



LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Kotido District

(Vote Code: 528)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	2	33%
No	4	67%

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	Not Compliant – Kotido District’s APC 2017/18 was submitted late to MoFPED (see Receipt dated 6th/10/2017 and Receipt No: 4091), hence failed to meet the required deadline of submission before the 30th/6/2017.	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	Not Compliant - No documented evidence (signed and stamped) seen for proof that the draft Kotido LG Budget/ APC 2017/18 was submitted to MoFPED with a Procurement Plan as per the copy on file submitted on the 10th July 2017. Self reports indicated that the plan was submitted latter, a possible lopsided or transliterate misinterpretation of the requirement, namely for <i>the APC to be accompanied by the plan (i.e. misconstrued easily to mean the APC followed by the plan not going in at the same time)</i> . NB: No justification was made to explain the discrepancy. However, the reported interdiction of the District Planner on account of indiscipline could have presented gaps linked to such anomalies, etc.	No
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	Not Compliant – All 4 quarterly reports for the FY 2016/17 were duly submitted but Q4 submitted late (i.e. Q1 - 9th/11/2016 Receipt No: 0026; Q2 – 24th/2/2017 Receipt No: 0409; Q3 – 23rd/5/2017 Receipt No: 0748; and Q4 - 15th/8/2017 Receipt No: 4555).	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>Not Compliant - All 4 quarterly reports for the FY 2016/17 were duly submitted but Q4 submitted late (i.e. Q1 - 9th/11/2016 Receipt No: 0026; Q2 – 24th/2/2017 Receipt No: 0409; Q3 – 23rd/5/2017 Receipt No: 0748; and Q4 - 15th/8/2017 Receipt No: 4555).</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>xxxxx</p>	<p>The LG provided information on the responses to issues raised in the Auditor General's findings for the previous year 2015/16.</p> <p>The responses were dated 2nd /3/2017 and submitted on 14th /3/2017 which was within the required date of submission (deadline 30th/4/2017).</p> <p>The issues raised were 10 and they responded to all as evidenced in their submission report.</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 LG scored an unqualified audit opinion as per the annual report of the auditor General FY 2016/17.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Kotido District

(Vote Code: 528)

Score 58/100 (58%)

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. <p>• All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2.</p>	0	<p>The Physical Planning Committee (PPC) for Kotido was formed, being appointed by CAO on the 28th/07/2016 and inducted 19th/08/2016. The PPC was functional at the time of the assessment (as at 19th/1/2018). There were no minutes that proved that it sat on the 14th/07/2017, 14th/12/2017 and on the 28th/12/2017. Even so, the PPC's sittings did not always help consider new investments (e.g. considering land title applications from developers and MoLHUD circular on land title processing within a 28 day timeframe, etc) but often deliberated on other peripheral matters (e.g. the model sub-county to use to pilot operations of sub-county PPCs, etc).</p> <p>At the time of the assessment (19th/01/2018) there was no documented evidence (minutes) available for proof of any approvals of plans consistent with the Physical Plan. This was attributed to low levels of appreciation of the need to support such activities. This sets a bad precedent and creates potential for risks especially with the introduction of new Town Councils in FY 2017/18 in Kotido (i.e. Lokitalaebu and Kacheri Town Councils). However, according to official records got from MoLHUD, (Status of Physical Planning in Uganda 2017, the MoLHUD Physical Planning Department (2015) considered Kotido (then with Kotido Town Council) to have available a valid Structural Plan, 2008-2018 but with an expired (hence not valid) Detailed Plan, 2008-2013 (see Page 5). At the time of the assessment Kotido Town Council had been upgraded to Kotido Municipality but the records indicated need for revision of both the structural and detailed plans.</p>

