



## LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Katakwi District

(Vote Code: 522)

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>Katakwi District submitted a Draft Performance Contract for FY 2017/2018 on 8th May 2017 and issued with a receipt (No. 0613) by MoFPED; and the <i>Final Performance Contract</i> for FY 2017/2018 was submitted on 7th July 2017, as per MoFPED Submission Schedule.</p> <p>This was a late submission. The mandatory deadline for submission of the Final Performance Contract was 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>Katakwi District Local Government has in place a Budget for FY 2017/2018 (approved under Council Min.11/31/05/CL/2017); and has 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>	xxxxx	<p>The Annual and Quarterly Budget Performance Report for FY 2016/2017 was submitted on 4th August 2017 (Receipt No. 0900 issued by MoFPED), which was after the mandatory deadline of 31st July 2017.</p>	No

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

xxxxxx

.The four Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for FY 2016/2017 were submitted to MoFPED as follows:

o Quarter One submitted on 24th November 2016 (Receipt No. 0105) issued by MoFPED.

o Quarter Two submitted on 24th February 2017 (Receipt No. 0405) issued by MoFPED.

o Quarter Three submitted on 21st June 2017 (Receipt No. 0800) issued by MoFPED.

o Quarter Four submitted on 4th August 2017 (Receipt No. 0900) issued by MoFPED.

All quarterly reports were submitted late. The requirement that is that quarterly reports should be submitted by the end of the following month after the end of each quarter.

No

Assessment area: Audit

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).

XXXXX

i. Responses were submitted to the Permanent Secretary/ Secretary to the Treasury (PS/ST) before 40th April 2017 (via letter dated 24th February 2017, reference No. CR/252/1).

ii. Nine out of nine audit queries in OAG Report were responded to and these are;

- o Unsupported pension payments
  - o Unaccounted for funds
  - o Over payment of salaries
  - o Diversion of Rural Transport Infrastructure funds
  - o Under staffing
  - o Under collection of Local Revenue
  - o Non delivery/ under delivery of medicines
  - o Non disposal of expired drugs
  - o Incomplete of projects and shoddy work
- iii. 4 audit queries in internal audit report
- o Unspent Funds
  - o Unaccounted for funds
  - o Local Revenue performance
  - o Operations of Secondary schools
- Therefore, compliant

Yes

The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer

xxxxx

Unqualified audit opinion according to Auditor General's Report of FY 2016/17 of December 2017.

Therefore, compliant.

Yes



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Katakwi District

(Vote Code: 522)

Score 31/100 (31%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality; and (ii) all Town Councils in a District are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a municipality/district has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 2.</li> </ul> <p>• All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2.</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no Physical Planning Committee in place.</li> <li>• There is no Registration Book in the Physical Planning Section of Katakwi District.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, it was not possible to ascertain who (in absence of the Physical Planning Committee) considers new investments.</p> <p>Katakwi District does not have a Physical Development Plan, and therefore, consistency of all new infrastructure investments with the physical plans could not be ascertained.</p> <p>However, it was noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Katakwi Town Council has an Urban Physical Development Plan - (2009 - 2019).</li> <li>o Omodoi and Amusia Rural Growth Centres (RGCs) have Local Physical Development Plans:</li> </ul>
2	<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.</li> <li>• Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If different, justification has to be provided and evidence that it was approved by Council. Score 2.</li> </ul>	0	<p>Budget Conference Report was not availed; and therefore, it was not possible to establish whether the priorities in the Annual Work Plan for FY 2017/2018 are based on the outcomes of budget conferences.</p> <p>The capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for FY 2017/2018 are derived from the approved Five-Year Development Plan (2015/2016 – 2019/2020). For example, under Water the projects are derived from the ‘Summary of Sectoral Programmes / Projects’ of the Katakwi DDP (Page 201).</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 1.</li> </ul>	0	<p>There is no evidence that project profiles have been developed and discussed by the District Technical Planning Committee (DTPC) for all investments in the Annual Work Plan (AWP) as per LG Planning Guidelines.</p> <p>It was noted that the Planning Unit, which is the Secretariat of the DTPC did not have minutes of the meetings held in hard copies! <u>INSTEAD</u> there were soft copies on the Laptop of the Senior Planner (who was not available in the district during the assessment), Some minutes were printed on 16 January 2018, expressly signed and presented to the assessor.</p>
3	<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual statistical abstract, with gender disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum 1 point.</li> </ul>	0	<p>The information availed by the Planner, was that the Statistical Abstract was only available in soft form, and had not been presented to DTPC.</p>
4	<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>The infrastructure projects implemented by the District in FY 2016/2017 were derived from the Annual Work Plan (AWP) and the Budget approved by the District Council (under <i>Min. 02/28/04/CL/2016</i>).</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	0	<p>Investment projects implemented during FY 2016/2017 were NOT completed as per work plan by end of FY 2016/2017. For instance: out of the 35 latrine stances planned to be constructed under Education, only one was constructed (page 19 of the Budget and Annual Work Plans for 2017/2018).</p>



