



LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Kaberamaido District

(Vote Code: 514)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	3	50%
No	3	50%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	xxx	<p>Kaberamaido District submitted a Draft Performance Contract for FY 2017/2018 on 8th May 2017 and issued with a receipt (No. 0615) by MoFPED. From the Submission Schedule (of FINAL FORM B FY 2017/18) obtained in MoFPED, the district submitted on 17th July 2017.</p> <p>The submission of the Final Performance Contract for FY 2017/2018 was done AFTER the mandatory deadline of 30th June 2017.</p>	No
Assessment area: Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	xxxxx	<p>Kaberamaido District Local Government has a Budget for FY 2017/2018 including a Procurement Plan for FY 2017/2018.</p>	Yes
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			

<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>XXXXX</p>	<p>The Annual Budget Performance Report for FY 2016/2017 was submitted on 24th August 2017 (Receipt No. 4572) issued by MoFPED.</p> <p>This was a late submission. The submission was made after the deadline of 31st July 2017.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>XXXXXX</p>	<p>All the four Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for FY 2016/2017 were submitted to MoFPED as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Quarter One submitted on 12th December 2016 (Receipt No. 0156) issued by MoFPED. o Quarter Two submitted on 1st March 2017 (Receipt No. 0439) issued by MoFPED. o Quarter Three submitted on 6th June 2017 (Receipt No. 0645) issued by MoFPED. o Quarter Four submitted on 24th August 2017 (Receipt No. 4572) issued by MoFPED. <p>All quarterly reports were submitted late. The requirement is that quarterly reports should be submitted by the end of the following month after the end of each quarter.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Assessment area: Audit</p>			
	<p>XXXXX</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).

- Status report to Auditor General queries dated 13th March 2017, reference PLA/ submitted to PS/ST on 5th April 2017

- 6 issues were addressed as follows;

- i. Unrecovered Youth Livelihood Programme Funds

- ii. Un implemented Youth Livelihood Program Funded projects

- iii. Understaffing

- iv. Lack of a Land Title

- v. Non Disposal of Expired drugs

- vi. Direct cash procurement

- Status report on Internal Audit queries dated 13th March 2017, reference PLA/ submitted to PS/ST on 5th April 2017

- 8 issues were addressed as follows;

- i. Unaccounted funds

- ii. Non remittance of WHT to URA

- iii. Flouting procurement regulations

- iv. Spending cash at source

- v. Non remittance of 35% local revenue to the district

- vi. Borrowing Sub-county funds by SAS and Sub-Accountants

- vii. Lack of Final Accounts in some secondary schools

Yes

		viii. Diversion of funds Alwa in Sub-county Therefore, compliant.	
The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer	xxxxx	Unqualified audit opinion for FY 2016/17 as per Auditor General Report of December 2017. Therefore, compliant.	Yes



LGPA 2017/18

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Kaberamaido District

(Vote Code: 514)

Score 61/100 (61%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality; and (ii) all Town Councils in a District are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a municipality/district has: • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 2.</p> <p>• All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2.</p>	0	<p>There is no functional Physical Planning Committee in place.</p> <p>There is no District Physical Development Plan for Kaberamaido. Therefore, the consistency of the plans of all new infrastructure investments with the Physical Development Plans cannot be ascertained as some investments are outside areas that have Physical Development Plans</p> <p>However, there are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban Physical Development Plan for Kaberamaido Town Council (2008 - 2018). • Local Physical Development Plans for Ochero and Otuboi Town Boards.

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

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

2

The priorities in AWP for FY 2017/2018 are based on the outcomes of budget conference held on 1st December 2016. For instance, under

- Education:

- o Construction of 2-classroom block at Kiryamet PS (P.25 of Approved Budget 2017/2018)

- o Rehabilitation of 4 classrooms Doya PS is linked with the plans for 2017/2018 in the BFP (P.15).

- Water

- o Borehole drilling and installation and rehabilitation (P.35 of Approved Budget 2017/2018) is linked with the plans for 2017/2018 in the BFP (P.17 - 18).

- Health

- o Completion of theatre at Kalaki HC III (P.17 of Approved Budget 2017/2018) is linked with the plans for 2017/2018 in the BFP (P.13).

• 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

The capital investments in the Approved Annual Work Plan for 2017/2018 were derived from the approved Five-Year Development Plan (2015/2016 – 2019/2020). Refer to DDP - Chapter Three – Strategic Direction and Plan (Section – Five Year Implementation Plan and Indicative Budget Pages 62 - 157).

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

0

The project profiles have not been developed.

3	<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	1	<p>The Abstract for FY 2016/2017 is available. This was discussed during the DTPC meeting held 12th October 2016 under Min. 5/Oct/DTPC/2016.</p>
4	<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2 	2	<p>Information on all infrastructure projects implemented in the Q4 Performance Report for 2016/2017 showed that the projects were derived from the respective AWP and Budget. For instance, under Roads and Engineering Services the projects implemented (on Page 177 of the Fourth Quarter Report 2016/2017) were derived from the Budget (Annual Performance Contract) of FY 2016/2017 – Pages 155 – 156.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	4	<p>All investment projects (i.e. district-level) implemented in FY 2016/2017 were completed as per work plan by end of FY 22016/2017.</p>
5	<p>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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	2	<p>There were twenty-six investment projects implemented during FY 2016/2017. All these projects were completed within approved budget - the budget was UGX 1,668,901,999 and the overall expenditure was UGX 1,642,427,618. This is 98.4%.</p>
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	2	<p>The total budget for O&M (for all departments) for FY 2016/2017 was UGX 174,044,966 while the actual expenditure was UGX 383,076,000.</p> <p>This was 220.1% of the budget for O&M [as per Reports and Financial Statements for the Year Ended 30th June 2017].</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"> Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The HODs had only the agreements but the performance reports were not seen
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are four substantive heads of department i.e., head production, education, community based services and head finance. Because of the wage bill
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"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the 4th ordinary meeting of 2017 for kaberamaido DSC held from 29th – 31th minute DSC 24/2017 Minutes of the 3rd ordinary meeting of 2017 for kaberamaido 17th-18th may 2017 minute DSC MINUTE 16/2017 Minutes of the DSC 2nd meeting of 2017 from 16th- 17th march 2017 DSC minute11/2017 <p>The staff submitted for recruitment were considered</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the 4th ordinary meeting of 2017 for kaberamaido DSC held from 29th – 31th minute25/2017 Minutes of the 3rd ordinary meeting of 2017 for kaberamaido 17th-18th may 2017 minute DSC MINUTE 18/2017 <p>The staff submitted for confirmation where considered</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the 3rd ordinary meeting of 2016 of kaberamaido DSC 12th- 14th October 2016. Minute 16/2016(x), 16/2016(viii) <p>They had three disciplinary cases which were considered</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"> 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 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The staff were recruited in March and accessed the pay roll in May and June as per payroll and personnel files. <p>All the recruited staff accessed the pay roll a month after their appointments</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	0	<p>Some of the retired staff have not accessed the pension's pay roll because of delays from the ministry of public service. Their files were submitted for approval but the district doesn't have feedback yet and also the supplier numbers delay</p> <p>Epetu Alphonse file no. 147215 was submitted 5/10/2017, his retirement was 4/8/2017 but has not assessed pay roll</p>

