



LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Kisoro Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 782)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	2	40%
No	3	60%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	xxx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance contract of the forthcoming year was submitted to MoFPED on 13/07/2017 after the due date of June 30th. 	No
Assessment area: Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	xxxxx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LG Budget that was submitted is accompanied by a Procurement Plan. However, from the review of the Plan it is not consolidated but all User Department Procurement Plans are incorporated 	Yes
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			
<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	xxxxx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LG submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY to MoFPED later than the due date of July 31st. It was received and acknowledged at MoFPED on 03/08/2017. 	No

<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>• LG submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY and dated as follows: Q4 report-03/08/2017; Q3 Report-05/05/2017; Quarter 2-24/02/2017; Quarter 1-16/12/2016.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Assessment area: Audit</p>			
<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>xxxxxx</p>	<p>Kisoro Municipal Council became operational in FY 2016/2017. As such, there were no audit queries raised during FY 2015/2016.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>From the Auditor General's report for FY 2016/2017, the assessment established that Kisoro Municipal Council received an unqualified audit opinion.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Kisoro Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 782)

Score 63/100 (63%)

782 Kisoro Municipal Council Crosscutting Performance Measures

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality; and (ii) all Town Councils in a District are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a municipality/district has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 2. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical/Structural Plan available in the LG, approved by the Council and was submitted to the Physical Planning Board. • Physical Planning Committee was appointed and is functional with the last date of attendance November 15, 2017. • Registration book is in place though mixed up with other items. • Minutes of the Physical Planning committee when reviewed indicate that all submissions are not considered within 28 days after submission. Reason advanced is that of lack of funds to facilitate members of the committee some of whom are from the District LG.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the FY 2016/17 there were four new infrastructure investments carried out namely: (a) Municipal Office Block; Market Shades; Renovation of Classroom Block at Gisoro Primary School; Construction of Classroom block at Kisoro Demo Primary school; Toilets at Sesame Primary School. All the above new investments do not carry approved plans.

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

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

2

Reviewed the Budget Conference file and it is evident that Budget conference was held on 16/12/2016. TPC Minutes sampled held on the following dates: 08/7/2016; 10/08/2016; 06/09/2016; 04/10/2016; 08/11/2016; 28/12/2016; 10/01/2017; 20/02/2017; 31/03/2017; 25/04/2017; 06/05/2017,22/06/2017 were also reviewed & it can be ascertained that priorities in the AWP that was approved on 24/05/2017 for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences.

- 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

AWP & Development when reviewed appear linked. To a great extent the prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for 2017/2018 were derived from the approved five-year development plan than was approved by Council on 24/03/2017. These investments include Construction of Classrooms, Municipal Office Block, Construction of 5 stance Pit Latrines. However, there was inaccurate documentation in the description of some projects. That is, inconsistency between 'construction of new' as opposed to 'rehabilitation

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

1

Project profiles are listed & profiled in the 5 year Development plan approved on 24/03/2017 in line with LG Planning guideline & have been routinely reviewed & discussed by TPC & Executive from the sampled minutes as follows: 12/7/2016; 01/08/2016; 09/09/2016; 18/10/2016; 30/11/2016; 12/12/2016; 30/1/2017; 08/02/2017; 15/03/2017; 03/04/2017; 08/05/2017; 22/06/2017; 30/06/2017.

3	<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual statistical abstract, with gender disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum 1 point. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Statistical abstract with gender aggregated data not compiled. TPC minutes reviewed and there is no evidence to the effect.
4	<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2 	2	<p>From these sampled investments: Municipal Office Block; Market Shades; Renovation of Classroom Block at Gisoro Primary School; Construction of Classroom block at Kisoro Demo Primary school; Toilets at Sesame Primary School it is indicative that these infrastructure projects were derived from the AWP & Budget and approved by Council. The 4th Quarter Report for FY 2016/17 indicates adherence to Annual Budget and Work plan as well as the minutes of the respective standing Committee for Works that sat on 27/1/2017; 07/03/2017; 11/04/2017; 04/05/2017.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	4	<p>Based on these completed investment projects i.e. Renovation of Classroom Block at Gisoro Primary School; Construction of Classroom block at Kisoro Demo Primary school; Toilets at Sesame Primary School they were all completed in line with the work plan by end of FY. Reviewed payment Certificates of Practical Completion show that even retention of 10% has also been released and the infrastructure already in use.</p>