5	<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects and assets during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not all investment projects were completed.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>The total budget for O&amp;M (for all departments) for FY 2016/2017 was UGX 171,543,000, while the actual expenditure was UGX 105,467,000. The expenditure is 61.5%.</p>

Assessment area: Human Resource Management

6	<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only 2 personnel files were seen i.e. the PHRO AND DEO and were appraised as per MOPS guidelines . these were the only files that were presentd</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approved structure vote 522- katakwi district. File no 151/1. Date 15th sept 2017. Council minute 12/19/09/CL/2017 and the staff list</li> <li>District engineer is vacant as per staff list</li> <li>Senior procurement officer vacant as per staff list</li> <li>District natural resources officer vacant as staff list</li> <li>Community development officer vacant as per staff list</li> </ul>

7	<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>The DSC considered the staff positions submitted for recruitment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minutes of DSC 7TH Meeting. 19/06/2017. Minute 83/2017.</li> <li>16th-17th may 2017 6th meeting minute 75/2017.</li> <li>Minutes of the DSC 5TH Meeting 20th /04/2017 minute 66/2017</li> <li>Minutes of the DSC 4TH meeting 22nd-23rd February 2017 minute 35/2017</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>staff submitted for confirmation were considered as the minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minutes of DSC 7TH Meeting. 19/06/2017. Minute 84/2017.</li> <li>16th-17th may 2017 6th meeting minute 76/2017.</li> <li>Minutes of the DSC 5TH Meeting 20th /04/2017 minute 66/2017</li> <li>Minutes of the DSC 4TH meeting 22nd-23rd February 2017 minute 37/2017</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minutes of the DSC 2/08/2017. Minute 98/2017 there was one disciplinary case which was considered</li> </ul>
8	<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of the recruited staff have not got appointments because of the wage bill are not on the payroll however those that got appointments accessed the pay roll</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>Some of the retired staff had not accessed the pension payroll because of inconsistency in documentation as per pension payroll</p>
Assessment area: Revenue Mobilization				

9	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If increase in OSR from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10% : score 4 points</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5 -10% : score 2 point</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5% : score 0 points.</li> </ul>	4	<p>Own Source Revenues increased from UGX 192.5 million in the FY2015/16 to UGX 217.4 million in FY 2016/17. This translates into an increase of 12.9% between FYs 2015/16 and 2016/17. This being more than 10% to qualify for the maximum score.</p> <p>Therefore, score 4.</p>
10	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10% : then 2 points. If more than +/- 10% : zero points.</li> </ul>	0	<p>Own Source Revenue was budgeted at UGX 284.3 million but UGX 217.4 million was realized in the FY 2016/17. This translates into a shortfall of 23.5%, a clear demonstration that the whole budget process was unrealistic.</p> <p>Therefore, score zero.</p>
11	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>The district received a total of UGX 45,666,500 from Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development as local revenue (Local Service Tax) for FY 2016/17 but did not remit the 65% to LLGs. This is contrary to Section 85 (4) of the Local Governments Act, CAP 243, and Regulation 39(2) of the Local Government (Financial and Accounting Regulations) 2007. The source of this data is the Final Accounts for the FY 2016/17 (showing total Local Service Tax), Bank statements reflecting the transfers from MoFPED (date, time, and amount transferred), and payment vouchers and instructions to transfer funds to LLGs.</p> <p>Therefore, score zero.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>A total of UGX 62.7 million was spent on council activities during the FY 2016/17. While 20% of local revenue in FY 2015/16 was UGX 192.5 million was UGX 39 million, UGX 62.7 million was spent on council activities which translates into 32.6%. 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>Therefore, zero score.</p>
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

12	<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The position of Senior Procurement officer is vacant and not yet recruited. The Procurement officer is present.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minutes of the previous FY were available and a total of 13 minutes were seen.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the sampled reports of infrastructure, there were no disagreements from the technical committee members</li> </ul>