Assessment area: Revenue Mobilization

9	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If increase in OSR from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10% : score 4 points If the increase is from 5 -10% : score 2 point If the increase is less than 5% : score 0 points. 	2	<p>Own Source Revenue collection in FY 2015/16 was UGX 163,712,052 which increased to UGX 175,480,362 in FY 2016/17. The increase was UGX 11,768,310 which is to 7.2%. This is between 5% and 10%.</p> <p>Therefore, a score of 2.</p>
---	--	---	---	--

10	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10% : then 2 points. If more than +/- 10% : zero points. 	0	<p>Own Source Revenue was budgeted at UGX 293,884,113 in the FY 2016/17 and the actual collection was UGX 175,480,263. This is translates into negative variance or UGX 118,403,751 equivalent to - 40.3%.</p> <p>Therefore, zero score.</p>
11	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	2	<p>The LG remitted 65% of local revenue (Local Service Tax) to Lower Local Governments as required by Section 85 (4) of the Local Governments Act, CAP 243, and Regulation 39(2) of the Local Governments (Financial and Accounting Regulations) 2007. Evidence of remittance is as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9th Sept 2016 – UGX 7,224,175 FOR 11 Sub-counties and UGX 1,450,000 for the Town Council (July 2016) • 20th Sept 2016 – UGX 7,447,675 for 11 Sub-counties and UGX 1,450,000 for the Town Council (August 2016) • 24th Oct 2016 – UGX 8,222,800 for 11 Sub-counties and UGX 1,450,000 for the Town Council (Sept 2016) • 2nd Nov 2016 – UGX 8,044,000 for 11 Sub-counties and UGX 1,450,000 for Town Council (Oct 2016) <p>Therefore, the LG gets a 2 point score.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2 	0	<p>i. UGX 44,450,000 was spent on council activities in FY 2016/17 which is more than 20% of local revenue collected in FY 2015/16 (UGX 32,742,410). Total local revenue in FY 2015/16 was ugx 163,712,052 with 20% being UGX 32,742,410</p> <p>ii. First Schedule of the Local Governments Act, CAP 243, requires that expenditure on council activities should not be more than 20% of the total local revenue collection of the previous financial year.</p> <p>Since expenditure on council activities for FY 2016/17 is more than 20% of actual local revenue of FY 2015/16, the score is zero.</p>
--	--	---	---	--

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

12	<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The position of Senior Procurement officer is vacant and not yet recruited. The Procurement officer is present with an Assistant.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TEC Minutes are present (5 No 26th Oct 16, 2nd Nov 16, 2nd Dec 16, 2nd Aug 16, 2nd May 17) for the works projects and contracts committee reports seen (12 No)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes are present no deviation. Technical committee is well represented and all issues handled during the evaluation where all parties are invited.

13	<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement and Disposal Plan has same activities with the AWP. Example is 3 projects from the previous FY planned and were worked on. (Construction of piped water system scheme at Alwa Trading centre with 1 deep water borehole, siting and construction of 5 deep boreholes in Kaberamaido and construction of a walkway at Kaberamaido Hospital) • Procurement plans for the current year presented and dated 13th July 2017 • Previous FY plan is in line with projects worked on and completed.
14	<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bid process completed on time. Evidence is advert of 9 infrastructure projects was on 19th June 2017. • Procurement and Disposal quarterly reports on bids presented dated 13th Jan 2017, 10th April 2017, 13th July 2017. • Acceptance letters from contractors presented for the works infrastructure projects.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The register was not updated and was Last updated on 23rd Jan 2016 and still in raw hand written form.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of advert on 11th Oct 2016, 5th Oct 2016 and these follow the Open Domestic bidding for 50Million and above and selective for projects below. Construction of community resource centre Aperkira sub county contract price 147, 321,233 (open bidding) Construction of a walkway at Kaberamaido hospital 66,584,450 (Open bidding) Siting design construction of deep boreholes filled with U2 hand pumps contract bid 111,312,182 (Open bidding) Construction of 2 classroom block in Otuboi township primary school contract value 58,979,114 (Open bidding) <p>Construction of 2 classroom block in Olelai primary school contract value 58,9428,290 (Open bidding)</p>
15	<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 No Interim certificates selected (14th May 17, 27th Dec 2017, 13th June 2017, 23rd Aug 2017, 25th Sept 2017, 28th Dec 2016) and 5 <p>No completed certificates selected for works projects. These are well signed and stamped (12th May 2017, 19th Jan 2017, 19th Oct 2016, 21st June 2017, 21st Marc 2017).</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No project had site boards
Assessment area: Financial management				

16	<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bank reconciliation from July 2016 to December 2017 are up to date • The statement shows zero unreconciled balance as at 31st December 2017 <p>Therefore, a score of 4.</p>
17	<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2. 	0	<p>The following are overdue accounts for more than 60 days;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Orech and brothers Ltd – supply of cassava cuttings and sweet potatoe vines ii. Jedidah Enterprises – supply of Tractor mower to health department iii. Rainbelt contractors (U) Ltd – construction of security house at Kaberamaido Hospital iv. Rainbelt contractors (U) Ltd – construction of security light lines to Nurses quarters at Kaberamaido Hospital <p>Therefore, score zero.</p>

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.