2	<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2. 	2	<p>There is some evidence of one-on-one correspondence or matching of district priorities for intervention in district official documents. For example, page 32 of the AWP FY 2017/18 demonstrates plans to procure tents and seats in support of districts official functions. This quest was based on outcomes of the budget conference and traceable to the contents of the Budget Conference Report (BCR)/BFP 2017/18 (page 8). All this was drawn from DDP 2015/16-2019/20 (page 113).</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<p>Documented evidence offers some proof that the capital investments in the approved AWP 2017/18 are derived from 5-year District Development Plan (DDP) 2015/16-2019/20. For example, the construction of the new council block appears on page 39 of the approved AWP 2017/18 is drawn from page 10 of what is in the BCR/BFP as well as linked to what is on page 114 of the DDP 2015/15-2019/20.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 1. 	0	<p>There was no TPC minute seen discussing the DDP 2015/16-2019/20. The LGPA (2018) confirmed that several TPC Minutes offered no documented proof that TPC meetings sit to discuss the developed project profiles with the specificity this requirement suggests. The TPC's deliberations on the 22nd/06/2017, 14th/02/2017, 10th/11/2016 and 3rd/01/2017 appeared to focus more on the more generic aspects of LG functioning e.g. on problems (e.g. HR resource gaps), on programmes (YLP, UWEP, PAF and NUSAF), on guidelines (e.g. DDEG circulars and requirements, harmonization of the DDP, etc.) as well as LG reports (e.g. departmental or sector reports) than on the specific aspects with respect to the merits and demerits of supporting different projects meant to benefit the LG as well as relevant statistics to inform the TPC's decision making processes, etc.). Indeed, for the FY2016/17, NPA's (2017) Certificated of Compliance with Planning Guidelines awarded Kotido a score of 25% on the robustness of the planning process and an average score of 20.9% when all planning aspects were considered (see page 82).</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"> 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	<p>There was no evidence of the existence of Kotido district statistical abstracts that captured some gender-related data. This partly explains why the TPC minutes demonstrated no documented evidence of use of such statistical data. Again, this speaks to proof of absence of effective evidence utilisation to inform decision making at the district level.</p>
4	<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2 	2	<p>As seen at the district and MoFPED online/website, all investment projects implemented in the FY 2016/17 were drawn from APC FY 2016/17 and approved by the district council meeting (of 29th/4/2016 – minute number 27/COU/04/2016). Indeed, according to documented evidence drawn from the APC/Budget 2016/17, all projects implemented in the FY 2016/17 were drawn from AWP 2016/17.</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 	0	<p>Due to delayed procurement and contractors being unable or unwilling to pre-finance major works, only some investment projects (64%) implemented in the FY 2016/17 were completed as per AWP by end of the FY 2016/17 as seen in the Q4 Consolidated Report FY 2016/17.</p>
5	<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects and assets during the previous FY</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	2	<p>All projects in FY 2016/17 were completed within approved budget with only minor exceptions of those that were not completed (see pages 134 of the Q4 Consolidated Report FY 2016/17 where only 11 out of 16 Borehole constructions were completed). Again page 135 shows that the cattle dip was not completed.</p>
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	0	<p>The district made no direct attempts to budget for O&M more systematically. The practice in use is ad hoc O&M (i.e. O&M as and when such needs arise). The prevailing attitudes and practices disfavourable best-practice O&M management (i.e. O&M planning, O&M budgeting, O&M monitoring, O&M coordination, etc).</p>
<p>Assessment area: Human Resource Management</p>				

LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.

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

2

All HoDs (5) existing in FY 2016/17 were appraised by the CAO as evidenced by dully signed Performance Contracts and Performance Reports contained in their Personnel files. They were appraised on key areas including:

- Key targets/outputs
- Finance and Human Resource management
- Crosscutting initiatives and innovations
- Areas of improvement and Action Plans were drawn

The dates of appraisal and dates for signing performance contracts for the respective staff are indicated below:

1. Chief Fin. Officer: Appraised on 29/6/17, performance report on file and and performnce contract signed on 6/7/16.
2. Natural Resc. Officer: Appraised on 28/6/17, performance report on file and performance contract signed on 11/7/16
3. District Prodn.Officer: Appraised on 30/6/17, performance report and performance contract signed 30/6/16
4. Comm.Devpt. Officer: Appraised on 3/7/17 , performance report on file and performance contract signed on 4/7/16
5. Principal Asst.Sec: Appraised on 7/7/17, performance report on file and performance contract signed on 4/7/16

