
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<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>Yes there was evidence of an updated Contracts register for FY 2016/17 actions fully registered.</p> <p>On the contrary, the Action files had missing information due to HoD not willing to submit copies for all reports and payment certificates, contract managers are missing for several files with no supervisory reports which form a basis for payment, hand over and closure of Procurement action file.</p>

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

2

Yes For previous FY, there was evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds

- Igan773/wrks/16-17/00018 drainage channel along old market street at 167,005,000 was selectively bided for under Force account.

- Igan773/Srvcs/16/17/00004 was open domestic at 1.170,000 per month to collect revenue from Hotel Tax as the best evaluated bid notice dated 18/July 2016 signed by Luyimbazi James Town Clerk

- Igan773/Supls/16-17/00020 as per Best Evaluated Bidder Notice as open National dated 8th May 2017 at 114,500,000 to Tata Uganda signed by Luyimbazi James as TC

- On 8th May 2017 Construction of foundation substructure for a storied block for I MC HCIII at 40,155,988 was selectively awarded to Ms Kasokoso Services Ltd.

- On 18th July 2016 Igan773/Srvcs/16-17/00010 Revenue collection from loading and off loading at 3,340,000 per month Vat Inclusive was procured under Open domestic.

It was also noted that there were rather few transaction at IMC. The advert for FY16/17 singled out the open bid projects

So there was evidence that IMC adhered to the procurement thresholds.

15

The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

- 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

0

In PDU there were 16 action files for FY 16/17;

Igan773/wrks/16-17/0021 as a phased project it had contract manager reports and one Interim /Completion certificate one dated 27th June 2017 worth 16,587,000 signed by only the SAEO and not approved by the Mr. Bidondole Muzamiru as the Project Manager/DFI,IMC.

All the other files either ended with contract agreements or bid acceptance letters.

Okurut who was appointed Contract Manager made no report at all.

The Assessor notes that the certificate has not provision for Accounting officer

There was no evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified with –interim and completion certificates.

- Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration:  
score 2

0

At IMC the Road inspector Mr Lyada Philip and SAEO Ms M.G Nyangweso had no projects on ground save for assembled AMCO culverts under Road Fund for 5 months at 3m per month.

The delays for implementation arise from

1. Delays to get suppliers for Fuel, gravel, hard core , cement , sand etc via PDU. Example we submitted request for facilitation to install the assembled culverts on 29th /12/2017 it was approved by TC and Vote controller.

2. At the time the warrant by CFO and MoFED was not effected .

3. IFMIS Procurement Invoice could only be effected on 29/1/2018 and posted on 30/1/2018 still pending the suppliers receipt of the said invoices for work to commence. The agreement was signed on 29/1/2018

The above applies to several other work processes.

Conclusively, there are no sign boards for any works as ongoing in the current FY. Nonetheless FY 16/17 the sign boards were said to be in place but without contact values and project duration.

Education SFG funds were reverted to procurement of a vehicle

While under health there was no work started with the rolled over project at the time of the assessment.

Assessment area: Financial management

16	<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>Review of the cashbook revealed that the Municipality made manual monthly bank reconciliation for its accounts until 30th July 2017</p> <p>From July 2017 the reconciliations are generated from the IFMS.</p> <p>Review of the IFMS revealed that the Municipality made monthly bank reconciliations.</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>	0	<p>From the review of the contract files and vouchers it was observed that there were contractors who were paid after 2 months of presentation of the invoice. For example:</p> <p>The contract to Maro (U) Ltd for construction of teachers' houses at Bugumbi Noor, an invoice for payment of the retention fees was presented on 14th/Dec/2016 but payment was effected on 10/03/2017.</p> <p>The reason given by the accounts staff was that the guidelines direct them to pay within six months and they additionally attributed it to lack of funds.</p>
18	<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor and produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 3.</li> </ul>	0	<p>The Internal Audit Department is headed by an Internal Auditor U4 appointed on attainment of higher qualification on 4th February 2013 under Minute No. Min.70/2013(b)</p> <p>This internal auditor has produced all the four quarter internal audit reports on the following dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Q1 report on 31st/10/16</li> <li>o Q2 report on 31st/01/17</li> <li>o Q3 report on 28th/04/17</li> <li>o Q4 report on 31st/07/17</li> </ul> <p>The Municipality does not attain a score for not having a substantive Senior Internal Auditor heading the department.</p>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries: score 2.</li> </ul>	0	No reports seen evidencing that the Municipality has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>The internal audit reports that were produced were submitted and received in the registry on the following dates:</p> <p>Q1 was received on 3rd/03/17</p> <p>Q2 was received on 22nd/05/17</p> <p>Q3 was received on 23rd/08/17</p> <p>Q4 was received on 15th/10/17</p> <p>However LG PAC has not reviewed any of these reports. It was reported that for most of FY 2016/17 LG PAC was not fully composed thus it did not meet</p>
19	<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>Copy of the fixed assets register not seen</p> <p>It was alleged that an accountant who was in-charge of updating it didn't handover when he was interdicted thus the register could not be found at the time of the assessment.</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>	4	<p>The Municipality received an unqualified audit opinion. This was verified from the District audited financial statement for FY 2016/17 that was obtained at the Office of the Auditor General</p>
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				