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

0

- The LG does not have a Substantive Senior Internal Auditor and the office is being managed by an Acting Internal Auditor (Substantively, a Senior Accounts Assistant from July 2017).

- Internal audit reports are produced on time but there are significant delays (up to more than 60 days) in submission to MoFPED (Directorate of Internal Audit), for example;

- o 4th Quarter – dated 2nd August 2017 was submitted on 6th December 2017

- o 3rd Quarter – dated 28th April 2017 was submitted on 13th June 2017

- o 2nd Quarter – dated 30th January 2017 was submitted on 30th March 2017

- o 1st Quarter – dated 14th October 2016 was submitted on 28th November 2016

Although internal audit reports were produced, they were late and equally submitted late.

Therefore, zero score.

- Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries: score 2.

0

i. No evidence of information to council and LG PAC on implementation of internal audit recommendations.

ii. Finance, Planning and Administration Committee has not discuss or received updates on status of implementation of internal audit recommendations

iii. No LG PAC reports for 3rd and 4th Quarter 2015/16

iv. No LG PAC reports for FY 2016/17

Therefore, score zero.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1 	1	<p>Although internal audit reports for 1st and 3rd Quarter were submitted late, there is evidence that all the reports for 4 Quarters of FY 2016/17 were submitted to the CAO and LG PAC as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 4th Quarter – dated 2nd August 2017 was submitted on same day 2nd August 2017 ii. 3rd Quarter – dated 28th April 2017 was submitted on 14th June 2017 iii. 2nd Quarter – dated 30th January 2017 was submitted on 30th March 2017 iv. 1st Quarter – dated 14th October 2016 was submitted on 17th October 2016 <p>Therefore, score 1.</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"> • 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 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Although the assets register is not per format in the LGAM 2007, there is evidence that the LG maintains detailed, separate and up to date registers for; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land; • buildings specialized; • motor vehicles; • office equipment; • furniture and fittings; • medical equipment; • Machinery; and • ICT equipment. ii. As evidence, the last date of register update was on 6th December 2017 with a Printer, serial No. VNC4R52023 for Community Services Department. <p>Therefore, score 4.</p>

20	<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY: • unqualified audit opinion: score 4 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</p>	4	<p>Unqualified audit opinion for FY 2016/17 as per Auditor General Report of December 2017. Therefore, score 4.</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>The Kaberamaido District Council met and discussed service delivery related issues, as evidenced under the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MIN. 33/KDO/COU/206/2017 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 29th May 2017) • MIN. <i>Not numbered</i> – Laying of the Draft Work Plan and Budget for 2017/2018 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 31st March 2017). • MIN. 26/KDO/COU//2015/2016 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 20th December 2016). • MIN. 19/KDO/COU/10/2016/2017 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 6th October 2016). <p>Noted that District Council sat only four times instead of the mandatory six times stipulated in the Local Governments Act, CAP 243.</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 feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2.</p>	0	<p>The task was assigned to the Principal Assistant Secretary (PAS). However, there was no evidence in writing.</p>

23	The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency) Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	Evidence that the LG has published: • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2	2	The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule were displayed on public notice board in the Administration Block at Kaberamaido District headquarters.
		• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1	1	Information on the awarded contracts is displayed on the Notice Board in the Education and Administration Blocks at Kaberamaido District headquarters.
		• 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	Not Applicable. The Central Government did not conduct the Annual Performance Assessment for LGs in 2016/2017. It was also noted that the district website is not functional. This would be the most appropriate channel to publish the LG performance assessment results and implications.
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	The district communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during FY 2016/2017. An example was the meeting held on 30th November 2016 to explain the role of Parish Chiefs in enhancing service delivery (as per MOLG Circular – Ref. Admin/187/01 dated 29th November 2016)
		• 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.	1	There was a file in the Registry of Kaberamaido DLG (CR/212/16), in which the records of discussions with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation were kept.
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				

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

- Guidance is present in the Gender sector including issues as dissemination of gender policies laws and regulations, recognising the international women's day, conduct investigations and provide support to child justice, 30 YLP supported, operations of 13 YLP officers

- Minutes presented dated 30th May 2017, 28th June 2017, 6th March 2017, and 28th February 2017.

- Monitoring report July 2016,

- Mentoring of staff in the production department on Gender mainstreaming issues dated 30th Jan 2017

- GBV Cot-Dec Quarterly report and coordination meeting dated 10th Jan 2017.

• 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.

2

- Current year has activities on Gender mainstreaming (women council), disability and elderly people, youth livelihood programs.

- The budget submitted for the previous year was 2,250,000 for office operations and UNFPA towards GBV activities was 30,000,000 giving a total of 32,250,000, hence making a 93% towards gender related activities.

- For the current FY UWEP is offering 230,553,574 and women council groups have a budget of 213,665,814 making a 92.6% towards gender main streaming activities.

26	<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only 2 Screening forms are presented for projects the rest are for primary schools • No EIA are presented. Only Environmental Impact Statements were provided and some of them were not stamped and signed by the Environment Officer
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presented works and infrastructure projects all integrated ESMP involving tree planting and environmental restoration seen in the bids.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No land agreements were presented
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Environmental certification reports presented • Budget for Environmental related activities is normally directed to local revenues that in most cases isn't realised



LGPA 2017/18

Educational Performance Measures

Kaberamaido District

(Vote Code: 514)

Score 30/100 (30%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				
1	<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4 	0	<p>The LG has budgeted 5,420,355 billion shillings for 2017/2018 to cater for 828 teachers on the payroll and for the 45 primary school teachers that are due to be recruited. After recruitment all schools will have the minimum of 7 teachers but 16 schools will still not have a substantive Head Teacher</p> <p>After recruitment all schools will have the minimum of 7 teachers but 16 schools will still not have a substantive Head Teacher because there is no intention to recruit Head Teachers for the FY 2017/2018</p>
2	<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% score 6 If 80 - 99% score 3 If below 80% score 0 	3	<p>The ceiling for teachers within the existing wage bill provision is 840 teachers. So far the LG has filled 828 positions which translates into 99%</p>