5	<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects and assets during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	2	<p>A review of the Q4- Annual Performance report dated Q4 report-03/08/2017, reports and consolidated Financial Statements of the Local Governments for the Year ended June 30, 2017 from the Accountant General's Office obtained from the Auditor General's Office dated December 21, 2017 indicate that all investment projects were completed within the approved budget. To a great extent projects were within planned budget except where there was supplementary budgeting resulting from release of more funds in the sectors. Sample projects include among others: (a) Municipal Office Block; Market Shades; Renovation of Classroom Block at Gisoro Primary School; Construction of Classroom block at Kisoro Demo Primary school; Toilets at Sesame Primary School.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	2	<p>Based on the annual financial accounts of the sampled projects that included construction of the municipal Administration block; classroom blocks; toilets and the annual budget performance report it is reported clearly that the LG spent over 80% of O & M budget for infrastructure</p>

Assessment area: Human Resource Management

6	<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	0	<p>From the personnel files reviewed by this assessment it was established that all Heads of Departments were not appraised during the financial year 2016/2017</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3 	0	<p>According to the approved staff structure only 2 Heads of Departments positions are substantively filled. These are Head of Administration and Health.</p> <p>The rest of the staff were assigned duties by the Town Clerk</p>

7	<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	2	<p>From Secretary DSC it was established that 100% of all staff submitted by Town Clerk for recruitment were considered as evidenced by</p> <p>The Town Clerk Declaration of vacancies to DSC in the letter dated 13th July 2016</p> <p>All the staff positions submitted were all considered by the DSC in the meeting of 7th, 8th and 9th of December 2016</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	1	<p>From the Secretary DSC this assessment established that there were no staff due for confirmation to be submitted to DSC during the financial year 2016/2017</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	1	<p>From the Secretary DSC this assessment established that there were no disciplinary cases submitted for consideration during the financial year 2016/2017</p>
8	<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3 	3	<p>From the Human Resource Office, it was established that all the staff recruited during the financial year 2016/2017 accessed the salary payroll not later than two month after Appointment.</p> <p>Records reviewed show that all the staff appointed on 28/12/2016 accessed payroll on 24/1/2017 and on 6/2/2017 respectively</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2 	2	<p>From the Human Resource Office this assessment established that there were no staff due for retirement during financial year 2016/2017</p>
Assessment area: Revenue Mobilization				

9	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If increase in OSR from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10% : score 4 points • If the increase is from 5 -10% : score 2 point • If the increase is less than 5% : score 0 points. 	4	<p>In FY 2016/2017 Kisoro Municipal Council collected local revenue amounting to UGX 618,615,964. Considering that the Municipal Council became operational in FY 2016/2017, no local revenue was collected in FY 2015/2016 by the Municipality as an entity. Therefore, the increase between FY 2016/2017 and 2015/2016 is assessed as UGX 618,615,964 (100%).</p>
10	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10% : then 2 points. If more than +/- 10% : zero points. 	0	<p>During FY 2016/2017 Kisoro Municipal Council collected local revenue amounting to UGX 618,615,964 against a budget of UGX 836,400,000 implying a realization ratio of - 26%.</p>
11	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	0	<p>During FY 2016/2017 Kisoro Municipal Council received UGX 230,203,222 from the Divisions. Out that amount, the Municipal Council remitted UGX61,526,021 back to Divisions. This implies that only 26.7% was remitted instead of 30% required by the regulations.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2 	2	<p>During FY 2016/2017 Kisoro Municipal Council spent UGX 47,511,200 on Councillors' allowances from local revenue collected. This is 16.9% of the shareable amount derived in the table below ;</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>Description</th> <th>Amount (UGX)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Gross amount collected</td> <td>618,615,964</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less amount retained by divisions</td> <td>(230,203,222)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less amount remitted to Divisions by MC</td> <td>(61,526,021)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less property tax (not shareable with Councillors)</td> <td><u>(45,244,155)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount shareable with Councillors</td> <td>281,642,566</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Description	Amount (UGX)	Gross amount collected	618,615,964	Less amount retained by divisions	(230,203,222)	Less amount remitted to Divisions by MC	(61,526,021)	Less property tax (not shareable with Councillors)	<u>(45,244,155)</u>	Amount shareable with Councillors	281,642,566
Description	Amount (UGX)															
Gross amount collected	618,615,964															
Less amount retained by divisions	(230,203,222)															
Less amount remitted to Divisions by MC	(61,526,021)															
Less property tax (not shareable with Councillors)	<u>(45,244,155)</u>															
Amount shareable with Councillors	281,642,566															