The current District Planner, Health Officer, and Engineer were recruited in FY 2017/18.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3 	0	<p>4 out of the 9 established positions in the district were filled substantively by the time of the assessment. The positions of the CAO and Deputy CAO were filled centrally while the rest were filled by the district. Six (6) positions are held by staff in acting positions while 1 position of the district LED officer is still vacant. The recruitment status is as shown below:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Substantive</u></th> <th><u>File Ref. No</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>• Chief Finance Officer:</td> <td>CR/D/10146</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Natural Resources Officer:</td> <td>CR/D/11328</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• District Health Officer:</td> <td>CR/D/11344</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><u>Acting</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Dist. Educ. Officer:</td> <td>CR/D/10244</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• District Engineer:</td> <td>CR/D/11350</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• District Prodn. Officer:</td> <td>CR/D/10396</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Comm.Dev.Officer:</td> <td>CR/D/10829</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• District Planner:</td> <td>CR/D/11113</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• District LED Officer:</td> <td>Vacant</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Substantive</u>	<u>File Ref. No</u>	• Chief Finance Officer:	CR/D/10146	• Natural Resources Officer:	CR/D/11328	• District Health Officer:	CR/D/11344	<u>Acting</u>		• Dist. Educ. Officer:	CR/D/10244	• District Engineer:	CR/D/11350	• District Prodn. Officer:	CR/D/10396	• Comm.Dev.Officer:	CR/D/10829	• District Planner:	CR/D/11113	• District LED Officer:	Vacant
<u>Substantive</u>	<u>File Ref. No</u>																									
• Chief Finance Officer:	CR/D/10146																									
• Natural Resources Officer:	CR/D/11328																									
• District Health Officer:	CR/D/11344																									
<u>Acting</u>																										
• Dist. Educ. Officer:	CR/D/10244																									
• District Engineer:	CR/D/11350																									
• District Prodn. Officer:	CR/D/10396																									
• Comm.Dev.Officer:	CR/D/10829																									
• District Planner:	CR/D/11113																									
• District LED Officer:	Vacant																									
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>DSC considered 10 submissions (100%) made by CAO for the FY 2016/17. Following the request by CAO to MoPs for the recruitment for 91 positions (ref:CR/156/1 dated 4/42016 and the subsequent response from MoPs dated 4/12/2016 ref: 6/293/05 that approved only 10 positions, CAO submitted individual declarations for the 10 positions to DSC dated 8/11/16 Ref. CR/214/11</p> <p>DSC met from the 24th to 26th April 2017 and considered the submissions. Following the recruitment process, 7 out of the 10 positions were filled as 3 positions did not attract suitable candidates as evidenced by minute extract no. 18/DSC/KTD/2017</p>																						

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	1	The DSC considered all (100%) of the submissions made by CAO for the confirmation of staff. Five (5) staff were who were already in service but on probation were confirmed, while 2 were maintained on probation as per DSC minute extract no. 1/05/2017.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	1	No disciplinary cases were submitted to the DSC for action during FY 2016/17 as there were no cases that required DSC action. However, there were 5 cases forwarded to the Rewards and Sanctions committee and they were resolved.
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>All the 7 staff (100%) recruited in FY 2016/17 (June) accessed the salary pay roll not later than two months after appointment as evidenced by the August pay roll payment voucher dated 22/08/17 dully signed by the CAO and the CFO on the 22/08/17. The staff pay roll identification numbers of the staff in point are indicated below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 100638 866261 1006400 852933 1005841 145753 1006384
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2 	0	No staff accessed the pension pay roll not later than two months after retirement. Only 1 staff retired during FY 2016/17 on the 15/11/15 file ref.no. UTS/0/2311. He accessed the pension payroll in December 2017 as evidenced by the December 2017 pension pay roll signed by CAO and CFO (available in HROs Office).