3	<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	0	<p>The LG has 3 positions for school inspector i.e. 1 position of Senior Inspector of Schools, which is filled and 2 positions for Inspector of Schools. 1 of these positions is filled and the other position is due to be filled in 2017/2018 as per the recruitment plan in the OBT 2017/2018.</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 Department submitted a recruitment plan to HRM. The plan presents the intention to recruit 45 Primary School Teachers for the period 2017/2018 (See recruitment plan in the OBT 2017/2018)</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 Department submitted a recruitment plan to HRM. The plan presents the intention to recruit 1 inspector of schools for the period 2017/2018 (See recruitment plan in the OBT 2017/2018)</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only one the inspector of schools was appraised I e the senior inspector of schools. • The other inspector presented appraisals that were not complete
	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All the files presented had performances reports for 2015 only they did not have for 2016/17

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			<p>The Department received several circulars from the national level during 2016/2017.</p> <p>The circulars were as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher support supervision in schools dated 30/6/2017 from DES, MOES; • Monitoring Learning Achievement Exercise for P2 Literacy dated 14/8/2016 from DES, MOES • Operation of unlicensed /unregistered schools dated 16th January 2017 <p>At the time of assessment, the Department had not compiled an inventory of the circulars received from the national level in the FY 2016/2017 and so it could not be ascertained whether these were the only circulars received during this period.</p> <p>Also, the fact that the schools visited had no circulars while others had circulars the LG did not list means that the LG is not</p>
	Maximum 3 for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	

		<p>systematic in the way it communicates circulars.</p> <p>For instance, two of the schools that were visited i.e. Alem P/S and Bululu P/S did not have a single circular while Okapel P/S had a circular on UNEB Registration Guidelines for PLE 2017 dated 1st March 2017 that the district did not present at assessment</p> <p>Meanwhile both Okapel P/S and Kaberamaido P/S had the circular on Operation of unlicensed /unregistered schools dated 16th January 2017</p> <p>Okapel P/S also had the circular on Teacher support supervision in schools dated 30/6/2017 from DES, MOES</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level, including on school feeding: score 2 	<p>0</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings with Head Teachers were reviewed and none of these meetings explained the issues raised in the circulars presented by the Department at the time of assessment</p> <p>The Head Teachers meetings were held on 12/8/2016 (Departmental meeting with SMC, PTA and Head Teachers)</p> <p>15/11/2016 (Staff meeting with SMC Chairperson and Head Teachers)</p> <p>10/5/2017(Education Department meeting held with sub-county stakeholders and Head Teachers)</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4 	4	<p>A Continuous Professional Development training was conducted from 17th-18th November 2016. The activity was intended to retool teachers of P1- P3 on curriculum interpretation. 47 schools participated in the activity.</p> <p>The report of this activity indicates that the training was addressing a gap identified during school inspection</p>
9	<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5 	0	<p>The list of schools provided by the district Education department is inconsistent with both EMIS and OBT data.</p> <p>The list from the department presents 94 Government aided schools while OBT presents 92 schools</p> <p>The list from the LG presents 100 Government and Private schools while EMIS lists 138 Government and private schools</p>

		<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>The enrolment data in the Education Department is inconsistent with OBT and EMIS</p> <p>For instance, the enrollment data for Katingi P/S on the district list is 962 while OBT presents 953 for the same school. Meanwhile, Katingi has 940 pupils according to the EMIS data</p> <p>On the district list Omarai P/S has 726 pupils, OBT presents 650 for the same school and EMIS indicates that the school has 735 pupils</p> <p>On the district list, Oriamo P/S has 921 pupils, OBT presents 936 for the same school and EMIS presents 875 pupils</p> <p>Oyama Eolu P/S has 783 pupils according to the district list. The same school has 780 pupils according to OBT and 650 pupils according to EMIS</p> <p>Teete P/S has 709 pupils according to the district list. The same school has 712 in OBT and 612 in EMIS</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>The Social Services Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2016/2017 as evidenced below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of the Social Services Committee meeting held on 21st November 2016 (under MIN. 03/SCS/11/2016/2017). • Minutes of the Social Services Committee meeting held on 31st August 2016 (under MIN. 03/SCS/08/2016/2017).
----	--	---	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2 	2	<p>The Social Services Committee met and made recommendations for presentation to the District Council. Refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Recommendations to Council’ of the Social Services Committee presented during the District Council meeting held on 20th December 2016 (under MIN. 26/KDO/COU/2015/2016). • ‘Recommendations to Council’ of the Social Services Committee presented during the District Council meeting held on 6th October 2016 (under MIN. 19/KDO/COU/2016/2017).
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>All the 92 schools have an SMCs file at the DEO’s office, Kaberamaido. However, on sampling 5 Primary schools, it was established that three of these (Ongoromo Primary School, Anyara Moru Primary School, and Ogwolo Primary School) did not have a single set of minutes for SMC’s in their file for the year 2017. The other two (Abango Omunyal P/S and Angoltok P/S) only had two sets of minutes</p> <p>This means that schools are either not holding the 3 mandatory SMC meetings or they are not submitting Minutes to the office of the DEO.</p>

12	<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	3	<p>The LG posted UPE IPF's by school for 2017/2018 on the Education Department notice board. Also, all schools that were visited had posted the non-wage grants at the schools although it was posted in the Head Teachers office</p>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				
13	<p>The LG Education department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	0	<p>All procurement requests were submitted late on 30/6/2017. These included;</p> <p>Construction of 2 classroom block at Otuboi Township P/S in Otuboi S/C (60,406,802/=)</p> <p>Construction of a 5 stance drainable latrine at Anyara P/S in Anyara S/C (20,000,000/=)</p> <p>Rehabilitation of 4 classrooms with an office at Doya P/S in Ochero S/C (65,000,000/=)</p> <p>Rehabilitation of 2 classrooms with an office at Kibimo P/S in Bululu under force account (34,579,743/=)</p> <p>Supply of assorted furniture to Education Office (5,000,000/=)</p> <p>Rehabilitation of 7 classrooms with an office at Opungure P/S in Kakure S/C under force account (41,000,000/=)</p> <p>Rehabilitation of 4 classrooms with an office at Kalyamese P/S in Kobulubulu S/C under force account (16,000,000/=)</p>
14	<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p>			<p>There are no delays in certification, recommendation, and payment of suppliers in the health sector for example;</p>