21	<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2</p>	2	<p>Yes. The council meets and discusses service delivery issues including the DTTPC reports, performance, and monitoring reports</p> <p>For example the District Council held a meeting on 20th October 2016 under Minute MIN FC/06/10/2016 Page 10, where the Chairperson for the Standing Committee of Works and Physical Planning Committee presented the Quarter 1 Departmental Reports.</p> <p>These presentations were extracted from the HODs submissions in the TPC. For example one of the issues discussed was securing land titles for Iganga MC and development of Mutukula.</p> <p>Refer to the Minutes from the TPC meeting held 4th Oct 2016, under Minute TPC/02/10/16 Page 4 where the TC noted that departments had not submitted their quarterly reports, and should submit them to his desk by 6th Oct 2017.</p> <p>This was done and these same minutes were discussed in the subsequent TPC meeting held 6th Dec 2016 together with the department performance reports for Quarter 2. Refer to Minutes 02/TPC/12/2016 and MIN/03/TPC/016. There is no evidence that there was submission of the LG PAC report to the Mayor.</p>
22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2.</li> </ul>	0	<p>No, there is no evidence that the Municipal Council has a designated person who has been formally assigned to respond to grievances, feedback from the citizens on the budget website.</p>

23	The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)	Evidence that the LG has published: • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2	2	Yes, the LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedules were posted on the public notice board at the Administration block.
	Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1	1	Yes, the Procurement and Contract information was displayed at the Administration board in the reception of the building.
		• Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications, are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1.	0	No, there is no physical evidence submitted to show that the municipal council performance results and budget implications were shared and published since the assessment was not done in the previous year
24	The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens  Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	• Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1	1	Yes, the hard copies submitted by the ministries for example on LG planning or DDEG are disseminated to LLGs.  For example the MC Planner issued the two divisions with the Guidelines for the Distribution of the Discretionary Development Equalisation Grant for the FY 2016/2017 in 6th Nov 2017.  Refer to the DDEG guidelines acknowledgement registration schedule signed on 6th November 2017 in the Dispatch Registration Book which was opened March 2017.
		• Evidence that LG during previous FY has conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc..) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1.	0	No, there is no physical evidence submitted to show that the MC conducted discussions with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation.
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

Yes there was Evidence that the LG gender focal person has provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities ;

The Asst Education Officer was Ag. Principle Community Development Officer for the last two years .

Yes there was evidence of support and guidance to sector departments;

- Support supervision and monitoring of 7 women projects dated 30/6/2016

- Report on sensitisation on roads to be tarmacked dated 21/3/2016 where issues of HIV , project values and roles were discussed attended by 96 people

- General report to administration on activities under community development dated 17th August 2017

- GBV monitoring report outreach dated 3/8/2017 working with 6 activists discussing women empowerment, Human rights , zero tolerance to GBV amongst others

- There was also a meeting on 22nd March 2017 with 4 sector heads to discuss roles and responsibilities and develop a work plan. It could have been better though.

The assessor notes that the above reports did not have evidence of submission to the accounting officer.

• Evidence that gender focal point has planned activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and that more than 90% of previous year's budget for gender activities has been implemented: score 2.

