



## LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Kiboga District

(Vote Code: 525)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	5	83%
No	1	17%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.	xxx	Kiboga DLG submitted the Final Performance Contract for FY 2017/18 to MoFPED on 17th/7/2017 while the Draft had been submitted on 28/04/2017	No
Assessment area: Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).	xxxxx	Kiboga DLG submitted a Budget for FY 2017/18 that included a Procurement plan to MoFPED on 28/04/2017	Yes
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			
LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)	xxxxx	Kiboga DLG submitted to MoFPED the Annual Performance Report for FY 2016/17 on 28/7/2017	Yes
LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)	xxxxxx	Kiboga DLG submitted to MoFPED all the 4 Quarterly budget performance reports by the due date as evidenced here below:  Quarter I: 08/11/2016  Quarter II: 20/02/2017  Quarter III:12/05/2017  Quarter IV:28/07/2017	Yes
Assessment area: Audit			

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by April 30 (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action (PFMA Act 2015; Local Governments Financial and Accounting Regulations 2007; The Local Governments Act, Cap 243).</p>	<p>xxxxx</p>	<p>The DLG produced and submitted information to the PST/ST on the implementation of Internal Auditor General findings for the financial year 2015/2016 in a letter dated 20th March 2017 and was received by the Internal Auditor General's office on 24th March 2017. This was before the deadline of 31st April, 2017 required by the LGPA Manual. The same letter also submitted responses to the PS/ST (Internal Auditor General) the status of implementation of the OAGs report for the FY 2015/16.</p> <p>All the 5 findings in the internal audit report for the FY 2016/17 were responded to.</p> <p>The district further responded to all 7 findings in the OAG's report for the FY ended 30th June 2016 in a the same letter.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>xxxxx</p>	<p>The audit opinion on the Financial statements of the District for the FY ended June 2016 was not adverse or disclaimed. The audit opinion was, in fact, unqualified.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Kiboga District

(Vote Code: 525)

Score 65/100 (65%)

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>• Physical planning committee was in place having been recently constituted as evidenced in letter by CAO under ref. KBG/LAN/1200 dated 12/08/2017.</li> <li>• There was no evidence of meetings –no minutes available.</li> <li>• Registration book was not in place</li> <li>• No building plans had been received and therefore no approval ever granted.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District physical development plan was not in place.</li> <li>• No building plans had been received and therefore no approval ever granted</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>			<p>Report dated 30/10/2016 under ref. CR/D/FIN/103/1 of the Budget conference held on 20/10/2016 written by the acting District Planner, Mr. Rwebuga Kizito.</p> <p>Annex 4 outlined the following priorities under Production:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of agriculture inputs</li> <li>• Construction of a valley tank</li> <li>• Establishment of a model fish pond</li> <li>• Provision of fish seed and feeds</li> <li>• Provision of livestock</li> <li>• Procurement of bee hives</li> <li>• Procurement of solar panels and rehabilitation of office premises</li> </ul> <p>Annex 5 outlined the following priorities under Education:</p>

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

2

- Construction of clarrsoom at Kyeyitabya PS
- Construction of latrines at Bbiko, Mwezi, Kasega GC PS

Annex 6 outlined the following priorities under Health:

- Construction of Maternity ward at Kyanamunyonjo HC III
- Establishment of a private wing and Pharmacy at Kiboga Hospital
- Renovation of Hospital
- Completion of fencing of Bukomero HC IV

Annex 7 outlined the following priorities under Roads:

- 122.4km of roads to be routinely maintained

Annex 8 outlined the following priorities under Water:

- Deep borehole drilling (7no.) in all Sub Counties
- Spring rehabilitation (3no.) in Lwamata and Kibiga
- Borehole rehabilitation (5no) in Dwaniro, Bukomero, Lwamata and Kapeke
- Construction of a piped WSS in Kambuğu TC –unfunded priority

The priorities for the current FY 2017/18 are drawn from the list above.

• 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 following capital investments in the approved Annual Work Plan for FY 2017/18 were drawn from the approved five year district development plan (DDP) 2015/16-2019/20:

Production sector (pg. 14-15 of AWP derived from DDP pg.161-171)

- Procurement of in-calf heifers 22,000,000=
- Fencing of Kapeke market 5,000,000=
- Procurement of treadle irrigation pump 9,000,000

Health (pg. 18 of AWP derived from DDP pg. 101, 172-174)

- Construction of latrine at Lwamata HC III 20,000,000= (DDEG)

Education (pg. 20 of AWP derived from DDP pg.104, 180-182)

- Construction of 3 lined pit latrines in Kitagenda PS, Kirinda PS, Kiboga St. Andrews and Kiboga DAS 80,000,000=

Roads (pg. 22-23 of AWP derived from DDP pg.106-110, 183-184)

- Mechanised maintenance of 156.9km of roads 374,846,332=
- Manual routine maintenance of 230k of roads 70,000,000=
- Maintenance of 15km of Community Access roads 51,742,585=
- Maintenance of (unstated km) urban roads 300,516,355=

Water (pg. 26-27 of AWP derived from DDP pg. 113, 185)

- Rehabilitation of 6 boreholes 21,000,000=
- Reproduction of 4 springs 18,000,000=
- Construction of Kambugu piped WSS (phase I) 100,000,000=
- Drilling of 7 boreholes 203,000,000=

		<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>Though profiles for some of the investments were contained in the DDP (pg. 132-145) no evidence that they were discussed by DTPC was availed for review.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statistical abstract was not availed for review. Was said to have been last drafted in 2014.</li> </ul> <p>A nominal figure of 200,000= had been allocated to updating of the Abstract in the AWP FY 2017/18 (pg.35)</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 following Infrastructure projects implemented in FY 2016/17 were derived from the AWP and budget approved by the LG Council for the said year:</p> <p>Education (pg. 100-101 of Qtr 4 report 2016/17 was derived from pg 103. of AWP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 2-classroom block constructed at Kekumbya PS</li> <li>• 15 latrine stances rehabilitated</li> </ul> <p>Health (pg. 96-98 of Qtr 4 report 2016/17 was derived from pg. 101 of AWP 2016/17)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renovation of 1 out of 1 hospital</li> <li>• Renovation of Theatre at Bukomero HC IV</li> </ul> <p>Water (pg. 109-111 of Qtr 4 report 2016/17 derived from pg.109-110 of AWP 2016/17)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 deep boreholes constructed</li> <li>• 6 boreholes rehabilitated</li> </ul> <p>Roads and Engineering (pg.106-107 of Qtr 4 report 2016/17 derived from pg 107 of AWP 2016/17)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80km of urban unpaved roads routinely maintained</li> <li>• Bottlenecks removed from 10km of community access roads</li> <li>• 235km of district roads routinely maintained</li> </ul>