Maximum 3 for this performance measure

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

3

i. Name of Contractor – Robert Emadu Construction Ltd.

a. Nature of Contract – Construction of a 5-stance Drainable Pit Latrine at Kalaki Primary School

b. Award dated – 17th Nov 2016

c. Contract signed – 10th Feb 2017

d. Request for payment – 8th June 2017

e. Certificate – 12th June 2017

f. Approval – 12th June 2017

Payment – 15th June 2017

ii. Name of Contractor – Elgona Two Builders Ltd.

g. Nature of Contract – Construction of a 5-stance Drainable Pit Latrine at Doya Primary School

h. Award dated – 17th Nov 2016

i. Contract signed – 21st Nov 2016

j. Request for payment – 20th Feb 2017

k. Certificate – 20th Feb 2017

l. Approval – 6th March 2017

Payment – 9th May 2017

iii. Mi Romi General Supplies & Construction Ltd

a. Nature of contract – Construction of 2 classroom blocks at Olelai Primary School

b. Award dated – 31st August 2016

c. Contract signed – 5th Sept 2016

d. Request for payment – 11th Nov 2016

e. Certificate date – 25th Nov

				2016 f. Approved – 25th Nov 2016 g. Payment – 25th Nov 2016 Therefore, score 3.
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				
15	The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit Maximum 4 for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	0	The Education Department submitted the Annual Performance Report for 2016/2017 (as well as all four quarterly reports) to the Planner. However, given that there has not been any recording schedule for submission of OBT Baby Files for subsequent integration into the Master OBT Database, it could not be established whether the submission was by mid-July 2017.

<p>16</p>	<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 4 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points o If all queries are not responded to score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of 4th Quarter 2016/17 Internal Audit Report, status on unaccounted for funds totaling UGX 74,412,505 for construction of classroom blocks, construction of 5-stance drainable pit latrines, rehabilitation of classroom blocks, and inspection of schools among others. • While all the receipts were later provided by the DEO for accountability purposes, the following were picked during assessment because they involved large amounts of money; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o UGX 25,906,719 – receipt No 0059, o UGX 14,486,629 – receipt No. 254, o UGX 9,472,792 – receipt No. 0022 <p>The other receipts involved little money but totaling to about UGX 26 million, therefore, were verified but not picked for justification purposes.</p> <p>Therefore, score 2.</p>
<p>Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards</p>			

17	<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc...: Score 2 	0	<p>There is no evidence of dissemination of guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills</p>
	<p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2 	0	<p>There is no evidence of issue and explanation of guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	1	<p>The requirement of the gender composition of an SMC as per the 2nd Schedule of the Education Act 2008 is at least 2 women on the Foundation Body which has a total of 6 people.</p> <p>The Foundation Body of the SMCs of 3 schools that were visited; i.e. Alem P/S, Okapel P/S, and Bululu had 2 women and 4 men each which is consistent with the gender composition guideline of SMC's.</p> <p>Meanwhile, Kaberamaido P/S which was also visited, has an SMC which has 3 women and 10 men. Kaberamaido is a Community School and therefore has no Foundation body so its gender composition could not be judged like the rest of the other schools which are church founded and have Foundation Bodies.</p>

18	<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 3: 	0	<p>There is no evidence of issue of guidelines on environmental management to the schools by the Education Department in collaboration with the Environment Department</p>
----	--	---	---	--



LGPA 2017/18

Health Performance Measures

Kaberamaido District

(Vote Code: 514)

Score 49/100 (49%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human resource planning and management				
1	<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 80% filled: score 6 points, • 60 – 80% - score 3 • Less than 60% filled: score 0 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DHO told this assessment that the District has not fulfilled recruitment of primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage. The reason given is that the District wage bill had not been increased by the time of planning this financial year and therefore the District could not take up new recruitment this year.
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A recruitment plan for FY2018/2019 was presented as an evidence for this assessment. There was no recruitment plan for FY2017/18 presented because at the planning period of this financial year, the district was still waiting for communication from Ministry of finance to indicate an increase in the wage bill allocations for Kaberamaido. Hence no comprehensive recruitment plan/request has been submitted to HRM for the current FY.
3	<p>The LG Health department has ensured that performance appraisal for health facility in charge is conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the health facility in-charge have been appraised during the previous FY: o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0</p>	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The health centre iv in charge was appraised

4	<p>The Local Government Health department has equitably deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers equitably, in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY: score 4 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DHO said that because of no recruitment of workers yet done in the current financial year, it follows that there has not been any deployment done as well,
---	--	--	---	--

Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision

5	<p>The DHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No formal communication regarding guidelines , policies and circulars presented as evidence by the DHO for the purpose of this assessment, however, the DHO said that the policies and guidelines are discussed and communicated during the district quarterly performance review meetings. For example the DHO mentioned that guidelines are distributed by the National level distributors without factoring in a component of onward distribution and dissemination to lower level facilities. The district finds this situation so challenging to issue communication on dissemination without a budget.. One example observed at DHO's office, was distribution of the National Implementation plan for long-Acting reversible contraceptives and permanent methods. Piles of plans are at the DHO office currently not distributed.
---	--	--	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence presented on a specific meeting held by the DHO regarding explaining guidelines and policies to the in-charges. However, the DHO office says that a number of issues of policy and guidelines are discussed during quarterly performance review meetings but not as a stand-alone activity because of lack of funds. A further assessment of what is discussed in the performance review meetings, for example on 15th November 2016 indicates that no particular guidelines and policies were discussed although at some point the meeting talked about policy issues and this is normal in a technical meeting.
6	<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3</p>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Quarterly integrated support supervision reports were presented and contained supervision of Kaberamaido HCIV. The dates for support supervision reports are; (Dated 25th august 16, October 16, 30th mar 17 and 28th June 17
		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Quarterly integrated support supervision reports were presented and contained supervision of Kaberamaido HCIV. The dates for support supervision reports are; (Dated 25th august 16, October 16, 30th mar 17 and 28th June 17 The 4 Quarterly integrated support supervision reports (Dated 25th august 16, October 16, 30th mar 17 and 28th June 17, presented as evidence demonstrates that supervision was conducted across levels of health facilities in Kaberamaido District during the year 2016/17