13	<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AWP is missing in the procurement unit</li> <li>• AWP was got from the Finance department and plans covering infrastructure were not followed. Procurement plan for previous year not provided</li> </ul>
14	<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seven Infrastructure/works projects for the current year bid is at 43% and further still these account for 54% of the total biddings. The rest are supply bids, services bids and disposal bids.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contracts register is not updated and was presented in softcopy that was last dated 04/01/2017</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2.</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contracts committee held on 16th June 2017,</li> <li>• Invitation to bid was published on 19th June 2017, bid notice was published on 7th July 2017,</li> <li>• Bidding was on 14th July 2017 for projects.</li> <li>• Opening bidding for works projects was 50 million and above while selective bidding was applied to projects below 50M; for supply and services over 30M above, open bidding was used while selective was used for projects below 30M. Micro procurement was below 1 million and anything below 5 million was either by selective or bid by quotation. This was assessed on the 7 infrastructure projects undertaken by the district.</li> </ul>

15	<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No certificates were presented and the Procurement officer asserts that the certificates for the project are with the works department who was not present.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were no projects labelled</li> </ul>

Assessment area: Financial management

16	<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>i. Bank reconciliations were made from July 2016 to August 2017 instead of up to December 2017</p> <p>ii. Some of the few bank reconciliation statements that were prepared are not signed by one prepared them, one who reviewed, and one who approved them.</p> <p>iii. There were also delays in preparing bank reconciliation statements for example; August 2017 was reconciled in December 2017</p> <p>Therefore, score zero.</p>
17	<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2.</li> </ul>	2	<p>Payments were made within the mandatory period of a maximum of 60 days. All the 4 suppliers picked at random during the assessment had been paid within a maximum of 45 days save for one (for Food) who was paid after 50 days but, before 60 days.</p> <p>Therefore, score 2.</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.

3

a. There is a Principal Internal Auditor (effective 1st July 2017) as per appointment letter dated 5th April 2017, reference number CR/156/1, under District Service Commission Minute No. 45/2017)

b. Quarterly Internal Audit Reports were prepared in line with Section 90(2) of the LG Acts CAP 243, Section 48(6) of the Public Finance Management Act 2015, Regulation 12 of the LGs (Financial and Accounting Regulations) 2007 and submitted as follows;

o 4th Quarter – dated 14/8/2017 submitted to PS/ST on 21/8/2017,

o 3rd Quarter – dated 10/5/2017 submitted to PS/ST on 1/6/2017,

o 2nd Quarter – dated 13/2/2017 submitted to PS/ST on 24/2/2017,

c. 1st Quarter – dated 4/11/2016 submitted to PS/ST on 11/11/2016

Therefore, score 3.

- 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

- There was no evidence of any information on follow up of Internal Audit recommendations for FY 2015/16 submitted to council and LG PAC by CAO and or CFO.

- There was no item in minutes of Finance, Planning and Administration Committee meetings which were reviewed.

- The only minutes for Finance, Planning and Administration Committee available were for meetings held on 27th October 2016, 24th February 2017, and 29th – 30th May 2017.

Therefore, score zero.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>All the 4 Quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2016/17 were submitted to council and copies to CAO and LG PAC as follows;</p> <p>a. 1st Quarter report submitted on 15/11/2016,</p> <p>b. 2nd Quarter report submitted on 17/2/2017,</p> <p>c. 3rd Quarter report submitted on 19/5/2017,</p> <p>d. 4th Quarter report submitted on 9/10/2017.</p> <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"> <li>Evidence that the LG maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>a. Assets register is not maintained according to Local Governments Accounting Manual 2007 (LGAM) formats. The LGAM 2007 requires 3 formats namely;</p> <p>i. The General Format,</p> <p>ii. Land and Buildings, and</p> <p>iii. Motor Vehicles and Heavy Plants.</p> <p>b. The register is not up to date for example, it lacks key assets like; land and buildings, furniture and fittings, and equipment like photocopiers among others,</p> <p>c. The register is kept in excel format while the district is on IFMS. This would make maintenance of the register very simple.</p> <p>Therefore, score zero.</p>
20	<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>unqualified audit opinion: score 4</li> <li>Qualified: score 2</li> <li>Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</li> </ul>	4	<p>The district got an Unqualified audit opinion for the FY 2016/17 as per Auditor General Report of December 2017.</p> <p>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 District Council held 6 meetings in FY 2016/2017 on 20/9/2016, 23/12/2016, 29/12/2016, 12/4/2017, 13/4/2017 and 31/5/2017.</p> <p>These meetings discussed several service delivery issues including; approval of the Area Land Committee, approval of plans (Revenue Enhance Plan, Capacity Building Plan, District Budget, Procurement Plan, streamlining of the deployment of Head Teachers, progress on the implementation of project such as the Uganda Women Empowerment Programme and the Youth Livelihood Programme, among others.</p>
22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2.</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no designated officer to coordinate response to feedback.</li> <li>There is no evidence of feedback on complaints and grievances raised by citizens.</li> </ul>
23	<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Katakwi District published the Payroll and Pensioners Schedule on the Notice Boards in the CAO's Office and HRM Section at Katakwi District Headquarters.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>Information on the awarded contracts is displayed on the Notice Board (in the Building where the PDU is located) at Katakwi District Headquarters.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications, are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1.</li> </ul>	0	<p>Not Applicable. The Central Government did not conduct the Annual Performance Assessment for LGs in 2016/2017.</p> <p>It was also noted that the District Budget Website is not functional.</p>