		<p>• 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</p>	2	<p>Quarter 4/ Annual Performance report for FY 2016/17 indicated that many of the projects were completed within the FY including:</p> <p>Production (pg. 92 of Qtr 4 report 2016/17)</p> <p>21 out of 12 fish ponds stocked with fish fry of tilapia and catfish</p> <p>Education (pg. 100-101 of Qtr 4 report 2016/17)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 2-classroom block constructed at Kekumbya PS budget 150,088,000= spent 89,387,000= pg 100</li> </ul> <p>Health (pg. 96-98 of Qtr 4 report 2016/17)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renovation of 1 out of 1 hospital (budget 300,000,000= spent 299,919= pg 96)</li> <li>• Renovation of Theatre at Bukomero HC IV (budget 25,000,000 and spent 30,046,000= pg 98)</li> </ul> <p>Roads and Engineering (pg. 106-107 of Qtr 4 report 2016/17)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80 out of 80km of urban unpaved roads routinely maintained (budget 226,925,000= spent 349,739,000= pg. 106)</li> <li>• Bottlenecks removed from 10 out of 10 community access roads (budget 51,743,000= spent 104,837,000= pg. 106)</li> <li>• 235km out of 235km of district roads routinely maintained (budget 294,340,000= spent 281,696,000= pg 107)</li> </ul> <p>Over performance was reported under Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 out of 8 latrine stances rehabilitated (budget 80,308,000= spent 123,942,000= pg. 101)</li> </ul> <p>However the following projects were reported as partially achieved in the Annual performance report 2016/17 thus bringing the overall performance to 80.6%:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5/10 deep boreholes constructed (budget 285,040,000= spent 546,092,000= pg 111)</li> <li>• 6 out of 8 boreholes rehabilitated (budget 27,390,000= spent 9,614,000= pg 109)</li> </ul>
--	--	---	---	--

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>	2	<p>The following sampled projects as captured in the Kiboga DLG Annual performance report 2016/17 indicate a total expenditure of 1,064,910,000= against 928,963,000= budget (14.6%) which is within the acceptable range of Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget in the FY 2016/17.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15 out of 8 latrine stances rehabilitated (budget 80,308,000= spent 123,942,000= pg. 101)</li> <li>Renovation of 1 out of 1 hospital (budget 300,000,000= spent 299,919,000= pg 96)</li> <li>80 out of 80km of urban unpaved roads routinely maintained (budget 226,925,000= spent 349,739,000= pg. 106)</li> <li>235km out of 235km of district roads routinely maintained (budget 294,340,000= spent 281,696,000= pg 107)</li> <li>6 out of 8 boreholes rehabilitated (budget 27,390,000= spent 9,614,000= pg 109)</li> </ul> <p>It should however be noted that this is marginal performance and the district needs to be more mindful of spending within the budget.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Based on the sample below derived from Kiboga Annual performance report FY 2016/17 the LG budgeted for 928,963,000= for O&amp;M of infrastructure and spent 1,064,910,000= which is over and above (114% ) budget:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15 out of 8 latrine stances rehabilitated (budget 80,308,000= spent 123,942,000= pg. 101)</li> <li>Renovation of 1 out of 1 hospital (budget 300,000,000= spent 299,919= pg 96)</li> <li>80 out of 80km of urban unpaved roads routinely maintained (budget 226,925,000= spent 349,739,000= pg. 106)</li> <li>235km out of 235km of district roads routinely maintained (budget 294,340,000= spent 281,696,000= pg 107)</li> <li>6 out of 8 boreholes rehabilitated (budget 27,390,000= spent 9,614,000= pg 109)</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				

6

LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments

- Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2

2

Kiboga District uses the Ministry of Public Service appraisal guidelines titled "Guidelines on the Implementation of Performance Agreements for FY 2011/2012" of 26.06.2011. It was verified that all HoDs were appraised during FY 2016/17

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.

• Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3

3

In Kiboga district, the effort of filling Heads of Departments and units has been on-going with a lot of vigour, encouragement and enforcement by the Chief Administration Officer (CAO) herself. Nevertheless, at the time of assessment, only 8 HoDs were substantively filled:

? Head of Natural Resources position (Musasizi Patrick) appointed by letter dated 16.4.13 under minute number DSC/02(a)3/2013.

? District Production Officer, appointed by letter dated 3.8.17 under reference number CR/159/2 and signed by Gwokto Achola.

? Principle HR Officer position filled (by Katusime Jane) letter dated 20.6.13 under minute DSC/02(a)/2/6/2013.

? Head of Administration who is the Dpty. CAO

? District Community Development Officer (Nsubuga Patrick) – appointment letter dated 10.4.16 under minute DSC/39(a)/2015.

? Senior Procurement Officer position filled (by Nalugwa Dorothy Bagala) with letter dated 13.3.14 under minute DSC/MIN/13/2014.

? District Production Officer (Dr. Atikoro John Richard) - appointed 13.7.2000.

? District Service Secretary unit (Ms Nassiwa Bulindi Juliet) appointment dated 25.5.1998.

The other 7 Heads of departments and key units had been submitted to, interviewed, and selected and appointed by letters which came out during the assessment second day i.e. 25.01.18. With the progress of recruitment of the rest of HoDs as evidenced by the minutes and appointments so far viewed with the DSC secretary, I am convinced that the effort is worthy and therefore warrants full score award.

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

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

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

2

The district of Kiboga submits several lists to District Service Commission for recruitment whenever approval is granted from the Ministry of Public Service. This is supported by the several submission lists viewed addressed to DSC some dated 2.2.17 and 13.9.17. Some of the submissions are submitted individually. For example minute extracts viewed dated 18.5.17 and sent to DSC for consideration produced staff such as Bbosa John, Sekyanzi Benedict, Ggume Frederick, Twinomugisha Ali. And Njuba Violet. In the plight of recruiting of staff and filling positions all submissions viewed were considered by DSC. Viewing minute extracts from DSC, could not find evidence of any submission that was not considered. Therefore all submissions were considered during FY 16/17 – this is 100%.

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

1

Several submission lists for confirmation were viewed. For example, submissions for confirmation viewed were dated 13.9.16 and 21.4.17. It is clear that all submissions made to DSC for confirmation were considered because no evidence of failed or pending cases of confirmation was found in at DSC. A long document containing minute extracts for confirmed cases was referenced as DSC/9(e)/2017.

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

1

It seems the district of Kiboga also takes disciplinary action very seriously. For the FY 16/17, it was not possible to find evidence of un-attended disciplinary cases either at HR office or DSC secretariat of the district. An example of cases submitted and considered for disciplinary action were: Tongolo Ezera (Education Asst) – closure of file; submission letter referenced as CR/D/10382 of 25.11.16.

Disciplinary submission for 11 staff who absconded duty – letter dated 17.2.16 signed by Makumbi Henry Hillary.

Minute extracts dated 27.12.17 for disciplinary action meetings held at DSC considered 50 staff with various cases. It is evident that all cases of disciplinary action submitted were considered for the FY 16/17.