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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% supervised score 6 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 4 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 2 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0 	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The support supervision log book and visitors book for Kaberamaido HCIV indicates that supervision to the facility is conducted by the district on a regular basis. Dates of support supervision are 14 July 2016, 4th October 2016, 18th January 2017 and 31st may 2017
8	<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	0	<p>No evidence presented by the DHO to justify that the reports were discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: However the DHO office claims that a number of issues are normally presented in the quarterly review meetings. A report of 15th November 2016 performance meeting was presented as an evidence on this particular issue. Again the report did not have a line item that talks about discussions of other reports and used them to make recommendations for corrective actions.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DHO office said that this was not consistently done because support supervision was normally conducted by different personnel in different quarters. The follow-up of previous issues identifies in past activities was not effectively done last financial year.
9	<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for health facility lists as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10 	0	<p>No evidence presented regarding submitted regarding a list of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and planned OBT .</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"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	2	<p>The Social Services Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2016/2017 as evidenced below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the Social Services Committee meeting held on 21st November 2016 (under MIN. 03/SCS/11/2016/2017). Minutes of the Social Services Committee meeting held on 31st August 2016 (under MIN. 03/SCS/08/2016/2017).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	2	<p>The Social Services Committee met and made recommendations for presentation to the District Council. Refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Recommendations to Council' of the Social Services Committee presented during the District Council meeting held on 20th December 2016 (under MIN. 26/KDO/COU/2015/2016). 'Recommendations to Council' of the Social Services Committee presented during the District Council meeting held on 6th October 2016 (under MIN. 19/KDO/COU/2016/2017).
11	<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 5 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5 If 80-99% : score 3 If 70-79%: : score 1 If less than 70%: score 0 	5	<p>This assessment sampled Kaberamaido HCIV and reviewed its board structures, The board has 9 members and it is a fully functioning board which had a meeting on 2nd February 2017, and among things discussed was a budget of 16M which did not come to the hospital instead only supply of drugs worth 9.6 M was sent to the facility.</p>
12	<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DHO office notice board has no publication of funds for PHC non-wage recurrent grants and no similar notices were identified on the CAO noticeboards as well.

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

13	<p>The LG Health department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2 	2	<p>A copy of procurement plan was submitted to the secretary contracts committee on on 07 April 2017</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>A procurement requests number 20th September 2017 because of delays in the releases.</p>
14	<p>The LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time: • 100% - score 8 • 70-99% – score 4 • Below 70% - score 0 	8	<p>The DHO presented participants of a meeting that was conducted on 8th February 2017 to support lower health facilities to develop NMS workplans for procuring medicines and supplies</p>

15	<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 2 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points 	2	<p>There are no delays in certification, recommendation, and payment of suppliers in the health sector for example, the major contract in sector during the year was;</p> <p>i. Name of Contractor – Grassland Business Contractors Ltd.</p> <p>a. Nature of Contract – Construction of walk ways at Kaberamaido Hospital</p> <p>b. Award dated – 17th Nov 2016</p> <p>c. Contract signed – 21st Nov 2017</p> <p>d. Request for payment – 8th June 2017</p> <p>e. Certificate – 12th June 2017</p> <p>f. Approval – 12th June 2017</p> <p>Payment – 13th June 2017</p> <p>ii. Name of Contractor – Smartech Supply</p> <p>a. Nature of Contract – Low Cost Sealing Volume Road of Kaberamaido – Kalaki Road</p> <p>b. Award dated – 20th Jan 2017</p> <p>c. Contract signed – 28th Jan 2017</p> <p>d. Request for payment – 19th April 2017</p> <p>e. Approval – 17th May 2017</p> <p>f. Payment – 25th May 2017</p> <p>Therefore, score 2.</p>
----	--	--	---	---

Assessment area: Financial management and reporting

16	<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	0	<p>The Department submitted the Annual Performance Report for 2016/2017 (as well as all four quarterly reports) to the Planner.</p> <p>However, given that there has not been any recording schedule for submission of OBT Baby Files for subsequent integration into the Master OBT Database, it could not be established whether the submission was by mid-July 2017.</p>
----	---	---	---	---

17	<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year • If sector has no audit query score 4 • If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points • If all queries are not responded to score 0</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of 4th Quarter 2016/17 Internal Audit Reports, status on unaccounted for funds totalling UGX 874,500 for water and electricity bills. • The query has not been resolved. <p>Therefore, zero score.</p>
----	---	--	---	--

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

18	<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2 	2	<p>This assessment sampled Kabermaido HCIV and a list of HUMC membership was presented. This list contained 3 Women on the board and 6 men.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific guidelines on sanitation were issued directly to health facilities. However, the issues of sanitation and infection control were extensively deliberated on with Health facilities during integrated support supervision. Example a report on support supervision 30th may 2017, indicates supervision on sanitation in Anyara and Ochoro HCIII,, for compound cleanliness and that Kobulubulu HCIII, Kalaki had no clean Tolilets . Thereafter issues instructions on standard guidelines on cleanliness whereby dumping and dusting done daily and avoiding bushy toilets

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"> • Evidence that the LGs has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal : score 2 points. 	2	<p>The district did not directly issue specific guidelines on clinical waste to health facilities. However, The DHO said that this is done through support supervision to observe adherence to standards. During the 3rd quarter supervision visit 30 May 2017, it was observed that most units had dust bins, waste are segregated according to the colour of bins and that few safety boxes are on use.</p>
----	---	---	---	---



LGPA 2017/18

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Kaberamaido District

(Vote Code: 514)

Score 65/100 (65%)