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. 	0	<p>There was a decline in OSR from Ugx: 236,786,000 in FY 2015/16 to Ugx: 97,165,324 in FY 2016/17. The decline was attributed to creation of Kotido MC in 2016/17 where most of the markets like Kanawati and panyangara were taken by the MC, some staff from the district are now attached to the MC so their local service tax goes to the MC and most of the property which pay property rates are in the MC leaving the District with a low revenue base. There was a decline of about 59% in own source revenue collection in 2016/17. (Source Financial statements for 2015/16 and 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"> • 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>The local revenue collection ratio against the planned for the previous FY is unrealistic. The District budget for FY 2016/17 was 175,596,000 Ugx and the actual Local revenue collected in FY 2016/17 was 97,165,324 Ugx giving a difference/ variance of Ugx 78,430,676(unrealized). The variance was equal to 45%. (source of information was the budget FY 2016/17 and final accounts 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"> • Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	2	<p>The District remitted to Kotido MC money collected from local service tax worth Ugx: 11,288,829, payment voucher number PV-AD00110, dated 27/6/2017(also reflected in statement of account Bank of Uganda on 28/6/2017). Also the lower local governments remitted the 35% to the District. Evidence of Kotido sub county paid 3,000,000 shillings cheque dated 28/11/2017 and Kacheri sub county paid Ugx: 857,325 payment slip dated 6/6/2017 and acknowledgement of receipt dated 6/7/2017, receipt number RECT-00405, Nakapelimoru sub county Paid 1,342,822 shillings cheque 5550 and Panyangara S/C paid 316,540 shillings cheque 5753. All this information can be viewed from Kotido District General Fund account.</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>The LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities. According to the information extracted from a file for general fund account, where local revenue spent on council activities is recorded, it indicated that 10,730,000 shillings (5%) of OSR was spent on council activities. The chief finance officer explained that they use unconditional grant for most council sittings.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

12	<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2 	2	<p>Kotido LG has the position of Senior Procurement Officer(vide letter; Posting instruction for Ojuk Denis dated 4th May 2017 signed by Sarah Narem for CAO and Procurement officer(vide letter of confirmation for Awidi Lilian Noel dated 18th April 2011 signed and stamped by Ag CAO (Okello Peter)</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 	0	<p>Submitted reports to contracts committee by TEC could not be established at the time of assessment for previous FY 16/17 However they were at the Auditor Generals office in Kampala</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	0	<p>There was no available information whether the contracts committee considered recommendations of the TEC at the time of assessment.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The procurement and disposal plan for FY 17/18 is available and covers all infrastructural projects signed by procurement officer and CAO but not endorsed and signed by LCV Chairman. • The LG made procurements in FY 16/17 as per procurement plan. Some procurement includes; construction of council Hall phase 1, Renovation of administration block at district. Drilling and installation of 12 deep boreholes, construction of 2 classroom blocks at Lorenyo primary school with furniture.
14	<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG in the current FY 17/18 prepared 70% of bid documents and reached at Prequalification stage(notice of best evaluated bidders displayed on Nov 10th 2017 signed and stamped by senior procurement officer and CAO. There was delay in the bidding process by the LG.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contracts register was viewed by the time of assessment(red book in colour). the contracts register shows contract start date, procurement ref number,,subject of procurement,contractor,amount budgeted as per PLO,Contract sum,amount paid,outstanding balance,contract end dates and remarks. <p>However it was noted that the contracts register was not updated to include FY 17/18 Procurement activities</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG adhered to procurement thresholds in the previous FY through open bidding, selective bidding and micro procurements. PPDA guidelines for 2008 works and supplies are followed.eg renovation of administration block at district HQ(103,838,000/-),Supply of office ordinary stationary as per LPO for framework contracts.

15	<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No projects for FY 16/17 were certified and completion certificates issued this is because the projects delayed to commence and were pushed to the current FY 17/18
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visited Project(s) were not labelled for Current FY 17/18, only project under Uganda Road Fund(URF) had project name: recurrent maintenance of Lopworokocha Rikitae Napumpum road 14.36km, Project source of funding, executing agency were all viewed on siteboards for force account

Assessment area: Financial management

16	<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4 	4	<p>Kotido District is on IFMS and the bank reconciliation for the District is updated and the last update was done on Thursday January 11, 2018 by Godfrey Lekam and approved by Akello Hilda (Chief finance officer). Hard copies are in file entitled bank reconciliation statement FY 2016/17.</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>Information was got from samples of payment vouchers attached together with requests and contracts. E.g. request from Muryagaz for funds for fuel dated 3/4/2017 was paid on payment voucher number PV-AD00053 dated 30/5/2017 and request from Fash enterprises dated 29/3/2017 for fuel supplied to statutory bodies and payment was made on 6/6/2017. This evidence indicates that some payments of suppliers were not timely. The form Ex 17 contracts/ commitment register had a list of contractors/suppliers with their overdue bills.</p>

18

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.