<p>8</p> <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>	<p>3</p>	<p>A salary payroll is displayed every month just before pay out is effected. A request for recruitment (letter with reference ADM(d)/297/01 and signed by Diana Atwine was authorised by PSC with reference number ARC6/293/05). An advert for the same staff was run through New Vision of 6.2.17 and minute extract for selection process from DSC was referenced as DSC5(d)/2017(1) for Kasande and Njuba Violet and dated 2.2.17 and another DSC5(d)/2017(6) as well as DSC(5)/2017(8) for Nimussima Babra and Nabunya. Recruitment of staff that were submitted to DSC were followed by the Assessor and found to have accessed the salary payroll within exactly 2 months of their recruitment. For example recruitment dates of recruitment of staff such as Namussima Babra (19.5.17), Kasande Robinah (2.2.17), Nabunya Eva Lilian (19.5.17). Njuba Violet (19.5.17). Correspondingly, these staff accessed patrol on the dates indicated. Namussima Babra (26.6.17), Nabunya Eva Lilian (26.6.17), Njuba Violet (26.6.17), Robinah Kasande (26.2.17). It was clear therefore to the assessor that all new recruitment done during FY 16/17 accessed payroll within the first two months of their recruitment as shown by these sampled staff.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2</li> </ul>		<p>0</p>

Assessment area: Revenue Mobilization

9	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If increase in OSR from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10% : score 4 points</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5 -10% : score 2 point</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5% : score 0 points.</li> </ul>	0	<p>The district LG increased its OSR by 0.5% from UGX 247,301,278 in the FY 2015/16 to UGX 248,444,288 in the FY 2016/17. (Source: Kiboga District Final accounts for FY 2015/16 and FY 2016/17).</p>
10	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10% : then 2 points. If more than +/- 10% : zero points.</li> </ul>	2	<p>The actual/budget revenue collection ratio for the FY 2016/17 was 100% (UGX 248,444,288/248,444,288). This resulted in a budget variance of 0% which is lower than 10%. (Source: Kiboga District accounts for FY 2016/17)</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>There was evidence that the DLG collected at least UGX 73,206,500 in Local Service Tax which was noticeably deducted from the staff salaries at the district. However, only UGX 17,000,000 (which constitutes only 23%) was remitted to the LLGs. The DLG should always remit all the statutory revenues to the LLGs( ie 65% to sub-counties and 100% to town councils).</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>The LG spent UGX 40,547,000 in the FY 2016/17 on Council allowances and emoluments compared to UGX 247,301,278 collected in the FY 2015/16. This was 16% of OSR for the FY 2015/16 (less than 20%) as per the Local Governments Act CAP 243. (Source: the Kiboga DLG final accounts for the FY 2015/16 and FY 2016/17)</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>	2	<p>Evidence shows that the positions are substantively filled. The district Senior Procurement Officer was appointed on 13 March 2014 (CAO's letter dated 13 March 2014 and Ref CR/D/HRM/156/2, DSC/MIN/13/2014) and the Procurement Officer on 10 April 2015 (CAO's of 10 April 2015 and Ref CR/D/HRM/156/2 and DSC Min 39(a)/2015).</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>The TEC committee produced an Evaluation Reports and submitted to the Contracts Committee. E.G Evaluation report for the construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Nabinene Primary School KIBO525/WRKS/16-17/00012 dated 24 October 2016 which recommended Karki Builders and Engineers Ltd.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>The Contracts Committee minutes were available and contained in the procurement files e.g. Contracts Committee meeting of 2 November 2016 considered and upheld the recommendations of the TEC and awarded KIBO525/WRKS/16-17/00014 to Ssekyeyune Investments and KIBO525/WRKS/16-17/00012 to Karki Builders and Engineers Ltd.</p>
13	<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of the procurement and disposal plan for 2017/18 shows that the infrastructure projects are reflected in the annual work plan.</li> <li>Procurement in 2016/17 was as planned, e.g. Borehole drilling and casting (KIBO525/wrks/16/17/00010) awarded on 21 September 2016 is reflected in the procurement plan as item 2 under Water sector with planned value of UGX 13,500,000.</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>Review of the consolidated procurement plan for 2017/18 shows that 45% of the bid documents for infrastructure were prepared by August 30.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Contracts Register for 2016/17 was available and last updated on 5 April 2017. The procurement files were also complete with relevant documents such as copy of pre-qualification and solicitation documents, record of bid opening and closing, evaluation reports, contracts committee decisions, notice of best evaluated bidder, Letter of Bid Acceptance, among others.</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>Sampled projects indicate the procurement thresholds were adhered to. E.g Open Bidding (OB) for Contract KIBO525/WRKS/16/17/00020 valued at UGX 87,484,055 and KIBO525/WRKS/16/17/00002 valued at UGX 249,667,793 which are within the OB threshold of more than UGX 50,000,000. Contracts KIBO525/WRKS/16/17/00012 valued at 19,047,212; KIBO525/WRKS/16-17/00025 valued at UGX 16,461,000 and KIBO525/WRKS/16/17/00027 valued at UGX 19,470,000 are within Selective Bidding threshold of not exceeding UGX 50,000,000.</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>Generally, all completed works projects from 2016/17 did not have Interim and/or Completion Certificates in the files and none were availed. Of about 22 completed projects, only contract KIBO525/WRKS/16/17/00026 had a Completion Certificate.</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	Project sites visited did not have site boards e.g. Kiboga hospital where renovations are underway, Lwamata Health Centre and Kitagenda Primary School where pit latrines are under construction.
Assessment area: Financial management				
16	<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4</li> </ul>	4	All the monthly reconciliations for the FY 2016/17 and those for the period July to December 2017 were in place. They were all signed by the sector accountants and verified by CFO (HOF). The dates of approval/verification of the reconciliations statements ranged between 5 to 10 days.
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	A sample of 12 transactions from health, water, education and production departments showed that all payments were fully within the period of payment timelines of 30 days as indicated in Contracts respectively. The range of payment timeline for the sampled vouchers was from 1 day to 29 days which was within the maximum recommended period of 30 days.
18	<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor and produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 3.</li> </ul>	0	The Head of Internal Audit department (Mr Ssentongo Keneth) was substantively appointed an Examiner of Accounts on 2nd May 2006 under DSC Minute No. 61c/2006 in a letter signed by the then CAO (Mr Atokoro John). He is therefore below the level of a substantive Senior Internal Auditor. He , however, produced all the quarterly internal audit reports for the FY 2016/17