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"> • According to annual work plan for the financial year 2017/2018 Kaberamaido district local government has safe water coverage of 82%. <p>The same source shows that safe water coverage per sub county is as seen here under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kaberamaido s/c 86% - Aperkira s/c 82% - Kabulubulu s/c 95% - Ochero s/c 68% - Bululu s/c 66% - Kalaki s/c 74% - Kakure s/c 91% - Otuboi s/c 63% - Anyara s/c 77% - Apapai s/c 95% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the approved budget and work plan for the financial year 2017/2018, page 46. The district planed sitting, design, deep borehole drilling in the five sub counties with safe water coverage below the district coverage of 82% as seen here under: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bululu s/c 1 hand pump bore hole at a cost of 18,900,000/= - Agule Ogola, I deep borehole in Ochero s/c at a cost of 18,900,000/= - Anyara village in Anyara s/c I deep bore hole at a cost of 18,900,000/= - Abia village in Otuboi s/c I deep

• Evidence that the LG Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: score 10

10

bore hole at a cost of 18,900,000/= and

- Apokemado village, Aperkira s/c I deep bore hole at a cost of 18,900,000/=.

This demonstrates that the LG water

department has targeted sub counties

with safe water coverage below the

district average in the budget for the

Current financial year.

• According to annual progress reports for the previous financial year 2016/2017, Quarter 2 report, and Quarter 3 Budget request FY 2016/2017, the under mentioned water projects were budgeted for the implementation in sub counties with safe water coverage below district average in the previous financial 2016/2017

I deep bore hole in Anyara s/c , Ogwolo parish, aatakwi LC1 DAWD 59233 at a cost of 18,328,547/=,Source of funding DWSCG

- I deep bore hole in Akorot lc1, Oculakur parich. Bululu s/c

DWD 59229, Source of funding: DWSCG

- 1 deep borehole DWD 59232, Kamuda parish, Kalaki s/c was approved at a cost of 18,3328,546/= with funding from DWSCG

- 1 deep bore hole in Ochero s/c DWD 59228 at investment cost of 18,328,546/= with funding from DWSCG

- Kabure poli village borehole in Ochero s/c DWD 46573 at investment cost 18,494,140/=

			<p>funded by DDEG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alau Ici in Ochero s/c DWD46574 at investment cost of 18,494,140/= with funding from DDEG - Adacar Ic1 Anyara s/c DWD 46569 at investment cost of 18,494,140/= <p>The above postulates that the LG Water department implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY 2016/2017.</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"> • Evidence that the LG Water department has implemented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to annual progress reports for the previous financial year 2016/2017, Quarter 2 report, and Quarter 3 Budget request FY 2016/2017, the under mentioned water projects were budgeted for the implementation in sub counties with safe water coverage below district average in the previous financial 2016/2017 <p>I deep bore hole in Anyara s/c , Ogwolo parish, aatakwi LC1 DAWD 59233 at a cost of 18,328,547/=,Source of funding DWSCG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I deep bore hole in Akorot Ic1, Oculakur parich. Bululu s/c <p>DWD 59229, Source of funding: DWSCG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 deep borehole DWD 59232, Kamuda parish, Kalaki s/c was approved at a cost of 18,3328,546/= with funding from DWSCG

		<p>budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY: score 15</p>	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 deep bore hole in Ochero s/c DWD 59228 at investment cost of 18,328,546/= with funding from DWSCG - Kabure poli village borehole in Ochero s/c DWD 46573 at investment cost 18,494,140/= funded by DDEG - Alau Ici in Ochero s/c DWD46574 at investment cost of 18,494,140/= with funding from DDEG - Adacar Ic1 Anyara s/c DWD 46569 at investment cost of 18,494,140/= <p>The above postulates that the LG Water department implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY 2016/2017</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>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kaberamaido district local government received funding from government of Uganda as DWSCG towards implement wss activities in sub counties with water coverage below district average water status. The total number of projects was 11 deep boreholes, 7 deep bore holes rehabilitation and one piped water scheme phase 2. (Annual performance report FY 2016/2017). The district procured a firm called multec consults U ltd to do the work. • The status of the projects was reported as seen here under in the progress monitoring report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Omwony bore hole drilled
---	--	--	--	---

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

15

- Angudwawele bore hole installed
- Akorot bore hole ready for installation
- Abalong installed
- Okwar bore hole installed
- Otil bore hole installed
- ,Kamuda borehole ready for installation
- Akatakwi bore hole ready for installation
- Ajulon bore hole installed
- Agora bore hole ready for installation
- Ousia bore hole ready for installation.

Supervision and monitoring reports

obtained at DWO to justify this were:

- Report on supervision of ongoing construction of water sector projects for the FY 2016/2017 dated 13/12/2017
- A report on drilling of 6 deep borehole in sub counties of Anyara (2), Alwa (1), Ocheru (2), and Kaberamaido (1) FY 2016/2017 dated 15/12/2016
- A report on inspection of the construction of works for Alwa piped water system at Alwa trading centre (Phase 2) in FY 2016/2017 dated 17/2/2017

There was no sanitation facilities funded in the previous financial year hence they weren't monitored. Since supervision and monitoring of all planned water projects / investment projects took place in the department as expected it justifies the score 80%-95%

4	<p>The LG Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: o List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sector mis was not observed at water department hence submission of consistent data to the MoWE as per the format was not verified at the sector level as was the case of OBT report for the current FY 2017/2018 at the district water office. The performance contract wasn't obtained at the water department as a critical requirement from the MoWE.
---	--	--	---	--

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

5	<p>The LG Water department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The water department submits procurement requests, complete with technical requirements to PDU that cover all items in the approved sector annual work plan and budget of the current financial year. The challenge though is that these official documents were not stamped to justify that they were submitted on time by 30 April of the current financial year 2017/2018.
---	---	---	---	---