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

0

According to the structure “Approved and adopted staff structure for Kotido District”, reference number ARC/135/306/07, dated 30/8/2017 and signed by PS, the District is supposed to have a District internal auditor and internal auditor but not a substantive senior internal auditor and they are both in place. The District internal auditor produced all quarterly internal audit reports. Copies of quarterly audit reports were available. First quarter submitted to Principal Auditor soroti on 24/11/2016. second quarter on 21/4/2017, third quarter to office of Auditor General on 3/7/2017 and fourth quarter to principal Auditor soroti on 8/9/2017.

- 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.

2

The quarterly internal audit reports (page 2) show the implementation status of internal audit findings for the previous financial year. What remains not handled in one quarter is handled in the next quarter. evidence to show provision of information to council can be viewed in the small delivery book where officials sign to acknowledge receipt of document. submissions in the delivery book from 15/11/2016 to 14/8//2017 is evidence of delivery of first quarter to fourth quarter internal audit reports to to different officials and heads of department in Kotido DLG.

- 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

There is evidence that the internal audit reports for previous FY were submitted LG Accounting officer and LGPAC in the small internal audit delivery book for Kotido DLG (from 15/11/2016-14/8/2017) where Chairperson, RDC, CAO, CFO and others sign to acknowledge receipt of the audit reports. LGPAC reviewed the Internal audit reports and followed up. Evidence was got from internal audit reports 2016/17, also minutes of the LGPAC held on 18th -21st April 2017, number 5 on the agenda (MIN.05/DPAC/4/2017) confirm examination of the district internal audit report for first quarter FY 2016/17. All the four quarterly audit reports were reviewed and review minutes were available,dated 1st-2nd August, 2017 and 5th-6th October 2017.

19	<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	4	<p>The Asset register was viewed from the computer since it was uploaded on the IFMS and it is updated automatically once information is fed in. It has details of the general format, land and buildings and motor vehicles and heavy plants as per format in the local governments finance and accounting manual 2007.</p>
20	<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> unqualified audit opinion: score 4 Qualified: score 2 Adverse/disclaimer: score 0 	4	<p>According to the Annual report of Auditor general 2016/2017, Kotido LG obtained 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>There was documented evidence in the District Council Minutes of the 25th/5/2016, 2nd/9/2016, 30th/9/2016, 28th/11/2016 and 31st/1/2017 that it met as per requirements to deliberate on issues indirectly relevant to service-delivery (e.g. council structuring, committee and departmental reports, supplementary budgets/plans, leaders reports (CAO, RDC and LCV Chairperson and others (e.g. HIV/AIDS Task Force, Land Board, etc)). However, what appeared to be missing in councils discussions in the FY 2016/17 were deliberations on TPC reports, monitoring reports and performance assessment reports. Evidence for these is rather indirect and altogether sketchy (e.g. page 16 of council minutes 20th/11/2016 offer some proof of Chairperson's report on trachoma vaccination going well (and from this it easy to glean elements of evidence for monitoring and performance assessment albeit all not fully robust or systematic as they are based more on gut feeling and cherry picking of what to cover).</p>
----	---	--	---	--

22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2. 	0	<p>No documented evidence - only sketchy evidence exists to confirm state that the CAO (through the sub-county chiefs) is a designated official meant to coordinate lower-level feedback on and responses to (grievances /complaints) to council. Even so, there were potential overlaps and role conflicts between the CAO and the offices of the LC V Chairperson as well as the RDC that play similar roles e.g. when it comes to promoting Barazas. For example, page 22 of Council Minute 28th/11/2016 reports that an LG councilor informed council that Rengen sub-county suffered non-implementation of council activities, hence urging CAO and the LC V Chairperson to cause a baraza to mitigate the challenge. There is need for division of roles on this was neither made clear nor evident formally.</p>
23	<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2 	0	<p>No evidence seen of posting/publishing of payroll and pension schedule on LG notice boards. Anecdotes have it that staff preferred privacy concerning matters related to the emoluments.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1 	1	<p>Evidence seen of posting/publishing of the procurement plan and awards of contracts and amounts LGs notice boards (e.g. on the main block where CAO's office is).</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	<p>Not Applicable (N/A) – There was no LGPA in the FY under review.</p>