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries: score 2.</li> </ul>	2	There was evidence that the LG provided information to Council and LGPAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings. The Ag District Internal Auditor had produced and submitted the 1st quarter, 2nd quarter, 3rd quarter and 4th quarter to LGPAC on 29th November 2016, 16th March 2017, 20th June 2017, and 25th September 2017 respectively to the LGPAC, CAO and the Chairperson LCV. The quarterly internal audit reports were duly acknowledged by the above offices.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1</li> </ul>	0	The Accounting Officer and the LGPAC received all the internal audit reports but there was no evidence that the LGPAC discussed them .
19	<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4</li> </ul>	4	The LG maintains updated assets registers.The latest update on the assets register was the entry of the following District Road equipment of a Water Bowser Registration No UG 2183W acquired on 24th November 2017.There was no evidence of any other asset that was not registered in the Assets Register.
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	The LG received unqualified audit opinion on the financial statements for the FY 2016/17. (source: The OAG audit report for the FY 2016/17 for the District)
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				
21	<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p>			The following 6 sets of Minutes of District Council meetings reviewed for FY 2016/17 confirmed that the Council discussed service delivery related issues including TPC reports, LG PAC reports, budgets and work plans, Ordinances:

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

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

2

a) Meeting of 24/05/2017 discussed motion seeking to approve supplementary budget of 2m for education, Kapeke Seed SS 66m (construction of a 2 classroom block) under Min 06/KBG/DLC/05/17, and Motion seeking for presentation and consideration of committee recommendations by Works and Technical Services under Min 07/KBG/DLC/05/17 and Motion seeking for presentation of Social Services Committee report under Min. 09/KBG/DLC/05/17 and approval of the district budget 2017/18 under Min. 12/KBG/DLC/05/17 and approval of the procurement plan 2017/18 under Min. 13/KBG/DLC/05/17

b) Meeting of 30/03/2017 considered laying of the district budget FY 2017/18 under Min 05/KBG/DLC/03/17

c) Meeting of 10/03/2017 considered departmental workplans, recruitment plan, capacity building grant, approval of changes in Roads projects Qtr III 2016/17 under Min 06/KBG/DLC/03/17; Works and Technical services committee report and recommendations under Min. 07/KBG/DLC/03/17, Social services committee report and recommendations under Min. 08/KBG/DLC/03/17c

d) Meeting of 03/02/2017 considered LG PAC report under Min 05/KBG/DLC/02/17(v); customised staff structure under Min 05/KBG/DLC/02/17(viii); Works and Tech services report under Min 05/KBG/DLC/02/17(vx); Social services committee reports under Min 05/KBG/DLC/02/17(xi).

e) Meeting of 27/10/2016 discussed upgrading of Nyamiringa HC II to HC III under Min 04/KBG/DLC/10/16(b); approval of Maize Quality Bill under Min. 04/KBG/DLC/10/16(e), Social services committee reports under Min 06/KBG/DLC/10/16

f) Meeting of 23/08/2016 discussed approval of supplementary budget including 30m from URF for work in Bukomero TC under Min 05/KBG/DLC/08/16(2) –but final resolution not captured in minutes; adoption of LARA policy of Education under Min. 05/KBG/DLC/08/16(5).

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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Deputy CAO then, Mr. Kalisa Birigwa, had been assigned by the CAO in a letter dated 02/08/2016 under reference no. KBG/HR/152/3 as Focal person Client Charter which included coordinating response to feedback/complaints.</li> <li>The following responses to the citizens complaints were seen: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter by CAO to Town Clerk dated 8/07/2016 under ref. no. CR.D/LAN/1203/1 on land encroachment at Kachwangozi HC II by Kiboga TC.</li> <li>Letter by the CAO to Town Clerk Kiboga TC dated 1/12/2016 under ref. no. CR/D/JUD/901/3 in response to notice from Kabuusu, Muhumuza &amp; Co. Advocates dated 8/11/2016 under reference KM/GEN/101116/KN regarding conflict between Kateera Boda boda Association and Nantongo Asia over use of the latter's land for operating a boda boda stage.</li> </ul> </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: • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LG Payroll December 2017 was published on notice boards at the District headquarters.</li> <li>However the Pensioner Schedule had not been displayed</li> </ul> <p>District website <a href="http://www.kiboga.go.ug">www.kiboga.go.ug</a> was established but was not up-dated. Planned for in BFP FY 2018/19</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>Procurement plan FY 2017/18 and awarded contracts and amounts were published on the notice boards at the 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	Not applicable. The Central Government did not conduct the Annual Performance Assessment for LGs in FY 2016/17
24	The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	1	Report prepared by the District Planner dated 30/05/2017 evidenced that a dissemination meeting was held with Senior Assistant Secretaries and Senior Accounts Assistants from LLGs to communicate and explain DDEG guidelines 2017/18.
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that LG during previous FY has conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc..) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1.</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Radio programme was held under Water sub-sector (pg. 110 of Qtr IV/Annual Performance report 2016/17)</li> <li>Kiboga DLG held an Accountability Day on 25/May 2017 where the District LG leaders presented progress made with implementation of programmes during the FY 2016/17 and highlighted priorities for the FY 2017/18. An activity report on this community feedback exercise that had been prepared by the Deputy CAO, Ms. Nalumansi Rose dated 29/05/2017 was reviewed.</li> </ul>
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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The gender focal person had activity report dated 16 June 2016 for Dissemination of Gender and Equity Guidelines and Scoring cards to District Sectors/Department Heads. This indicated that guidance and support was provided to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities.</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>A comparison of the budget for gender activities (gender mainstreaming, women's entrepreneurship program and support to women's councils) against availed evidence (payment vouchers PV-S00227 dated 7 December 2016; PV-S00226 dated 7 December 2016; PV-S00275 dated 13 December 2016 and PV-S00042 dated 28 September 2016) indicate that 69% of 2016/17 budget was used.</li> <li>The 2017/18 work plan indicates that there are planned activities to strengthen women's roles e.g. training district and sub-county technical personnel on gender budgeting and support to women's councils and women's entrepreneurship program.</li> </ul>
26	<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Available reports indicate environmental screening was done for projects. Reports also indicate the environment/social impact and the mitigation measures to be instituted. E.g. environmental screening report dated 21 October 2016 for 5-stance pit latrines constructed at five primary schools and for the establishment of deep and shallow wells dated 5 January 2016. The identified mitigation measures with cost implications were budgeted for.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>Whereas Environmental and social management plans are included in Element 7 of the BOQ for construction of pit latrines, there was no evidence provided to show environmental and social management mitigation measures were included in the contract bid documents for other infrastructure projects like wells, construction projects and boreholes.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>There was no evidence availed to show ownership of land where projects were implemented.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2</li></ul>	0	<p>Generally, completed projects do not have Environmental Social Mitigation Certification. Of the nearly 15 completed projects only three KIBO525/WRKS/16/17/00011, KIBO525/WRKS/16/17/00014 and KIBO525/WRKS/16/17/00020 had environmental and social certification.</p> <p>The concern over the absence of environmental certification for completed and paid projects is highlighted by the CAO in a letter to Heads of Departments ref KBG/ADM/213/6 dated 04/08/2017.</p>
--	--	---	---	---