6	<p>The DWO has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the DWO prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No contract manger was appointed to effectively manage the WSS contracts at DWO No contract management plan was obtained at the DWO as such monthly monitoring visits for different wss infrastructure could not be substantiated. The sample of 5 wss project was not taken to validate findings from files/ records/reports that didn't exist
---	--	---	---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	0	<p>No water and sanitation construction designs were obtained at DWO since it partly constitutes contract management records that weren't obtained at the water office of Kaberamaido DLG</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A copy of the completion certificate was observed in the handover report of sitting, design and construction of 5 deep bore holes in Kaberamaido district local government detailing: DWSCG as source of funding, FY 2016/2017, Client: Kaberamaido DLG, contractor: Multec consults (U) ltd, contract sum 90,301,819/=, contract no: KABE514/WRKS/2016/2017 00006-LOT 3. Defect date liability period 1st/12/2016-28/2/2017 Date of handover 9th/3/2017, dated 31/3/2017
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A copy the certified certificate was appropriately obtained at DWO dated 31/3/2017 by the district water officer for the above projects

7

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

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

3

There are no delays in certification, recommendation, and payment of suppliers in the health sector for example, the major contract in sector during the year was;

i. Name of Contractor – Pera Investment (U) Ltd.

a. Nature of Contract – Construction of piped water supply system 1 in Alwa Trading Centre

b. Award dated – 18th Nov 2016

c. Contract signed – 21st Nov 2017

d. Request for payment – 12th February 2017

e. Certificate – 17th February 2017

f. Approval – 5th May 2017

Payment – 31st May 2017

ii. Name of Contractor – Multec Consults Ltd

a. Nature of Contract – Construction of a piped water supply/ system in Alwa TC with one deep borehole

b. Award dated – 19th Apriln 2016

c. Contract signed – 20th April 2016

d. Request for payment – 27th September 2016

e. Approval – 27th September 2016

f. Payment – 3rd October 2016

Therefore, a score of 3.

Assessment area: Financial management and reporting

8	<p>The LG Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	0	<p>The Department submitted the Annual Performance Report for 2016/2017 (as well as all four quarterly reports) to the Planner.</p> <p>However, given that there has not been any recording schedule for submission of OBT Baby Files for subsequent integration into the Master OBT Database, it could not be established whether the submission was by mid-July 2017 or not.</p>
9	<p>LG Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 o If queries are not responded to score 0 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of 4th Quarter IAR, status on unaccounted for funds totalling UGX 130,701,656 for construction of piped water system, servicing and repair of motor cycles, and retention fees. Most of the queries involved payment acknowledgement receipts. • While all the receipts were later provided by the Water Officer for accountability purposes, the following were picked during assessment because they involved large amounts of money; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o UGX 4,515,091 – receipt No 498, o UGX 5,565,609 – receipt No. 499, o UGX 100,500,000 – receipt No. 006 • The other receipts involved little money totaling to about UGX 20 million, therefore, were verified but not picked for justification purposes. <p>Therefore, score 3.</p>

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3 	3	<p>The Works and Technical Services Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2016/2017 as evidenced below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 17th – 18th May 2017 (under MIN. /5/WORKS/2016/2017). Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 22nd November 2016 (under MIN.03/11/WORKS/2016/2017).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	3	<p>The Works and Technical Services Committee met and produced recommendations for presentation to the District Council. Refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Recommendations to Council' of the Works and Technical Services Committee presented during the District Council meeting held on 29th May 2017 (under MIN. 33/KDO/COU/206/2017). 'Recommendations to Council' of the Works and Technical Services Committee presented during the District Council meeting held on 20th December 2016 (under MIN. 26/KDO/COU/2015/2016).
11	<p>The LG Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district notice boards didn't have all the Information on the AWP, Budget and the water development grant releases and expenditures to enhance transparency The district website was not updated to enhance information sharing and transparency
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From a sample five projects it was established that WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and

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

2

source of funding as seen below:

- AngudaweleA

DWD 59226

Contractor: Multec consult (u) ltd

Fundedby: DWSCG

6/11/2016

- AngudaweleB

DWD20595

Contractor: Nile drilling co ltd

Funder : NUSAF 1

10th/11/2004

- Ongino CD2264

Rehabilitated by MoWE

FY: 2016/2017

Cont: Multec consult (u) ltd

16/5/2017

- Aleme cell CD2234

Rehabilitated by MoWE

FY:2016/2017

Cont: Nile drilling co

13/5/2017

- St. Tomas Girls SS

Funder: Friends of life

Cont: Friends of Life

DWD 34302

Date: 4/02/2011

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district notice board had information indicating contractor name, and contract sum displayed for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contractor name: Multec consults (U) ltd Contract price: 129,462,520/= DWSCG/DDEG Procurement ref no: Kabe514/wrks/2017-2018/00007
12	Participation of communities in WSS programmes Maximum 3 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No community application files were obtained at the DWO as per the sector critical requirements including community contributions in the current financial year
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O&M funds and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, for the current FY: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No community meeting minutes were obtained indicating agreed actions and collection of funds for o and m and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs exists at the district water office
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				
13	The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management Maximum 4 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Screening templates were obtained at the environment office for water source points. And a sample of 3 water source points testifies this. Ajulon borehole, Otil borehole, Abalony borehole. No EIA reports were required since the estimated environment damage was so minimal and minor to warrant the same.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the LG reviews environmental impact in the technical design of the contractor of planting at least 10 trees in a radius of 30 metre from the borehole, it was not followed through since the visited bore holes hardly had trees planted in their environs. The levelled reason being that most constructions occur around december which is a dry spell. Besides there was no mitigation plan obtained at the district environment office
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A clause on environmental protection exists in every contract as per the sampled wss project contracts but it not implemented to mitigate anticipated protection. From the sample no trees were found planted in the environs of the source point to justify relevancy of the clause
14	<p>The LG Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If at least 50% WSCs are women as per the sector critical requirements: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The soft ware progress reports obtained at DWO didn't show composition of WSC membership classified by gender. No list of WSC exists abut the DWO to justify promotion of gender equity in wsc composition

15	<p>Gender- and special-needs sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/RGCs.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>• If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3</p>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From a sample of 5 sanitation facilities obtained and verified in the field, it was established that the conditions of gender equity and inclusion was being observed for males, females and PWDs <p>Institutions sampled are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alem P/S in Kaberamaido T/C - St. Tomas Girls SS in Kaberamaido T/C - Kaberamaido HC IV General word - Gwetom P/S in Kaberamaido T/C - Kaberamaido P/S in Kaberamaido T/C
----	--	---	---	--