0

From the workplan of Community Based services dated 10th August signed by TC, Treasurer and Ag.CDO were activities like;

- Monitoring funded projects, sensitisation and training in poverty alleviation programmes, cross cutting issues, 16 days Gender based violence activism, support to women councils

- IMC also had submitted a UWEP workplan 2017/18 submitted to MoGLSD on 19th October 2017

The work plan and budget for 2016/17 has a budget of 4,000,000/= for sensitisation on cross cutting issues but was not realised at all.

However other functions were supported under the same work plan. The assessor notes THAT GENDER MAINSTREAMING IS THE GIST OF THE INDICATOR .

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

Yes, there was evidence for certification forms dated 7/3/2017 and signed by the Env. Officer for 4 road in northern division, 12 for central division.

On 7/4/2017 was evidence of 3 certification/screening forms for northern division and one for central division.

The MC has no EIA given the nature of their projects

The Env officer had evidence of a report to TC regarding mitigation measures to be implemented dated 31/5/2017 and an environmental and social management Plan for reshaping of roads to be budgeted for by the Engineer. It was Ref ENV/IMC/155/17 dated 12/4/2017 and a monitoring report on stone pitching and murraming along Bataka and old market street dated 22/6/2017. All that was done in 2016/17 belatedly though. For FY 2017/18 at the time of this assessment nothing in this regard had been done in IMC.

Under the Revised Annual Urban Road Maintenance Plan for Works in Iganga MC FY 2017/18 signed by Mun.Eng and Town Clerk on 28/6/2017. received by ED Uganda Road Fund, Director Budget, MoWT on 7/7/2017.. has under Table 1 has a plan for cross cutting issues and economic impact assessments.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>There was evidence that the Environment Officer had advised the Town Clerk on 7/4/2017 regarding ESMP for construction of wards at HC III</p> <p>On 10/4/2017 regarding ESMP for drainage</p> <p>On 11/4/2017 regarding murraming of roads</p> <p>They were received in registry on 1/May/2017.</p> <p>Nonetheless, from the action files the bid contract documents on for construction of a foundation of Northern Division Offices Igan 773/wrks/16-17/00047 had no provision for integrating Environmental and social management plan. The PDU was guided to make provisions for Environmental and social management plans as guided by the Environment Officer.</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>Yes, there was evidence and efforts to secure titles for HC III in Iganga Municipal Council, the abattoir In Nabidongha Prison for Buligo HC II, Nakavule HCII in Lubale Z one and Buluza dumping site ( six in all) the Headquarters had a title but with no ongoing project</p> <p>Under Education no project was on going and it was alluded to by the Environment Officer that only one school had a title but was not yet submitted to IMC office</p> <p>The assessor concludes that the project was initiated in 2016/17, on going in 2017/18 with donor support but the land ownership was not guaranteed /still being processed even at the time of the assessment</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2</li></ul>	0	<p>During FY 2016/17 IMC had only one project namely construction of wards at the HC III of IMC and it is not yet completed hence rolled over to 17/18. Nonetheless the funders (Davertry Friends of Iganga pay directly to the contractor).</p> <p>For 2017/18 all works /infrastructure developments are still pending due to IFMIS system delays.</p> <p>However, for the 2016/17 payment there was no ESM Certification form signed by Environment Officer for that phase paid.</p>
--	--	---	---	---





## **LGPA 2017/18**

Educational Performance Measures

Iganga Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 773)

Score 28/100 (28%)

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>There is evidence for budgeting in FY 2017/2018 with a wage bill of 1,303,038,110 catering for 7 Primary Schools with 198 Teachers including Head Teachers submitted to MoFPED on 30/03/2017.</p> <p>Budget is available for 1 head teacher &amp; minimum of 7 teachers per school.</p> <p>In FY 2017/2018 there are 5 Substantive Head teachers deployed out of 7 Head Teachers needed and 188 Teachers deployed as per PEO's List signed on 9/06/2017</p> <p>There is a gap of 10 Teachers inclusive of 2 Head Teachers</p>
2	<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>It's evident that out of the 198 teachers with wage bill provision, the Municipality has 188 teachers in place with a gap of 10 teachers as per CAO's report issued on 11/01/2018 to the DSC.</p> <p>188/198</p> <p>This gives 94.9% staffing rate</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>The Staffing structure shows 2 inspectors to be in place as approved by Head of HRM on 6/06/2017</p> <p>However there is only a wage bill provision for 1 Inspector of schools in the Performance Contract who is in place and fully appointed with Min No. 194/2012 issued on 28/06/2012</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>	0	<p>There was no evidence that the PEO had submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the available Staff Gaps.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of School Inspectors: score 2</p>	2	<p>There is Provision of 1 inspector of Schools in the Wage bill who is available and substantively appointed with Min No. 194/2012 issued on 28/06/2012.</p>