## **LGPA 2017/18**

Educational Performance Measures

Kiboga District

(Vote Code: 525)

Score 58/100 (58%)

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>	4	<p>According to the information obtained from the DEO's office, Kiboga District has 87 government aided primary schools and 140 privately owned. The list of schools, staff lists as well as performance agreements indicate that 862 teachers, which include the Head Teachers of government-aided schools, are on the wage bill. Most of the schools in and around the Administrative Headquarters such as Kiboga District Administration School, Kiboga St Andrew's Primary School and St Paul Kiboga Primary School have more than 7 teachers in the current FY 2017/18.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>Each of the government-aided schools has a Head Teacher and at least 7 teachers per school as the list of schools for the current FY 2017/18 indicates.</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               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% score 6</li> <li>If 80 - 99% score 3</li> <li>If below 80% score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	3	<p>The HRM register and the staffing list for primary schools show that only 97% of the approved structure for primary school teachers with wage bill provision has been filled for FY 2017/18.</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>Although Ideally there should be 6 inspectors in place, the current structure for Kiboga District provides for only 2 inspectors of schools; both places are filled.</p> <p>However, according to the CAO and the DEO, interviews have been held to fill the positions of Sports Officer, Guidance and Counselling Officer, and Special Needs Officer.</p>
4	<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of Primary Teachers: score 2</p>	0	<p>In the recruitment plan submitted to HRM for the current FY 2017/18, there was no provision made for the recruitment of 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>Recruitment plan to fill vacant positions for 3 inspectors was tendered to the HRM and interviews were recently held to that effect.</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 in Kiboga district. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Senior Inspector of Schools ie Buliro Augustine. His personnel file indicates that he was appraised on 11.5.17</li> <li>Inspector of Schools i.e Kasimagwa Margaret. The personnel file of this school inspector indicates that her latest appraisal report was signed on 11.07.17.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Therefore, all school inspectors are found to be appraised during the FY 16/17.</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

3

Kiboga district has a total of 87 primary schools and therefore a corresponding number of head teachers. Out of 87 head teachers, a sample of 10 school head teachers was picked at random by the Assessor – this represents around 10% of the head teachers. All the 10 sampled school teachers (10%) were found to be appraised. Teachers sampled and their respective dates of appraisals according to appraisal reports found in their files were as follows:

Nakayenze Sumaya of Kiboga Islamic PS – 20.4.17.

Tibaingana Julius of Kitagenda Primary School – 20.04.17a

Mafaya Charles of Muwanga PS – 20.4.17

Kayiira Jude PS of Kiribedda PS – 31.12.16

Kabuye Frederick of Ssinde PS – 6.2.17

Mosso Luke of St. Kizito Nkandwa PS – 6.8.16

Naiga Harriet of Kyato PS – 18.4.17

Kaala Rhoda Kadondi of Kyamakoora PS – 20.4.17

Nantume Winfred of Kijojobo PS – 7.12.16

Omit John of Biriira PS – 20.4.17

This finding concurs with the assertion by the Principle HR Officer that they pay keen attention to appraisals of staff and that all their head teachers were appraised regularly. With this I had reason to believe that all H/teachers were appraised and this is 100% compliance.

The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools

Maximum 3 for this performance measure

• 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

1

Ample evidence exists that the education department received several and various guidelines, circulars and policy related documents and communication them to the schools as required. Schools visited testified to this fact. Some of these are listed below:

- Registration and Management of Private Natural Forests in Uganda
- State of Uganda's Forestry 2016
- Circular on Preparatory Week & Licensing/Registration of Private Schools, dated 6 Dec 2016
- District Dialogue Meetings, dated 30 Nov 2016
- Placement of Schools / Institutions for Payment of Capitation Grant for FY 2016/17.
- Circular from MoLG No. 09/2015 dated 15 Dec 2015 on procurement of vehicle for the Education Department; responded to on 11 March 2016.

The education department, however, still has challenges in proper documentation and filing information.

• 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

0

All the selected schools visited acknowledged that the DEO usually calls them to receive the documents but meetings are rarely held to explain and sensitise on the guidelines, etc This was confirmed by lack of minutes of such meetings. Minutes of only 2 meetings were seen; one held on 23 Aug 2017 on circular from the National Identification Registration Authority (NIRA), and another on School lunch, dated 28 Nov 2016.

Again, the department has problems documenting and filing minutes of meetings.

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>	10	<p>Evidence availed revealed that over 90% of schools had been inspected in the FY 2016/17. Both government and private schools inspected. This is supported by the following record of inspection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>79 schools inspected in 1st Quarter of 2016/17; report dated 25 Nov 2016</li> <li>59 schools inspected in 2nd Quarter 2016/17; report dated 24 Feb 2017</li> <li>76 schools inspected in 3rd Quarter 2016/17; report dated 24 Apr 2017</li> <li>60 schools inspected in 1st Quarter of 2017/18; report dated 20 Nov 2017</li> </ul>
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>Head Teachers of the selected schools, ie Kiboga District Administration School, Kiboga St Andrew's Primary School and St Paul Kiboga Primary School were unanimous that no meetings between the DEO/District Inspectorate to discuss inspection reports were being held. This is confirmed by the fact that no minutes exist to prove otherwise.</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>	2	<p>The following record is proof that school inspection reports are being submitted to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) as required. Acknowledgement by DES dated 29 Nov 2017 and district lists of submissions are further evidence of this fact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Submission to DES of 3rd Qter FY 2016/17; dated 9 May 2017</li> <li>- Submission to DES of 1st Qter FY 2016/17; dated 29 Nov 2016</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>There was no documented evidence presented to show that inspection recommendations are followed up. The Head Teachers of the selected schools visited (St Paul Kiboga Primary School, Kiboga District Administration School, and Kiboga St Andrew's Primary School) confirmed that there no such meetings.</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>	0	<p>There are some inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the figures on record that do not agree with the data submitted. The reason given was that at the time of head counting some pupils are usually away from school.</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>Although data submitted is consistent with EMIS report and OBT formats, some inaccuracy still subsists, especially regarding the number of pupils per class. The following submissions were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission of 30 Nov 2016;</li> <li>Submission for 2017/18;</li> <li>Submission for 2018/19 dated 8 Jan 2018.</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				

The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council

Maximum 4 for this performance measure

• 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

0

3 sets of Minutes of the Social Services Standing Committee (handles Education, Health and CBS) meeting were Education sector issues were discussed were seen:

- Meeting of 18/04/2017 discussed Education matters under Min 03/KBG/SOC/03/17 but subject matter not stated though agenda includes Performance progress reports.
- Meeting of 08/02/2017 discussed Education report and Health Work plan 2017/18 under Min 02/KBG/SOC/03/17 but under an inappropriate subject matter of 'Communication from the chair'
- Meeting of 14/10/2016 discussed Education and Health performance reports under Min 03/KBG/SOC/10/16 but subject matter stated wrongly only as 'performance report for community based services department' (pg.3)

However evidence that Committee had discussed inspection reports was not availed for review.