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

12	<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2 	0	<p>The Municipality has a substantive Procurement Officer but does not have an Assistant Procurement Officer.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	1	<p>TEC produced Minutes and submitted a report dated 17/11/2016 to the Contracts committee.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	1	<p>Contracts committee decision on submission report dated 202/2/2017 was presented.</p> <p>Subject of Procurement: PROC Ref KMC 782/WRKS/2017-17/00009: Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Kisoro Hill</p> <p>Contracts Committee Decision: The CC did not approve . Rejected because there were no copies for all the members.</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"> • a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2 	2	<p>PDU prepared and submitted procurement and disposal plan for 2017/18 that was submitted to PPDA and approved on 4/7/2017 . The total procurement budget is UGX. 647,353,188.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of of infrastructure projects include <p>i) Construction of a 10 ferocement rainwater tank at Kisoro Hill Primary School (UGX. 10m); .</p> <p>ii) Renovation of 1 classroom Gisoro Primary School (UGX. 20 million).</p> <p>The Procurement Plan for FY 2016/17 indicate that the municipality made procurements in previous FY as per plan e.g construction of Rusiza Market Sheds Under Proc Ref No: KMC 782/WRKS/2016-17/00002 by Byakyi Construction Co. Ltd.</p>

14

The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

• For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30: score 2

2

The Municipality prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investments and infrastructure projects by August 30th.

Investments/infrastructure bid files include:

Consolidated Bid documents file on record for FY 2017/18:

Bid Documents for Various Revenue Sources, FY 2017/18. PROC REF: KMC 782/SRVC/2017-18/0000..

Latrine Construction at Kisoro Hill Primary School (10 stance VIP) planned for UGX: 36,000,000

Proc Ref: KMC 782/WRKS/2017*18/0002: Renovation of Classroom at Gisoro P/S

• For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2

0

No updated contract register for FY 2016/17 was presented

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	2	<p>Prequalification files provided indicate thresholds for selective bidding and domestic open bidding;</p> <p>Construction of 10cm ferrocement water tank at UGX. 10 million.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open domestic bidding file: 1 infrastructure – Construction of Rusiza Market shades at accost of UGX. 162,487,212. Tender advertised in Yampe Newspaper (local newspaper); <p>Selective Bidding: for Periodic maintenance of mosque Road KMC782/WORKS/2016/17/00011</p> <p>Bid Notice under Open National Bidding for Construction of office administration block: Detailed procurement file has all the required information. KMC782/WRKS/2016-17/00012. Bid Security UGX: 3,000,000.</p>
15	<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2 	2	<p>Interim Payment Certificate No. 5 dated 08/05/2017: Contract No: KMC 782/Works/2016-17/00012: Construction of Office Block extension by Niyo Construction Co. Ltd. Commencement date: 15/03/2017; Completion date: 29/8/2017; Contract value: UGX: 198,236,870. Amount due to contractor: 48,816,239.</p> <p>Interim payment Certificate No. 01 dated 14/2/2017. For Procurement Ref No: KMC782/WRKS/2016-17/00002: Construction of Sheds at Rusiza Market by Byakyi Construction Co. Ltd. Contract Value: UGX 162,487,212. payment to contractor: UGX: 71,088,739. Commencement date: 23/01/2017. Completion Date: 23/05/2017.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2 	0	<p>Site boards do not have contract value but name of contractor, funder, expected duration, name of projects, source of funding are indicated. Sample site boards:</p> <p>Construction of Rusiza Market Sheds for Kisoro Municipal Council; Funding Source: DDEG; Contractor: Byakyi Construction Co.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management				
16	<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4 	0	<p>During FY 2016/2017 Kisoro Municipal Council operated 8 bank accounts, 7 of which were reconciled on a monthly basis up to 30 June 2017 when the finance department operations were transferred to IFMIS. One of the bank accounts was reconciled only up to 31 March 2017. From July 2017 to December 2017, the bank reconciliation statements were supposed to be prepared in IFMIS but this was not done as staff needed more training in operation of IFMIS. As such, bank reconciliations were not up to date by the time of this assessment.</p>
17	<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2. 	0	<p>During FY 2016/2017 the payment claims register was in place, though it lacked critical information like date of receipt of the payment claim and date of actual clearance/payment of the claim. As such, the timeliness of payments to suppliers could not be readily ascertained from this claims register.</p>