5	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.	Evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY • 100% school inspectors: score 3	0	There was no evidence of annual performance appraisal report for FY 2016/17 on file for the inspector of schools. Iganga MC has one substantively appointed Inspector of Schools as per the structure for the education department.
	Maximum 6 for this performance measure	Evidence that the LG Education department appraised head teachers during the previous FY. • 90% - 100%: score 3 • 70% - 89%: score 2 • Below 70%: score 0	0	Iganga MC has (7) Primary Schools with (5) substantively appointed head teachers (confirmed through checked personnel files). There was no evidence of annual performance reports on file for calendar year 2016 for all the (5) head teachers for the following MC primary schools: Iganga TC P/S, Igamba P/S, Bugumba P/S, Kasokoso P/S, and Nakavule P/S. However there was evidence of filled performance agreement forms for 2016 and annual performance reports for calendar year 2015 for some head teachers.

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	• Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1	0	It is evident that not all guidelines, Policies and circulars were received by the Education department hence only a few were disseminated to schools in FY 2016/2017  The circular available in office;  1. Ensuring Teacher Presence in schools through enforcing Sanctions & Rewards issued on 26/06/2017 issued by PS – MLG,
	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>	0	<p>There was no Evidence of communication, sensitising of policies to the Schools. The available meeting minutes seen with the Head Teachers did not have enough detail to show the communication of policies especially there was no communication on school feeding.</p> <p>Meeting held with Head Teachers on 3/8/2016 called by the IS had minutes, however these minutes were not signed.</p>
7	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all private and public primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all private and public primary schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100% - score 12</li> <li>o 90 to 99% - score 10</li> <li>o 80 to 89% - score 8</li> <li>o 70 to 79% - score 6</li> <li>o 60 to 69% - score 3</li> <li>o 50 to 59% score 1</li> <li>o Below 50% score 0.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	0	<p>There are 3 reports available for FY 16/17 ( Q2, Q3, Q4)</p> <p>Q2 report submitted on 18/11/2016 reflected no Government school inspected and 20 Private schools inspected.</p> <p>Q3 Report Submitted on 18/03/2017 reflected no government schools inspected and 20 Private schools inspected.</p> <p>Q4 report indicated 7 government schools and 20 Private schools visited who were on the EMIS database. Other schools inspected in the report included Secondary Schools and Nursery schools who were not on the EMIS database</p> <p>This reflects Government schools inspected once in a year = 7/21 and private schools inspection yielding to 60/90 since there were 30 private schools = 67/111 = 60.36%.</p> <p>However out of the 4 Quarterly reports required only one report was endorsed by the PEO on 18/11/2016 but never reached the Town Clerk's Office for final endorsement. All the other reports were not approved</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>	0	<p>There were no minutes in place to reflect the education department meeting and discussing the Inspection reports.</p> <p>However the available minutes, reflect the department discussing other issues and little attention was given to the inspection reports.</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: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5</li> </ul>	5	<p>List of schools submitted in the EMIS report are consistent with those in OBT.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bugumba Noor Islamic P/S</li> <li>2. Iganga Town Council P/S</li> <li>3. Bulligo P/S</li> <li>4. Kasokoso P/S</li> </ol>