		<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 Social Services Standing Committee presented to the District Council in the meeting of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 24/05/2017 supplementary budget of 2m for education and for Kapeke Seed SS 66m (construction of a 2 classroom block) for approval under Min 06/KBG/DLC/05/17, Social Services Committee report under Min. 09/KBG/DLC/05/17 and the district budget 2017/18 for approval under Min. 12/KBG/DLC/05/17.</li> <li>• 30/03/2017 the district budget FY 2017/18 (laying) under Min 05/KBG/DLC/03/17</li> <li>• 10/03/2017 departmental work plans under Min 06/KBG/DLC/03/17, Social services committee report and recommendations under Min. 08/KBG/DLC/03/17c</li> <li>• 03/02/2017 Social services committee reports under Min 05/KBG/DLC/02/17(xi).</li> <li>• 27/10/2016 Social services committee reports under Min 06/KBG/DLC/10/16</li> <li>• Meeting of 23/08/2016 LARA policy of Education under Min. 05/KBG/DLC/08/16(5).</li> </ul>
11	<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO) • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80% schools: score 0</p>	5	<p>Evidence from the DEO's office and from schools visited reveal that 100% of schools have well constituted and have functional SMCs that hold meetings regularly to discuss issues pertaining to their schools and submit reports to the DEO, eg meetings of:</p> <p>- 3 Aug 2017; 20 Nov 2017; 23 Nov 2017</p>

12	<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>All the government-aided primary schools receive the non-wage recurrent grants and lists are displayed on the notice boards in the District Headquarters and in the schools.</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>Submission to the PDU was made late, ie on 26 Oct 2016, instead of by 30 April as required. The submission was subsequently acknowledged on 3 March 2017.</p>
----	---	--	---	--

14	<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	3	<p>The education department certified and recommended payments to suppliers on time. A sample of 6 payment vouchers and LPOs which were examined and compared with the payments registrar indicated that the payment were made between one day and 25 days compared to maximum period of 30 days indicated in the LPOs</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of actual date of submission to Planning unit was lacking but evidence of auto generated date or sign off on the relevant section in the reports seen for:</li> </ul> <p>Quarter I report on 4/11/2016</p> <p>Quarter II report on 16/02/2017</p> <p>Quarter III report on 10/05/2017 (signed date)</p> <p>Quarter IV report on 26/07/2017</p> <p>However Qtr 4 report auto generated date was past the due date of mid July. The actual date of submission could not be ascertained.</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>	4	<p>The education department did not have audit findings in the FY 2016/17.</p>

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

17	<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc...: Score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>This is being done. Some of the guidelines disseminated include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Gender in Education Strategic Plan: 2015 – 2020</li> <li>- Creating a Gender Responsive Learning Environment</li> <li>- Understanding and Managing Menstruation</li> <li>- National Strategy for Girls’ Education (NSGE) in Ug (2014 – 2019)</li> <li>- Guidelines seen, eg Life Skills for Primary Schools in Ug</li> <li>- Disseminated</li> <li>- Need to do more to explain the guidelines to the service delivery implementers</li> </ul>
		<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>No current documented evidence on this performance measure; the last one having been held on 7 &amp; 8 October, 2015.</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 guidelines on the gender composition of SMCs is fully met. All the schools have SMCs with at least 3 women in the forum.</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>A few guidelines have been issued out, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Environmental Management Operational Guide for Local Governments;</li> <li>- National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA) brochures; Safe School Environment.</li> </ul> <p>Some schools have not received the guidelines and no meetings are held on the subject.</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Health Performance Measures

Kiboga District

(Vote Code: 525)

Score 82/100 (82%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human resource planning and management				
1	<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than 80% filled: score 6 points,</li> <li>• 60 – 80% - score 3</li> <li>• Less than 60% filled: score 0</li> </ul>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The total wage budgetary provision for 2016/17 was 2,67,430,000/= and up to 2,607,412,000/= (97%) was spent in FY 2016/17.</li> <li>- About 76% of the established structure is filed, although this covers 97% of the wage budgetary allocations.</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>- There was a comprehensive recruitment plan in place with 61 health workers needing recruiting although the recruitment list does not fit in the current FY wage budgetary allocations.</li> <li>- However, there was the January 10, 2018 request for replacement of Health Workers who retired, died, absconded or transferred services. The request was submitted to CAO and HRM. A total of 15 health workers will be replaced.</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	<p>Kiboga District has only one Health Cetnter 4 – called Bukomero. According to records found in the personal file of HC4 In-charge (Dr. Musiitwa Michael Mugwanya), this officer is duly appointed and regularly appraised. For the FY 16/17, the Bukomenro HC4 in-charge was appraised as per Performance agreement report dated 18.7.17. The officer was appointed by letter dated 5.2.2009 referenced as CR/160/1 under minute DSC/118(a)/2008(2).</p>
4	<p>The Local Government Health department has equitably deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers equitably, in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>- The list of health workers in OBT report for first quarter current FY tallied with the staff list in district deployment plan</p>
Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision				

5

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

Maximum 6 for this performance measure

• Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3

3

- The district produces both quarterly and annual bulletins where all the most recent guidelines are communicated. The in-charges are given copies

- The district holds extended DHT meetings where all In-charges, DHT member, some heads of departments, the Secretary for Health and some partners attend. New Guidelines and policies are communicated in such meetings. There were quarterly DHT meeting minutes for Jan 13, 2017, June 19, 2017, Dec 9, 2016, February 7, 2017 were available and some new guidelines were discussed.

- There were a few guideline distribution lists (3) and a delivery book kept by the Office Assistant although these did not indicate that all facilities were covered.

• 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

3

- The district holds extended DHT meetings where all In-charges, DHT member, some heads of departments, the Secretary for Health and some partners attend. New Guidelines and policies are communicated in such meetings. There were quarterly DHT meeting minutes for Jan 13, 2017, June 19, 2017, Dec 9, 2016, February 7, 2017 seen and some new guidelines were discussed.