18	The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor and produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 3. 	3	Kisoro Municipal Council has a substantively appointed Senior Internal Auditor who produced all the four quarterly Internal Audit reports for FY 2016/2017. This assessment cited the Senior Internal Auditor's appointment letter dated 27/20/2016.
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries: score 2. 	0	By the time of this assessment, Kisoro Municipal Council had not yet provided information to Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit recommendations raised during FY 2016/2017.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1 	1	The internal audit reports for FY 2016/2017 submitted to the LG PAC were obtained and verified by this assessment. In addition, extracts of LG PAC minutes in respect of meetings where internal audit reports were discussed were obtained and verified by this assessment.
19	The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	0	<p>Kisoro Municipal Council maintained the Assets Register in a Microsoft Excel file in a format similar to that prescribed in the Local Government Accounting Manual. However, some exceptions were noted. These include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land and buildings lack values Motor vehicle sections lacks provisions for capturing repair and maintenance history. <p>In addition, there were some IT related assets provided by Ministry of Finance that were not yet recorded in the Assets register. As such, the register was not up to date by the time of the assessment.</p>

20	<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY: • unqualified audit opinion: score 4 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</p>	4	<p>From the Auditor General's report for FY 2016/2017, the assessment established that Kisoro Municipal Council received an unqualified audit opinion.</p>
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				
21	<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2</p>	2	<p>Council minutes dated 19/07/2016; 02/08/2016; 21/12/2016; 14/02/2017; 24/03/2017; 9 &10/05/2017; 24/05/2017 when reviewed indicate that LG Council meets and discussions are held for the related service delivery issues including TPC reports; Monitoring reports; Performance reports. A total of nine meetings were held for the FY 2016/17.</p>
22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2.</p>	2	<p>• Planner is the designate person to coordinate responses to feed-back.</p>
23	<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published: • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</p>	2	<p>• Published and available on the Notice Board.</p>
	<p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1</p>	1	<p>• Both Contracts & Consolidated Procurement Plan displayed on the Municipal Notice Board.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications, are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No LG PA exercise was carried out in the previous FY.
24	The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1 	1	An unreferenced flimsy file in the Town Clerks office was availed & reviewed it was confirmed that communications explaining guidelines, circulars especially Budget call papers, policies from MoLG were issued to LLG in the previous year.
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG during previous FY has conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc..) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LG provided receipts from Voice of Muhabura (U) Ltd dated 30/06/2017 & voucher Payment Instruction No.59 dated 29/6/2017 for Radio Talk shows carried out in the FY under review.

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"> Evidence that the LG gender focal person has provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities score 2. 	2	<p>The Municipal GFP provided support to gender mainstreaming in all other departments. .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invitation letter to attend Training to all Technical staff dated: 28/6/2017; Attendance list dated 3/07/2017 indicating all training participants on Gender and Labour relations
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.			

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that gender focal point has planned activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and that more than 90% of previous year's budget for gender activities has been implemented: score 2. 	2	<p>The GFP planned activities for FY 2017/18.</p> <p>The annual work plan and budget for 2017/18 include gender activities for Quarters 1 and 2 such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Counselling and needs assessment for youth females in KMC ii) Public sensitisation of youth and children; iii) Identification, establishment and equipping functional adult literacy classes <p>The GFP spent more than 90% of the allocated budget to strengthen gender in all activities.</p> <p>Accountability of UGX. 3.091 million; Payment Voucher dated 22/5/2017 for training on gender and labour relations</p> <p>Budgeted funds of UGX. 2M in the Annual work plan 2016/17.</p> <p>Percentage spent: 155%</p>
26	LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 2 	0	The Municipality did not have a substantive environmental officer to conduct environmental screening at the time of this assessment..
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	0	The LG did not present any evidence to suggest integration of environmental and social management plans in contract bid documents at the time of this assesment.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1 	0	The LG did not present any evidence of land ownership but the processing of acquiring the land title for the Municipality Administration is ongoing. A freehold land title is being sought in conjunction with the Kisoro DLG.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2	0	<p>The Municipality does not have an environmental officer to perform this function.</p> <p>A review of completed projects such as primary schools and the Rusiza Market Sheds do not have completed and signed Environmental and Social Mitigation Certificates on record.</p>
--	--	---	---	---