		<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5</p>	0	<p>Sampled school's enrolment data from the EMIS report doesn't tally with OBT as shown below</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kasoko P/S had 1028 pupils and 1028 in EMIS report</li> <li>2. Igamba P/S – it had 1043 pupils and in EMIS report it had 1033</li> <li>3. Iganga Town Council P/S had 1510 pupils and EMIS report had 1510</li> <li>4. Buliigo P/S had 468 pupils and EMIS report had 458.</li> </ol> <p>The sampled schools reveal inconsistency in the enrolment data of pupils.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• 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</p>	2	<p>Yes, there is evidence that the Standing Committee on Production and Social Services met and discussed Education service delivery issues like sector performance.</p> <p>For example the committee met on 21st Feb 2017 and discussed issues presented by the Municipal Education Officer on corporal punishment in schools, school feeding and performance of primary students in PLE.</p> <p>Refer to committee meeting report developed for 2nd March 2017 Municipal Council meeting which was developed and signed by the Committee Chairperson Hon. Isabirye Joseph</p>
----	--	---	---	---

		<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>Yes. The sector committee presented issues that require approval from council. Refer to Municipal Council meeting held on 2nd March 2017.</p> <p>Under Minute FC/06/03/2017 the Chairperson of the Standing Committee for Production and Social Services presented a report to the fuller Municipal Council for discussion.</p> <p>The report included among others Education sector issues namely on banishment of corporal punishment in schools, school feeding and performance of primary students in PLE.</p> <p>This submission was extracted out of a standing committee meeting report for meeting held 21st Feb 2017 which was developed and signed by the Committee Chairperson Hon. Isabirye Joseph</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>6 Schools had submitted SMC Lists of which 3 schools had Minutes which were forwarded to the PEO's Office out of the 7 government schools in the Municipality. They Included Kasokoso P/S Submitted minutes of meeting held on 19/10/2016, Noor Islamic P/S submitted minutes of meeting held on 27/11/2016, Buligo P/S, Nakavule P/S, Igamba P/S and Bugumba Noor Islamic P/S minutes of meeting held on 2/03/2017.</p> <p>Out of 30 Private schools on the EMIS database, none had submitted SMC Lists &amp; Minutes to the Education Department.</p> <p>This reflects <math>6/37 = 16.2\%</math> as the rate of functional SMC's in Iganga Municipality</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>	0	<p>There was no evidence on the noticeboard for publicising of schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</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 were submitted to PDU as initiated by the Inspector of Schools on 6/4/2016. This included Renovation of the administration Block of Municipal Council P/S, Stationery, Purchase of Laptop and accessories and Fuel.</p> <p>Head PDU received them on 6th April 2016 which is before the required date of 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>	0	<p>Three of the four contracts executed by the department in FY 2016/17 were certified on time and one was approved late. This is evidenced by the following:</p> <p>Contract for purchase of Taata Pickup for the department; an invoice was raised on 22nd/06/17, the department approved on 23rd/06/17 and payment was done on 26th/6/2017</p> <p>Payment of retention fees to Senole General construction for construction of 2 stance latrine at Nakavale; the invoice was raised on 16/01/2017, head teacher approved on 31st/01/2017 and payment effected on 21st/03/17</p> <p>Contract to Mosegan Technical services for construction of 2 classroom block at Navale; an invoice was raised on 27th/09/2017 and approved for payment by the department on 20th 01/2017 and payment effected on 21st/03/2017</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, there is no evidence that the Department of Education submitted annual performance reports for all four quarters to the planner by Mid - July for consolidation.</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>No evidence seen that the department provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings.</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>	0	<p>There was no evidence of any activity with Senior Men Teachers and Senior Women Teachers.</p> <p>However the department informed the Assessment team that they were trained by Sexual Reproductive Health Uganda but there was no report produced in this regard</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 that the LG Education department issued Guidelines, on how to manage Sanitation for Girls and PWD's in primary schools.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>Sampled Schools reflected that not all SMC's meet the Gender guideline on Composition. Sampled schools are listed below</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bugumba Noor P/S – non Compliant</li> <li>2. Igamba P/S – Compliant</li> <li>3. Bulligo P/S – Compliant</li> <li>4. Noor Islamic Municipal P/S – Compliant</li> <li>5. Kasokoso P/S – Compliant</li> <li>6. Nakavule P/S – non compliant</li> </ol>

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	<p>There was no evidence of activities in line with environment management with schools. However the department has informed that they had activities with rotary club of Iganga an sensitization on environment management of which there was no report produced</p>
----	--	---	---	---



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Health Performance Measures

Iganga Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 773)