6	<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3</p>	0	<p>- There were four quarterly reports. But some had insufficient detail to the number of facilities that were visited.</p>
		<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY: • If 100% supervised: score 3 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	0	<p>- There were four quarterly reports. But some had insufficient detail regarding the number of facilities that were visited.</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>	4	<p>- The HSD of Bukomero has quarterly supervision reports such as those of October 19, 2016, May 19, 2017 that provide evidence that all facilities were supervised. All facilities could not be supervised due to the resource envelope allocated.</p>
8	<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</p>	4	<p>- There were quarterly DHT meetings where supervision reports were discussed. Minutes for January 13, 2017, June 19, 2017, Dec 9, 2016, February 7, 2017 were seen and issues arising from the supervision were discussed. These included staff issues, immunisation, etc.</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>- The DHO sits in the social services committee and presents all key matters arising from quarterly supervision and need action. The meetings of October 5, 2016, July 28, 2017, February 8, 2017, April 18, 2017, March 22, 2017 discussed health issues for action and for budgeting purposes</li> <li>- Example, in Kapeke sub-county they did not have a health centre 3, so the matter was taken through the social services committee to council and finally Nyamilinga HC II was established and gazetted. At the moment the drug kit for the facility was being pursued.</li> <li>- Some service delivery issues like equipment and latrines were presented to Council and funds were allocated for an Ultra Sound machine to be procured this year and Latrines are being constructed in Lwamata.</li> <li>- Issues of land have received some funds for securing land especially where there were major issues such as Bukomero HC IV which was fenced</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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The list of PHC funded facilities of 21 (19 government and 2 PNFP) were concordant with the OBT generated reports. But the HMIS list was longer due PFP facilities.</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				

The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council

Maximum 4 for this performance measure

• 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

0

4 sets of Minutes of the Social Services Standing Committee (handles Education, Health and CBS) meeting were Health issues were discussed were seen:

- Meeting of 22/03/2017 discussed Health matters under Min 03/KBG/SOC/03/17 but subject matter stated wrongly only as 'community department workplan for FY 2017/18'
- Meeting of 08/02/2017 discussed Education report and Health Workplan 2017/18 under Min 02/KBG/SOC/03/17 but under an inappropriate subject matter of 'Communication from the chair'
- Meeting of 14/10/2016 discussed Education and Health performance reports under Min 03/KBG/SOC/10/16 but subject matter stated wrongly only as 'performance report for community based services department' (pg.3)
- Meeting of 07/10/2016 discussed Health performance reports under Min 02/KBG/SOC/12/16 but subject matter not stated wrongly as 'presentation of community department' (pg.2)

However evidence that Committee had discussed supervision reports and LG PAC reports was not availed for review.

		<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 Standing Committee presented to the District Council in the meeting of:</p> <p>a) 24/05/2017 Social Services Committee report under Min. 09/KBG/DLC/05/17 and district budget 2017/18 for approval under Min. 12/KBG/DLC/05/17.</p> <p>b) 30/03/2017 the district budget FY 2017/18 (laying) under Min 05/KBG/DLC/03/17</p> <p>c) 10/03/2017 departmental workplans, under Min 06/KBG/DLC/03/17; and Social services committee report and recommendations under Min. 08/KBG/DLC/03/17c</p> <p>d) 03/02/2017 Social services committee reports under Min 05/KBG/DLC/02/17(xi).</p> <p>e) 27/10/2016 upgrading of Nyamiringa HC II to HC III under Min 04/KBG/DLC/10/16(b); and Social services committee reports under Min 06/KBG/DLC/10/16</p>
11	<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 5 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5</li> <li>• If 80-99% : score 3</li> <li>• If 70-79%: : score 1</li> <li>• If less than 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	5	<p>- The hospital of Kiboga and all other visited health centres of Lwamata, Bukomero, Kambugu, Kyekumbya, and Kiboga hospital had functional HUMCs with minutes in place.</p>
12	<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>- The current PHC allocations to facilities were published on the notice board at the DHO</p>

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

13	<p>The LG Health department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was evidence that the procurement requests for the three investments and capital development plans as per current FY work-plan were done in time. The requests covered procurement for a Latrine at Lwamata HC, Kiboga hospital renovations, and the procurement of an ultra-sound machine for the hospital.</li> <li>- In addition, procurement plans were available for medicines including for the private wing of the hospital, and for consumables.</li> </ul>
		<p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PPF 1 were seen for latrine, U/Sound and the hospital renovations done by 1st quarterly of current FY</li> </ul>
14	<p>The LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time:</li> <li>• 100% - score 8</li> <li>• 70-99% – score 4</li> <li>• Below 70% - score 0</li> </ul>	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was documentary evidence that the DHO had supported HCIV, Hospital and lower health units to make procurement plans and submit them to NMS. The plans for 2017/18 were all in place for all level health facilities.</li> </ul>

15	<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 2 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points</li> </ul>	2	<p>The LG Health department certified and recommended payments to suppliers on time. Sample of 6 payment vouchers and contracts indicated that payment were made between 3 days and 28 days respectively compared to maximum period of 30 days indicated in the contracts and LPOs.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of actual date of submission to Planning unit was lacking but evidence of auto generated date or sign off on the relevant section in the reports seen for:</li> </ul> <p>Quarter I report on 4/11/2016</p> <p>Quarter II report on 16/02/2017</p> <p>Quarter III report on 10/05/2017 (signed by other HODs)</p> <p>Quarter IV report on 26/07/2017</p> <p>However Qtr 4 report auto generated date was past the due date of mid July. The actual date of submission could not be ascertained.</p>
----	---	---	---	--

17	<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If sector has no audit query score 4</li> <li>If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points</li> <li>If all queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The health department did not have internal audit queries in the FY 2016/17.</li> </ul>
----	---	--	---	--

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

18	<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>- There was evidence that HUMCs meet the gender composition. All facilities in Kiboga have files and these files receive all minutes from HUMCs. Each HUMC has more than one female member.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>- There was no available evidence that facilities had received guidelines on how to manage sanitation. In fact, even latrines at facilities were not labelled to indicate sections for men and for women.</p>
19	<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LGs has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal : score 2 points.</li> </ul>	0	<p>- There was no available evidence of guidelines for medical waste management at the district as well as at the facilities</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Kiboga District

(Vote Code: 525)

Score 66/100 (66%)



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>	10	<p>Kiboga district has a safe water coverage of 73% as per the Uganda Water atlas 2017. It has two sub counties that are below the district coverage and these are: Kapeke 56%, Ddwaniro 62%.</p> <p>While 6 sub counties are above the district water coverage eg Bukomero 95%, Kibiga 95%, Lwamata 76%, Mwanga 83%.</p> <p>As evidenced in the AWP (FY) 2017/18 submitted to MWE dated 7th Aug 2017 all the two sub counties that are below the coverage were budgeted for.</p>
2	<p>The LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY: score 15</li> </ul>	15	<p>Annual Progress report for the previous financial year (2016/17), that was submitted to MoWE dated 7th Aug 2017, was reviewed and found out that projects were done Ddwaniro (Lwantenga village), and Kapeke (Kyamakoora village) as planned.</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>	7	<p>From the monitoring and supervision reports on file submitted to CAO are as follows:</p> <p>12th Feb 2017 the following facilities were monitored:18 Shallow wells, 3 springs .</p> <p>On 30th Nov 2017 the following were monitored: 21 Deep bore holes, 2 springs, 6 valley tanks.</p> <p>On 16th March 2017 the following sources were monitored: 8 Deep bore holes, 5 springs, 4 shallow wells, 4 RWHT, 3 valley tanks.</p> <p>On 14th July 2017, the following sources were monitored:4 shallow wells, 3 springs, 8 deep boreholes.</p> <p>On 10th July 2017, the following were monitored: 2 Deep boreholes, 7 Springs.</p> <p>On 3rd Nov 2016, 1 deep borehole, 5 springs, 5 Shallow wells. 70% of the WSS facilities in Kiboga District were monitored.</p>
4	<p>The LG Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: o List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10</p>	0	<p>No MIS reports have been submitted for the current FY.</p>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				