LGPA 2017/18

Educational Performance Measures

Kisoro Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 782)

Score 42/100 (42%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				
1	<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance contract shows deployment and budget for at least one Head teacher and minimum of one teacher per class(7 teachers) per school for the four schools in the Municipal Council(Vote 782) Staff list provided shows that each school has a deployment of Head teacher and at least 7 teachers with one for each classroom
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher staff lists shows each school has a head teacher and 7 teachers as required. <p>The four primary schools visited in the Municipality have the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seseme P/S one head teacher and 20 teachers Gisoro P/S one H/T and 17 teachers Kisoro Hill P/S One H/T and 7 teachers Kisoro Demo P/S One H/T and 19 Teachers

2	<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision o If 100% score 6 o If 80 - 99% score 3 o If below 80% score 0 	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance contract FY 2017/18 shows that teachers currently needed with wage bill provision is 67 teachers and all teachers needed are in place
3	<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance contract FY 2017/18 shows wage bill provision for senior inspector of schools and already recruited. Approved LG staff structure(vide 135/306/01 public service dated 4th March 2017)indicates 5 staff for the education department with one senior inspector of schools who is already in place although acting as Head of department as well Staff list shows Senior inspector of schools in place
4	<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of Primary Teachers: score 2</p>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment plan seen for FY 2017/18 reviewed and found the recruitment of Education officer special needs but all teachers are in place
		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The position of inspector of Schools is filled

5	<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY • 100% school inspectors: score 3</p>	0	<p>From the personnel files it was established that the inspector of schools was not appraised during the financial year 2016/2017</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised head teachers during the previous FY. • 90% - 100%: score 3 • 70% - 89%: score 2 • Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<p>From the Human Resource unit this assessment established that all the 4 Head Teachers for primary schools in the municipal council were not appraised during the financial year 2016/2017 as the appraisal reports were not availed</p>

Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection

6	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• 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</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circulars received from DES and Gender Advisor Show that School feeding and nutrition guidelines, Teacher support supervision, Gender in education sector policy guidelines, School inspection guidelines, were sent out to districts • Some circulars not received from ministry according to the inventory of Circulars provided and evidence of only two circulars sent out to schools on attendance of teachers dated 10/10/17 and on examinations
		<p>• Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level, including on school feeding: score 2</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No minutes provided on meeting between department head education and head teachers

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"> Evidence that all private and public primary schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59% score 1 o Below 50% score 0. 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inspection report for QTR 1 2016/17 reviewed and shows only 12 schools were inspected out of which 4 public schools inspected and report submitted on 15/10/16 Inspection report QTR 2 report submitted on 15/01/2017 reviewed and shows 9 schools(2 public) inspected Inspection report QTR 3 submitted on 15/01/17 reviewed and shows 14 schools(4 public) inspected both public and private out of the 19 in the municipality Inspection report QTR 4 report submitted on 15/01/2017 reviewed and shows 11 Schools(3 public) inspected <p>Total schools in Municipality both private and Public are 19 and average schools inspected were 11.5 presenting a score of 60.5%</p>
8	<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 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 	0 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No minutes availed to show discussion of inspection reports between SIS and Head teachers Acknowledgement note form 4 from DES dated 18/09/2017 shows submission of school inspection reports for 4 QTRs from Kisoro Municipality for FY 2016/17 DES List of submission of inspection reports by DLGs and Municipalities shows that Kisoro Municipal council submitted all the inspection reports for FY 2016/17

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No minutes of departmental meetings Sampled schools visited namely Gisoro, Kisoro Hill, Kisoro TTC Demonstration and Sesame Integrated primary schools found no evidence in SMC minutes/ no Meeting minutes of follow up of inspection issues
9	<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of schools displayed at Notice board and also availed by Senior Inspector of school shows 15 private schools and 4 public schools within the municipality EMIS forms obtained from MoES shows Kisoro Municipal council has a total of 12 Schools(4 Public and 8 private)
		<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5 </p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of schools and enrollment of pupils provided by the SIS shows total enrollment of 5079(2515 male and 2564 female) pupils and UPE is 2560(male 1284, female 1276) EMIS forms obtained from MoES indicates total enrolment as 4125
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				

10

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

2

• Based on the Council minutes, Education sector committee minutes & Quarterly performance reports availed and reviewed for Q1-dated 15/10/2016; Q2- dated 15/01/2016; Q3- dated 15/01/2017; Q4- dated 15/07/2017 it is evident that the Education sector committee met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports during the previous FY.

• Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2

2

Council minutes reviewed indicated Education sector issues were presented under the Category of Social Services.

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of SMCs and their composition show that all public schools in the municipality have SMCs established • SMC minutes of Gisoro Primary School dated 14Th September 2016 show discussions on Resource issues under min 17/2016, also minutes of 23/08/2017, also minutes of 3/05/17 • SMC Minutes of Kisoro Hill primary school dated 21/07/2017 show discussions of budget issues and meeting held • Seseme Primary School SMC minutes dated 20/10/17, 12/4/17, 20/7/2016, 12/4/2016 show discussions on resource issues among others • SMC minutes of Kisoro Demonstration Priamry School dated 04/10/16, 30/05/17, 17/01/17, 14/06/16 were reviewed and shows discussion of resource issues under Min 76/SMC/2016(04/10/2016), Also under Min XXII/SMC/2017 (30/05/2017) shows discussion of budget and resource issues
12	<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No display of schools and allocations of non-wage recurrent grant seen on the municipality Notice board at time of assessment

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

13	<p>The LG Education department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Work plan reviewed and procurement requests and details included • Page 40 of Performance contract shows procurement requests for Education department incorporated • Procurement plan for FY 2017/18 submitted and received by Head of procurement by 10/10/2017 past the April 30 deadline
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"> • Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	3	<p>Based on a sample of 5 contracts handled during FY 2016/2017 the Education Department recommended suppliers/contractors for payment within an average of 2 days from the date of receipt of the request.</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"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on 02/08/2017 and it is integrated into the LG annual performance report. However, the Planner decried the challenge of late submission from the Education department.

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"> • 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 	0	<p>During FY 2016/2017 the Education Department had one audit query which was partially resolved by the time of the assessment.</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"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc...: Score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No minutes provided by Department head (Senior Inspector of Schools) of any meeting with head teachers to show consultations with gender focal person and dissemination of gender guidelines on how to handle hygiene and reproductive health.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No minutes provided by Department head (Senior Inspector of Schools) of meetings wherein to review and demonstrate dissemination of sanitation guidelines and demonstration of awareness raising on how to manage sanitation among boys and girls.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of SMCs and their composition shows that the gender requirements as provided for under schedule 2 of the Education ACT 2008 have been met

18	<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 3: 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circulars seen on exam management, Teacher absenteeism but none on environmental management • No minutes of meeting between Teachers and SIS • Inspection reports of four sampled schools in all four QTRs shows no dissemination of guidelines on environmental management
----	--	---	---	---



LGPA 2017/18

Health Performance Measures

Kisoro Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 782)

Score 42/100 (42%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human resource planning and management				
1	<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY • More than 80% filled: score 6 • 60 – 80% - score 3 • Less than 60% filled: score 0</p>	6	<p>The municipality has only one health centre; Zindiro HCII with 5 health care workers. All positions at the facility are filled.</p>
2	<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 4</p>	4	<p>There are no vacant positions for facility health workers thus there was no recruitment plan for the primary health care workers for this FY17/18.</p>
3	<p>The LG Health department has ensured that performance appraisal for health facility in charge is conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the health facility in-charge have been appraised during the previous FY: o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<p>From the personnel files reviewed that is CR/KMC/04, this assessment established that the in charge for the only Health Centre II in the municipal council was not appraised during financial year 2016/2017 as the appraisal reports were not availed for verification</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"> • 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 	4	<p>All the 5 health workers were deployed at Zindiro HCII. However 4 are actually working while one is on study leave. All the 4 Health care workers were present at the time we visited the facility and had signed their presence in the attendance book. The in-charge also confirmed the study leave of one of the workers.</p>
---	--	--	---	---

Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision

5	<p>The DHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 	0	<p>The municipality has not received guidelines from the Ministry of Health and as such has not communicated any guidelines to its health facility. There is a communication gap between the Municipality and District Health Office which needs to be strengthened. The Medical officer at the Municipality is not informed of the communications and health activities from Ministry of Health and Partners that are usually conveyed through the district health office. By the time he is aware, some of the activities have already taken place. In addition, because his facility is a HCII, not much support is received from partners.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	0	<p>No guidelines have been received and as such no disseminations have taken place</p>