24	The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	0	No evidence was availed to the effect that the district communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to Lower Local Governments during previous FY.
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that LG during previous FY has conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc..) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1.</li> </ul>	0	<p>According to CAO, the district officials endeavoured to attend various barazas in the sub-counties.</p> <p>However, evidence was not provided to certify that the district conducted discussions (e.g. barazas, and radio programmes) with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation.</p>

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

25	The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG gender focal person has provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities score 2.</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No annual reports presented</li> <li>Minutes available were obtained from the finance accounts office.</li> <li>Only accountability for 4 quarters of 2016/17</li> <li>The budgets, minutes and accountabilities presented were for the UNFPA funding.</li> </ul>
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that gender focal point has planned activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and that more than 90% of previous year's budget for gender activities has been implemented: score 2.</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No planned activities presented</li> </ul>

26	<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The District Environmental Officer was not present and no information was availed.</li> </ul>
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No information was availed because the Environmental officer was not present</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reports and agreements presented because the Environmental officer was not present</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No certificates, no screening reports and Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer were presented because the Environmental officer was not present .</li> </ul>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Educational Performance Measures

Katakwi District

(Vote Code: 522)

Score 33/100 (33%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				
1	<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>The total wage bill for primary teachers in Katakwi for 2017/2018 is 4,691,045,000/=.</p> <p>The district has budgeted for the recruitment of 312 teachers and 71 Deputy Head teachers but has no provisions for recruitment of head teachers although 36 primary schools do not have substantive head teachers</p>
2	<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision o If 100% score 6 o If 80 - 99% score 3 o If below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	0	<p>Katakwi has 74 Primary Schools. Thirty-six of these schools do not have substantive head teachers. Also, according the LG OBT 2017/2018,, some schools such as Apolin, Adere, Opeuru Aodot , Toibong have less than 7 teachers</p> <p>The approved posts within the wage bill provision for the teachers is 1047 teachers So far 724 places are filled. This is equivalent to 69.1%</p>

3	<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6</li> </ul>	6	<p>The structure has 1 position for senior inspector of schools, which is filled and 1 position for inspector of schools which is also filled.</p>
4	<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of Primary Teachers: score 2</p>	2	<p>The LG Department submitted a recruitment plan to HRM. The Primary teachers to be recruited include; 312 teachers and 71 deputy head teachers.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of School Inspectors: score 2</p>	2	<p>There is no provision for recruitment of school inspectors because both positions are filled.</p>
5	<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY • 100% school inspectors: score 3</p>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are two school inspectors and they have been appraised as per there file number CR/10965. And CR/10271</li> </ul>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised head teachers during the previous FY. • 90% - 100%: score 3 • 70% - 89%: score 2 • Below 70%: score 0</p>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>100% of the substantive head teachers have been appraised however 50% of the schools are under caretakers because the recruited head teachers have not yet been given appointments because of the wage bill but were appraised.</li> </ul>

Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection

<p>6</p>	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>	<p>The LG Education Department received circulars from the national level in 2016/2017. These include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNFPA supported Baseline Evaluation in Schools of 17th November, 2016 (found in Okolimo P/S)</li> <li>• School feeding Programme in Education Institutions of 15th May 2017 (Seen at MOES)</li> <li>• Progress on the National Registration of all learners in all schools of 12th June 2017 (Found in Katakwi DLG)</li> <li>• Ensuring Teacher presence in schools through enforcing sanctions and rewards of 26th June 2017 (found in Usuk Girls P/S)</li> <li>• Teacher support supervision in Schools of 30th June, 2017 (Seen at MOES and Katakwi DLG)</li> </ul> <p>There is no evidence that all these circulars were communicated to schools. Two of the schools visited had only one of these circulars.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level, including on school feeding: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p>The department met head teachers on 23/2/2017 and 28/2/2017. In the 2 sets, issues discussed include; teacher support supervision issues and review forms (drawn from the circular on Teacher Support Supervision dated 30th June 2017), national registration of all learners (drawn from the circular on progress on the national registration of all learners in all schools dated 12th June 2017) and rewards and sanctions for teachers (drawn from the circular on ensuring teacher presence in schools through enforcing sanctions and rewards of 26th June 2017)</p>

7	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all private and public primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all private and public primary schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100% - score 12</li> <li>o 90 to 99% - score 10</li> <li>o 80 to 89% - score 8</li> <li>o 70 to 79% - score 6</li> <li>o 60 to 69% - score 3</li> <li>o 50 to 59% score 1</li> <li>o Below 50% score 0.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	1	<p>There are reports that indicate that school inspection of both private and public primary schools happened.</p> <p>In August 2016 (Term 2), 62 primary out of 74 primary schools and 11 private schools were inspected</p> <p>In June 2017, all public primary schools were inspected to evaluate Head Teacher and Teacher performance</p> <p>In October/ November 2017 (Term 3) 49 out of the 74 primary schools and 11 private schools were inspected</p> <p>In February/ March 2017 (Term 1), 35 out of the 74 Primary Schools and 11 private schools were inspected</p> <p>This translates into 57.3%</p>
8	<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>There is no evidence that the Education department discussed school inspection reports and used them to make recommendations for corrective actions during 2016/2017</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>The Education Department did not submit school inspection reports to DES</p> <p>In the records at DES, there was no submission from Katakwi and neither did the district have an acknowledgement of receipt of these reports from DES</p>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>There were some follow up actions drawn from the recommendations seen in the inspection reports. For instance, the DEO held counselling sessions with 9 errant teachers who had been under-performing because of lateness, absenteeism. This was done on 13th and 20th June 2017</p> <p>Furthermore, in the FY 2016/2017, the DEO gave warning letters to at least 15 teachers especially because of absenteeism and insubordination. In some of these letters reference is made to the inspection reports</p>
9	<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5</li> </ul>	5	<p>List of schools is consistent with EMIS and OBT.</p> <p>The LG submitted a list with 74 public schools and 11 private schools. The OBT captures the 74 schools while EMIS captures both public (74) and private schools (11)</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>There are discrepancies between OBT and EMIS data in relation to enrollment data.</p> <p>For instance, Lalei P/S has 464 pupils in the OBT data while it has 672 pupils in EMIS, Aketa P/S has 652 pupils in OBT data and 609 in EMIS, Ocwiin P/S has 658 pupils in OBT and 553 in EMIS, Olupe P/S has 841 pupils in OBT data while it has 862 pupils in EMIS data, Katakwi P/S has 1301 pupils in OBT while it has 1607 pupils 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc...during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>The only Minutes availed for the Committee for Social Services, Health and Education were for the meetings held on 26th May 2017 as well as 27th February 2016. It was established that the committee had earlier met and discussed service delivery issues during a meeting held on the 27th February 2017 (under Min.07/02/16-17/CHE&amp;CBS).</p> <p>Nonetheless, minutes for the meetings held during other quarters of FY 2016/2017, were not provided.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>The Committee for Social Services, Health and Education held a meeting on 26th May 2017 to review the departmental budgets (under Min. 7/26th/05/CL/2017). The Mandate to approve the reviewed budgets is with the District Council.</p>
11	<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO) • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80% schools: score 0</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some of the schools have functional SMC's that discuss budget and resource issues and submit minutes to the DEO.</li> <li>The sampled SMC's were those of Katakwi PS, Omosingo, Apelun, Okibui and Aliakamer. Omosingo had no minutes of SMC meetings for 2016/2017 while Aliakamer had only 2 sets of minutes instead of the required three sets. The other SMC's held the 3 mandatory meetings</li> <li>40 out of the 74 school management committees had sent minutes for the period 2016/2017 to the DEO. This is equivalent to 54.05%.</li> </ul>