5	<p>The LG Water department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	4	<p>From the DWO it was established that a list of procurement requests for borehole siting, design and supervision and consultancy services of 7 deep boreholes, 6 rehabilitations of deep boreholes, was submitted to PDU on 3rd April 2017 (2017/18) below the deadline (30th April 2017).</p>
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>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p>	<p>No contract management plan on file.</p> <p>Five deep boreholes were visited, in Namuddu, Masiruba, Kyekumbya, Kakoni, Kyamakoola villages. They were well installed as per design in the BOQs.</p> <p>ICON Project (U) Ltd and SCAN Water Consultants handed over a completion report of all the 5 deep boreholes FY 2016/17 to DWO that were done in the sub counties of Lwantenga, Kyamakoola Prim, Masiruba, Kyooma, and Kakoni. They were the only planned new water sources to be done by ICON.</p> <p>DWO Handed over a completion certificate to ICON project (U) Ltd on 13th Sept 2017 for five WSS projects that were done FY 2016/17 as planned in the AWP.</p>

7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	3	<p>The LG Water department certified and recommended the contract for payments to suppliers within the recommended timelines in the contract of 30 days. Examination of 7 payment vouchers and contracts/LPOs indicated that the payment were made at interval between 2 days and 28 days which were less than the recommended timeline of 30 days indicated in the contracts and LPOs.</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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of actual date of submission to Planning unit was lacking but evidence of auto generated date or sign off on the relevant section in the reports seen for:</li> </ul> <p>Quarter I report on 4/11/2016</p> <p>Quarter II report on 16/02/2017</p> <p>Quarter III report on 10/05/2017 (signed date)</p> <p>Quarter IV report on 26/07/2017</p> <p>However Qtr 4 report auto generated date was past the due date of mid July. The actual date of submission could not be ascertained.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Water department did not have audit findings in the FY 2016/17.</li> </ul>
---	--	--	---	---

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10

The LG committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council

Maximum 6 for this performance measure

• 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

0

4 sets of Minutes of the Works and Technical Services Standing Committee (Water and Works) meeting seen:

- Meeting of 23/03/2017 discussed Water departmental workplan FY 2017/18

- Meeting of 7/02/2017 discussed Water Performance report under Min. 03/KBG/TECH/02/17

- Meeting of 05/10/2016 discussed Water departmental performance report under Min. 03/KBG/TECH/10/16

- Meeting of 03/08/2016 discussed Water departmental performance report under Min. 03/KBG/TECH/10/16

Minutes of another meeting held on 8/12/2016 received water sector progress report under Min. 04/KBG/TECH/12/16 however the minute was hanging since the discussion that may have followed was not recorded in the Minutes (pg. 5)

Meeting of 03/08/2016 was seen but did not handle any matters regarding Water sector then looked at only Natural resources and Roads reports, and in meeting of 22/07/2016 though discussion of Departmental reports was stated on the agenda there was no corresponding minute and yet the meeting seemed to have discussed some service delivery issues in Roads under Min. 03/KBG/WORK/07/16 (Reactions-to communication from the chair)

However no evidence of discussion of Supervision reports, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination (DWSCC) was availed for review.

		<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 Works and Technical Services Standing Committee presented to the District Council in the meeting of</p> <p>a) 24/05/2017 committee recommendations by Works and Technical Services under Min 07/KBG/DLC/05/17, the district budget 2017/18 (for approval) under Min. 12/KBG/DLC/05/17 and the procurement plan 2017/18 under Min. 13/KBG/DLC/05/17</p> <p>b) 30/03/2017 the district budget FY 2017/18 (laying) under Min 05/KBG/DLC/03/17</p> <p>c) 10/03/2017 departmental workplans under Min 06/KBG/DLC/03/17; and Works and Technical services committee report and recommendations under Min. 07/KBG/DLC/03/17.</p> <p>d) 03/02/2017 Works and Tech services report under Min 05/KBG/DLC/02/17(vx)</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> <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	<p>Budget and the water development grant releases were not displayed on the district notice board.</p> <p>WSS facilities were well labelled as below:</p> <p>Masiriba, Bukomero S/C, DWD 52564, DOC 17/03/2017, Kiboga DLG</p> <p>Kyekumbya, Lwamata S/C , DWD 52845, DOC 24/12/2017, Kiboga DLG</p> <p>Namuddu, Kapeke S/C, DWD 52842, DOC 27/12/2017, Kiboga DLG</p>

		<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>	2	<p>Contract awards were displayed on the notice board: Construction of solar Driven piped system, cost 100,000,000/, Open bidding, lump sum. Source of funding: DWSCG</p> <p>Deep Bore hole drilling of 07 boreholes, cost 115,500,000/, open bidding, lump sum Source of funding DWSG</p> <p>Borehole survey, siting and supervision, Cost 18,900,000/, source of funding DWSG, Selective bidding.</p>
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	<p>There was evidence that two community applications were on file from Namuddu village (Kapeke S/C) and Kyekumbya village in Lwamata S/C.</p> <p>Three villages (Kyekumbya, Kyeyagalire, Namuddu) had paid capital contribution</p>
		<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	<p>Five water facilities were visited, they were all functional but there was no evidence of O&amp;M collections collected.</p>
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>	2	<p>Environmental screening Was done (FY) 2017/18 by the District Environment Officer. The report was submitted to the CAO through the DWO on 20th October 2017 for all the 7 deep boreholes planned to be drilled and installed in this current FY.</p>
		<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	<p>There was no evidence that environmental concerns raised were followed up.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1</li> </ul>	0	In the Contracts signed by ICON Project U Ltd, there was no clause on environmental protection.
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>	3	<p>Five WSCs for five deep boreholes were sampled in the report on file in DWOs office and they all had 50% women on the committees that is:</p> <p>Namunywa 4 males 4 females</p> <p>Kirugwala 3 males 4 females</p> <p>Nairobi 5 Males 5 females</p> <p>Namuddu 3 Males 5 Females</p> <p>Kyantamba 5 Males 2 Females</p>
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>	3	<p>One VIP latrine was visited at Kawaawa Primary, constructed Kiboga DLG. It has separate stances and well marked (Gents, Ladies), there is a ramp for PWDS and has adequate access.</p>