Score 19/100 (19%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human resource planning and management				
1	<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY • More than 80% filled: score 6 points, • 60 – 80% - score 3 • Less than 60% filled: score 0</p>	0	<p>There was no recruitment for the current year. The letter from public service dated March 13 2017 there was clearance to recruit but none of posts were for health department and no mention of shortfall in PHC wage bill.</p>
2	<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 4</p>	0	<p>There was no recruitment plan from the health department, however there were health positions in the consolidated recruitment plan for the council. In the clearance letter from public service health department was to recruit a health inspector dated 15th Jan 2018 and that position had not been filled.</p>
3	<p>The LG Health department has ensured that performance appraisal for health facility in charge is conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the health facility in-charge have been appraised during the previous FY: o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<p>The health facility in-charge for Iganga TC HC III (Okulutu Nelson) was last appraised for FY 2011/12 on 29/8/12. Thus no evidence of performance appraisal report for FY 2016/17 on file. Also noted that Iganga MC has no HC IV but Iganga TC HC III is supposed to be upgraded to HC IV status as required.</p>

4	<p>The Local Government Health department has equitably deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers equitably, in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>There were no staff deployed this current year because no recruitment.</p>
---	--	--	---	---

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

3

There is evidence the DHO of Iganga District communicated the policies, guidelines and circulars.

At the municipal council the following policies and guidelines were available. Self-Regulatory Quality Improvement System Tool for Quality Improvement in the Private Sector Uganda 2017, National Policy on Public -Private Partnerships in Health Implementation guidelines 2017, Tetanus Toxoid Vaccination Guidelines for the Safe Male Circumcision Program in Uganda, Health Sector Quality Improvement Framework and Strategic Plan 2015/16-2019/20

At the facilities Iganga Prison HCII: Uganda Clinical Guideline 2016, Essential Medicines and Health Supplies for Uganda 2016, Primary Health Care Grants Guidelines 2016. Iganga Municipal HCIII: Consolidated Guidelines for Prevention and Treatment of HIV in Uganda 2016, Immunization in Practice in Practice Uganda 2017, Uganda Clinical Guidelines 2016, Guidelines for Integrated Management of Acute Malnutrition in Uganda 2016, Integrating Nutrition Assessment Counselling and Support in Health Service Delivery 2016,

Walugogo HCII Primary Health Care Grants Guidelines 2016, Immunisation in Practice in Uganda 2017, Uganda Clinical Guidelines 2016, Essential Medicines and Health Supplies List for Uganda 2016

With regard to circulars there was a circular on 25th May 2016 on Discontinuation of Vitamin Supplementation in Post-Partum Mothers IN Uganda in Iganga Prisons HCII and in Iganga Municipal HCIII dated June 2017 on Ambulance Census. There were no circulars in Walugogo HCII and Naluvuule HCII was closed.

• 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

There was no evidence the DHO disseminated guidelines, policies and circulars to facility in charges.



6	<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>There is no HCIV in the municipal.</p>
	<p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</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>	<p>0</p>	<p>The DHT of Iganga District is supposed to supervise Iganga Municipal HCIII, and between 6th and 9th July, 26th -29th Sept and 7th -13th Dec of 2016 this facility was supervised. This information was from the DHT supervision reports of Iganga District. However the other facilities Iganga Prisons HCII, Walugogo HCII and Naluvuule were not supervised.</p>

The Health Sub-district(s) have effectively provided support supervision to lower level health units

Maximum 6 points for this performance measure

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

0

There is no evidence that HSD supervised the facilities in municipal mainly because the information on file was inconsistent with information at facilities.

On file there was an HSD supervision report for Iganga Municipal HCIII, Walugogo HCII, Iganga Prisons HCII, Nakavule HCII, Bethany and Reproductive Health Uganda. This supervision happened between January and March and report dated 17th April 2017. The second report was dated 28th April and facilities Nakavule HCII, Iganga Prisons HCII, Walugogo HCII AND Iganga Municipal HCII, period when supervision was conducted was not indicated, most likely if first supervision happened in March then this one happened in April. Both Reports had the findings grouped as good practices, challenges and recommendations. Not worth is the action points of the first supervision were not followed up in second supervision. The third report was on 23rd Dec 2016, and supervision was conducted between 19th -23rd Dec 2016. The following facilities were supervised namely Iganga Municipal HCII, Walugoggo HCII, Iganga Prisons HCII, Iganga Islamic HCIII, Nakavule HCII. The report had two broad findings namely observations and recommendations. The fourth report was dated 21st June 2017 period of supervision is not indicated and Iganga Municipal HCIII, Walugogo HCII, Iganga Islamic HCIII, Nakavule HCII, Bethany and Reproductive Health Uganda. Worth noting this was a cut and paste report of the supervision report for 17th April 2017 and all reports were signed by acting head of department for health.