12	<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<p>At the time of assessment, the district had not posted the non-wage recurrent grants on the district notice board. Meanwhile, the schools that were visited posted the grants in the headmaster's 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"> <li>Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>The Department planned to construct two classrooms in Kokorio. The initial phase is due to cost 53,460,481/= and to procure 36, 3 seater desks in the same school at a cost of UGX 3,394,752.</p> <p>The department submitted the procurement request for construction to PDU late on 13th June 2018 and is yet to submit the procurement on desks</p>
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

14	<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</p>	0	<p>There were delays in certification, recommendation, and actual payment to suppliers during the FY 2016/17. For example, supply of desks to selected schools was the only contract in the education sector during the financial year and was handled as follows;</p> <p>i. Name of Contractor – M/s Kitau Limited</p> <p>ii. Date of Award of contract – 24th March, 2016</p> <p>iii. Contract signing – 6th April 2016</p> <p>iv. Supply of desks – 31/8/2016, 1/9/2016, and 2/9/2016 (to various schools)</p> <p>v. Request for payment – 2nd September 2016</p> <p>vi. Approval of payment – 21st December, 2016 (DEO) and 23rd December 2016 (CAO)</p> <p>i. Name of Contractor – M/s Kitau Limited</p> <p>ii. Date of Award of contract – 24th March, 2016</p> <p>iii. Contract signing – 6th April 2016</p> <p>iv. Supply of desks – 31/8/2016, 1/9/2016, and 2/9/2016 (to various schools)</p> <p>v. Request for payment – 2nd September 2016</p> <p>vi. Approval of payment – 21st December, 2016 (DEO) and 23rd December 2016 (CAO)</p> <p>Therefore, score zero.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				

15	<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>The Education Department submitted all the four quarterly reports electronically to DPU; thus it could not be established whether the Quarter 4 report was submitted by mid-July 2017. There were no records in the DPU to ascertain the dates of submission of the various performance reports.</p>
16	<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 4 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points o If all queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	0	<p>i. No evidence of follow-up on the following issues as raised in the internal audit report of 4th Quarter FY 2016/17;</p> <p>a. Unaccounted funds – UGX 16,947,861 in Universal Primary Education (UPE) schools and UGX 3,361,000 in Universal Secondary Education (USE) schools.</p> <p>b. Weak governance bodies – School Management Committees (SMCs) and Board of Governors (BoGs).</p> <p>c. Doubtful purchase of learning materials for UPE schools.</p> <p>d. Staffing gaps are wide spread, worse in USE schools.</p> <p>ii. Similar issues were raised by the internal audit during the 1st and 2nd Quarter of FY 2016/17.</p> <p>Therefore, score zero.</p>
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				

17	<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc...: Score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>There was no evidence of dissemination of guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>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"> <li>• Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>The requirement of the gender composition 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 schools visited were Apuuton, Usuk Girls and Okolimo. The Foundation Body on the SMC's of Apuuton and Usuk Girls had a composition of 3 men and 3 women each while that of Okolimo Primary School had 2 women and 4 men which is consistent with the gender composition requirement of SMCs</p>
18	<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 3:</li> </ul>	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

Katakwi District

(Vote Code: 522)

Score 48/100 (48%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human resource planning and management				
1	<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY • More than 80% filled: score 6 points, • 60 – 80% - score 3 • Less than 60% filled: score 0</p>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 38 out of 62 planned Health Workers were recruited and provided appointment letters, and this is 62%</li> <li>• Copies of appointment letters available at DHO's office</li> <li>• List of successful candidates or job applicants</li> <li>• The advertised jobs did not attract , candidates of the following cadres; Medical Doctor, Anathetic, Public Health, and Dispensor</li> </ul>
2	<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 4</p>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A recruitment plan composed of 62 proposed position was submitted to CAO</li> </ul>
3	<p>The LG Health department has ensured that performance appraisal for health facility in charge is conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the health facility in-charge have been appraised during the previous FY: o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0</p>	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The health facility in charges have all been appraised as per there personnel files. Both their performance plans and appraisals are present in their personnel files</li> </ul>



4	<p>The Local Government Health department has equitably deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers equitably, in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Copies of appointment letters for successful applicants were available at DHO's office</li> <li>Did not see the deployment list</li> </ul>
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision

5	<p>The DHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<p>No formal communication seen but DHO claims that guidelines are distributed through trainings mainly conducted by implementing partners, TASO for Katakwi</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<p>No evidence seen about meetings regarding guidelines</p>
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"> <li>4 DHT Quarterly supervision reports dated 14th October 2016, 10th Jan 2017, 11th April 2017 and 13th July 2017 outline all visits made to all 17 lower level Health facilities</li> </ul>
		<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% supervised: score 3 points</li> <li>80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2</li> <li>60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 1</li> <li>Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</li> </ul>	3	<p>4 Quarterly supervision reports dated 14th October 2016, 10th Jan 2017, 11th April 2017 and 13th July 2017 were presented as evidence and are available. The reports outline all visits made to the Hospital and 17 lower level health facility</p>

7	<p>The Health Sub-district(s) have effectively provided support supervision to lower level health units</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities have been supervised by HSD and reports produced: • If 100% supervised score 6 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 4 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 2 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Katakwi Hospital is the only HSD, a visit to one of lower facility Akaboi HCII found out the HSD had registered in the visitors book a visit regarding support supervision to the health Centre</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
8	<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>Quarterly performance reports and DHT meetings held on 10th January 2017 and 17 May 2017 respectively. Both reports show discussions on service delivery, ANC services, HB tests, Maternal and Perinatal death , Deliveries in facilities and this indicated corrective actions that were done during the quarterly performance review meetings</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</li> </ul>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One evidence on follow up was shown about maternal death audits to facilities and this came up of corrective actions that were established during the 10 January performance review.</li> </ul>
9	<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for health facility lists as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: o List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DHO office Claim 100% reporting on HMIS but no justification of health facilities consistent in both HMIS reports and OBT</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the council committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>The only Minutes availed for the Committee for Social Services, Health and Education were for the meetings held on 26th May 2017 as well as 27th February 2016. It was established that the committee had earlier met and discussed service delivery issues during a meeting held on the 27th February 2017 (under Min.07/02/16-17/CHE&amp;CBS).</p> <p>Minutes for the meetings held during other quarters of FY 2016/2017, were not provided. The other would-be set of minutes also bears the date of 27th February 2017, and the contents are not the same.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>The Social Services, Health and Education Committee held a meeting on 26th May 2017 to review the departmental budgets (under Min. 7/26th/05/CL/2017). The Mandate to approve the reviewed budgets is with the District Council.</p>
11	<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 5 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5</li> <li>• If 80-99% : score 3</li> <li>• If 70-79%: : score 1</li> <li>• If less than 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Katakwi Hospital budget 2016/17 was approved by the Hospital Board and signed by the chair to the board</li> </ul>
12	<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not seen and DHO stated that practice has not been done but admitted that it should be done</li> </ul>

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

13	<p>The LG Health department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	District procurement plan submitted, 10 feb 2017. No other evidence presented
		<p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	0	DHO said Submitted July 2017 but no evidence
14	<p>The LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time:</li> <li>• 100% - score 8</li> <li>• 70-99% – score 4</li> <li>• Below 70% - score 0</li> </ul>	0	A list of attendance list of a planning meeting that was held to support facilities to submit health supplies procurement plans to NMS but no other details to justify that the department supported health facilities with NMS procurement plans

15	<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 2 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points</li> </ul>	2	<p>The DHO certified and recommended all suppliers and contractors for payment during FY 2016/17. The only contractor (Omukuny General Suppliers Limited) whose payment delayed from 5th July 2016 until 5th January 2017 was because the bank had closed the contractor's account without his knowledge therefore, when payment was made it bounced back to Bank of Uganda. The modalities of requisitioning the money by the district in the new financial year delayed the whole process. This was clearly a contractor's problem and not the DHO.</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"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>The Health Department submitted all the four quarterly reports electronically to DPU; thus it could not be established whether the Quarter 4 report was submitted by mid-July 2017.</p> <p>Also, there were no records in the DPU to ascertain the dates of submission of the various performance reports.</p>
17	<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year • If sector has no audit query score 4 • If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points • If all queries are not responded to score 0</p>	0	<p>No evidence of follow-up on the following issues as raised in the internal audit report of 4th Quarter FY 2016/17;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weak governance bodies Health Unit Management Committees (HUMCs). The HUMCs do not meet regularly to execute their functions.</li> <li>Accountability issues have remained a big challenge in the Health Units.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, score zero.</p>