6	<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3</p>	0	<p>There are no HCIVs and Hospitals in the municipality. It only has Zindiro HCII</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>In the last FY16/17, there was no evidence of 4 support supervisions done at Zindiro HCII. There were no supervision reports available. Even at the facility, there was no evidence of support supervision done from the supervision book. This was attributed to lack of funds for support supervision during the transition period from Town council to Municipality during FY16/17</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>	0	<p>No supervision was done during the transition period of FY16/17 since no funds were available for supervision and the municipality didn't have adequate staff to carry out the support supervision. The Principal Medical Officer came into office in July 2017 and there was no one during the transition to do supervisions before he came into office.</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>	0	<p>No reports were discussed since no supervisions were done in the last FY16/17</p>
		<p>• Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</p>	0	<p>Since no reports were discussed as a result of no supervisions done in the last FY16/17, no recommendations were followed up for action</p>

9	<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for health facility lists as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10 	10	<p>The municipality has one health facility which reports in the MoH DHIS2 system. The health facility submits monthly and quarterly HMIS reports. Available were the monthly HMIS reports 105a that were submitted through the district biostatistician and copies were retained by the Principal medical officer. In OBT, Zindiro HCII was also listed to receive PHC non-wage funds for this FY17/18</p>
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				
10	<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council minutes of 27/02/2017; 10/03/2017; 12/04/2017; 04/05/2017 & Health sub-Sector minutes and sector reports available on file provide evidence that Council committee met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council minutes dated 27/02/2017; 10/03/2017; 12/04/2017; 04/05/2017 for the sector were reviewed and Health issues such as budget, monitoring reports; supervision reports, implementation & work plans, refugee influx were presented under Social Services sector based on the recommendations derived from the health sector implementation plan that was also availed for review.
11	<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 5 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5 If 80-99% : score 3 If 70-79%: : score 1 If less than 70%: score 0 	0	<p>There was no copy of HUMC file available at the Municipality and on verification from the facility, although there is a HUMC committee, meetings were not held in the last FY16/17 due to lack of funds during the transition period</p>

12	<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	0	<p>No evidence on the notice of PHC Non-wage grant for Zindiro HCII</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"> 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 <p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	2	<p>Yes, there was evidence that the health department submitted the procurement request as part of the annual work plan on 13th April 2017 to the procurement department</p> <p>Procurement request for Q1 was received on 15th August 2017 at the procurement department</p>
14	<p>The LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% - score 8 70-99% – score 4 Below 70% - score 0 	0	<p>The health facility is not on the NMS list of receiving drugs. As a HCII, it is required to receive the Kit for HCII. The municipal medical officer is following up upgrade of the facility to a HCIII and inclusion on the NMS list with the DHO who is required to write to MoH. In the last FY16/17 the facility was borrowing from other health centres, however, they were cautioned not to borrow drugs from other HCs since PHC funds were allocated for medicines. Currently there is direct procurement of drugs from Joint Medical stores using PHC funds.</p>

15	<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 2 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points 	2	<p>Based on the FY 2016/2017 transactions sampled by this assessment, the Health Department recommended suppliers/contractors for payment within an average of 1 day from the date of receipt of the request. Therefore, there was timely recommendation of suppliers for payment.</p>
----	--	--	---	--

Assessment area: Financial management and reporting

16	<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report was submitted by the department on 9th July 2017 for consolidation into the Quarter 4 LG Annual Performance report by the Department of Health based on the information obtained from the Planning Unit.
----	---	---	---	---

17	<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year • If sector has no audit query score 4 • If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If all queries are not responded to score 0 	2	<p>The Health Department had one audit query which was resolved by the time of this assessment.</p>
----	---	--	---	---

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

18	Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2 	2	At the facility, the HUMC file indicated that the committee has 2 females out of the 6 members on the committee which represents a third of the members to be female.
	Maximum 4 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2 	0	The in-charge indicated that they have not received any guidelines from the Municipality
19	The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LGs has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal : score 2 points. 	0	The in-charge indicated that they have not received any guidelines on medical waste management from the Municipality and neither were job aids on segregation of wastes visible on the walls
	Maximum 2 points			