At the facilities there was no evidence of HSD supervision at Iganga Prisons HCII, Iganga Municipal HCIII, Walugogo HCII and Nakavuule HCII was closed (this facility is not operational and doesn't receive resources from PHC).

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>	0	While the reports are available on file there was no evidence there was no evidence of discussions and action plans development.
		<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	There was no evidence action plans were implemented.
9	<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for health facility lists as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	0	<p>There is only one list the HMIS at Iganga District because HMIS is coordinated at district. But no list of facilities in OBT.</p> <p>The OBT for Iganga Town Council doesn't have a breakdown of funds for each facility. The PHC grant is supposed to be for Walugogo HCII, Iganga Prison HCII, Iganga Municipal HCIII. According to the workplan 2017/18 the total amount to facilities is 29,288,315. But in the OBT document it is unclear there is 58,577,000/= was allocated to Conditional non-wage and it is possible the 29,288, 315/=</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>Yes, there is evidence that the Standing Committee on Production and Social Services met and discussed Health service delivery issues like sector performance.</p> <p>For example the committee met on 21st Feb 2017 and discussed issues presented by the Municipal Health Officer on public sanitation, public health and food safety / security.</p> <p>Refer to committee meeting report developed for 2nd March 2017 Municipal Council meeting which was developed and signed by the Committee Chairperson Hon. Isabirye Joseph</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>Yes. The sector committee presented issues that require approval from council. Refer to Municipal Council meeting held on 2nd March 2017.</p> <p>Under Minute FC/06/03/2017 the Chairperson of the Standing Committee for Production and Social Services presented a report to the fuller Municipal Council for discussion. The report included among others Health sector issues namely public sanitation, public health and food safety / security.</p> <p>This submission was extracted out of a standing committee meeting report for meeting held 21st Feb 2017 which was developed and signed by the Committee Chairperson Hon. Isabirye Joseph</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>	0	<p>At Iganga Prisons HCII there is one meeting minute dated 25th June 2017 budget issues not discussed. Iganga Municipal there was one meeting minute dated 5th Oct 2016 and an orientation report dated 16th Sept 2016 and at Walugogo HCII there was no HUMC in place.</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	<p>No evidence of LG publicising all health facilities PHC non-wage recurrent grants at the municipal office. At facilities visited no facility had PHC non-wage funds publicised</p>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				

13	<p>The LG Health department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <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>Yes, there was a procurement request on file as cost share for construction of a storeyed building at Iganga Municipal HCIII. The request was dated 3rd Feb 2017. This investment was 28,958,770/= Ugshs.</p> <p>There was no procurement request form PP5 to PDU.</p>
14	<p>The LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time:</li> <li>• 100% - score 8</li> <li>• 70-99% – score 4</li> <li>• Below 70% - score 0</li> </ul>	8	<p>This activity was coordinated by the centre and DHO Iganga District. Procurement plan was developed in consultation with the DHOs office, and were available at the DHOs office, though not at municipal health department.</p>
15	<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 2 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the review of the contract files it was observed that there were no projects implemented by the department in 2016/17</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>No, there is no evidence that the Department of Health submitted annual performance reports for all four quarters to the planner by Mid - July for consolidation</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>No evidence seen that the department provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings.</p>

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

18	<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>Iganga Prisons HCII had a composition of 2 females and four males, Iganga Municipal had two females and five males and Walugogo had no HUMC.</p>
----	--	--	---	---

		<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	<p>There was no evidence, the guidelines for sanitation in health facilities were issued. At the DHOs office there was no evidence on file at municipal health department and facilities.</p>
19	<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	0	<p>There was no evidence, that the guidelines for medical waste management including those for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal were issued by the DHO. At the DHOs office and at municipal health department and facilities there were no circulars on file. At one facility Walugogo HCII there were SOPs on the wall.</p>