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

<p>18</p>	<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p>HUMC contain a mix of women and men. Sampled health facility had equal proportions while hospital has men and women on the committee</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence, However facilities claim that LG do not issue guidelines. They are done through implementing partners</li> </ul>
<p>19</p>	<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LGs has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal : score 2 points.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>	<p>No evidence, facilities claim that LG do not issue guidelines. They are done through implementing partners</p> <p>like TASSO now</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Katakwi District

(Vote Code: 522)

Score 12/100 (12%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: score 10</li> </ul>	0	<p>According to the Annual work plan of FY2017/2018, approved under minute 11/31/05/CL/2017 five boreholes were planned per sub counties irrespective of whether their safe water coverage status is above the district coverage (93%) or not</p>
2	<p>The LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY: score 15</li> </ul>	0	<p>According to the fourth Quarter progress and annual cumulative report of Katakwi district local government dated 13/07/2017, the district did not implement budgeted water projects in sub counties below the district safe water coverage as expected for equitable access to safe water coverage. The two sub counties are Magoro sub county and Katakwi sub county</p>
Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision				



3	<p>The LG Water department carries out monthly monitoring and supervision of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually. • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15 • 80 - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10 • 70 - 79%: score 7 • 60 - 69% monitored: score 5 • 50 - 59%: score 3 • Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored -score 0</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No annual progress reports of the previous financial year were obtained at DWO as well as monitoring and supervision reports/ plan documents for the previous financial year 2016/2017</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information in the mis report is inconsistent for the current financial year especially water access for the sub counties of Kapujan, Katakwi, and Magoro.</li> <li>• No performance contract obtained at DWO</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• No submission reports on procurement was obtained at the DWO and the reverse holds for the DPU</li> </ul>

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"> <li>• If the DWO prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2</li> <li>• If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2</li> <li>• If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2</li> <li>• If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No contract management records/reports were obtained at the DWO as the position of contract manager is vacant in district water department</li> <li>• No design specifications in the contract management records were obtained at DWO</li> <li>• No hand over reports at DWO was obtained</li> <li>• No contract management records/reports were obtained at the DWO as the position of contract manager is vacant in district water department</li> </ul>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were no records to prove that the DWO timely certified and recommended suppliers for payment.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, zero score.</p>
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"> <li>• Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>	<p>The Water Department submitted all the four quarterly reports electronically to DPU. However, there were no records in the department or DPU to ascertain the dates of submission of the various performance reports.</p> <p>Thus, it could not be established whether the reports were submitted by mid-July 2017.</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"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 5 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 If queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	5	<p>There were no issues raised in the internal audit reports for FY 2016/17. Therefore, score 5.</p>
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>It was established that the Works, Production, and Marketing committee met and discussed service delivery issues during a meeting held on the 23rd April 2017 (under Min. 08/4/23rd/Wrks/2017).</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>The Committee for Works, Production, and Marketing held a meeting on 25th May 2017 to review the departmental budgets (under Min. 06/05/25th/Wrks/2017). The Mandate to approve the reviewed departmental budgets is with the District Council.</p>
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"> <li>• The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No AWP, budget water grant release, expenditures were displayed, duly dated and stamped and validated at the district notice boards and district local government website</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No sample was taken since the assessor didn't access contract management records and plan at DWO</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No contract information was obtained on the district notice boards and Katakwi district local government website</li> </ul>
12	<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community application files were obtained at DWO</li> <li>Community meeting minutes were obtained at the district water office including memorandum of understanding for community contribution for o and m</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O&amp;M funds and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, for the current FY: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No sector MIS information on o &amp; m funds was obtained at DWO</li> </ul>

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

13	<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No EIA reports were obtained at ENR office to ascertain if EIA was conducted for all wss projects in the district</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No completed environmental screening templates were obtained at ENR office to ascertain whether mitigation measures were put in place for wss projects in the district</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No contract records were obtained at the DWO to ascertain compliance with good environmental and social protection practices for all wss projects in the district</li> </ul>

14	<p>The LG Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If at least 50% WSCs are women as per the sector critical requirements: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the software progress reports obtained at DWO there is gender representation but not at 50% of the WSC as per the LG performance manual</li> </ul>
15	<p>Gender- and special-needs sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/RGCs.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From a sample of five public sanitation facilities namely Katakwi district LG VIP, Katakwi Hospital vip, Apuuton primary school, Katakwi primary school and Katakwi T/C there was no equity and inclusion observed in the fore mention public sanitation facilities.</li> </ul>