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	Radio programmes relied on mostly to promulgate government circulars, guidelines, policies and standards. Evidence was availed of Radio Talk Shows on FM 92.7 (Voice of Karamoja) on the 15th/12/2017 (covering land registration) and the 22nd/9/2017 (covering District Land Board) with the active participation of the Chairperson of the DLB and the Senior Land Management Officer.
	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. 	0	No documented evidence for proof to confirm the practice of downward accountability through barazaas, etc,

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG Gender focal person provided guidance to sector departments for previous FY 16/17 ie, newly elected councillors oriented on gender equity and budgeting in a letter dated to CAO through CDO requesting for 1,750,000 shs to facilitate workshop held on 2nd may 2017 at District Production Office(in attendance were 17 members(8 women),support to women's day held at Kotido Resort Hotel, orientation of GBV stakeholders on the National Database(NGBVD) at district level, Training of duty bearers' and political leaders on GBV, council members, health workers and district officials. • Reports on training community based cultural institutions to address early child marriages in district were also viewed.
----	---	--	---	--

		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are planned activities for FY 17/18 eg Newly elected councillors staff mentored on gender equity and budgeting, staff mentored on gender mainstreaming, stakeholders oriented on GBV relevant laws and policies, quarterly supervision and monitoring of GBV service points .planned budget is 3,500,000shs from LG and 18,000,000/- from donors. GBV domestic violence Act ,women action plans, guidelines support of UWEP. 3.5 M shs and 19m shs from Donors(UNFPA)were utilised from previous budget as indicated by activities.
26	<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was evidence of Environmental and social screening forms viewed, mitigation measures addressed for projects, ESMP plans viewed. Projects include; construction of office block at Panyagara Sub county dated 22/06/17 ,construction of perimeter wall at works offices on 21/06/17,construction of boys dormitory at Naroreto primary school, renovation of administration block at district HQ, All the above projects were screened and signed by the environment officer
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was evidence of environmental aspects integrated in bid document showing removal of rubbish budgeted for the renovation of administration block at district HQ.
		<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 	1	<p>The LG had proof of land ownership and land agreements signed by communities and LC officials for consent forms for voluntary land contribution.eg communal crush at Naponga parish, Cattle crush at Lokiding parish, establishment of Dam at Kapus at Lokitelabu parish under Resilient project., project quarantine control site at Lokadeli, Rengan sub county</p>

		<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	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The LG had complete environmental and social mitigation certification forms for projects which include; construction of office block at Rengen sub county, construction of 4 stance pit latrine at Rengen Sub County, staff house at Kacheri sub county, construction of twin staff house at Panyangara health canter II. All these projects were signed and stamped by the District environment officer
--	--	---	---	--



LGPA 2017/18

Educational Performance Measures

Kotido District

(Vote Code: 528)

Score 68/100 (68%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				
1	<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4 	4	<p>Kotido had budgeted for one Head Teacher and a minimum of 7 teacher per school for 2017/18as verified from 2017/18 Budget framework paper</p> <p>There was no evidence to show that Kotido LG has deployed a Head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school</p>
2	<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision o If 100% score 6 o If 80 - 99% score 3 o If below 80% score 0 	3	<p>The wage bill provision for Kotido DLG is for 150 teachers. The DEO is yet to recruit the 20 vacant posts as evidenced by the advertisement of 25th December by the secretary District Service Committee (DSC). This means only 87% of the posts are filled.</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>	<p>• 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</p>	6	<p>Kotido has substantively filled positions for the 2 inspectors required in the approved staff structure as evidenced by the appraisal reports signed by the DEO on 30/06/16</p>
4	<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of Primary Teachers: score 2</p>	2	<p>• Kotido LG is yet to recruit Primary school Teachers for the 20 vacant posts as evidenced by the advertisement of 25/12/17 by the Secretary District Service Committee (DSC)</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>Kotido has substantively filled positions for the 2 inspectors required in the approved staff structure as evidenced by the appraisal reports signed by the DEO on 30/06/16</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	<p>The DEO appraised the 2 inspectors of schools that were in service during FY 2016/17. Personal files for the two inspectors (indicated below) contain performance plans and completed performance appraisal reports (PS form 5)</p> <p>1. District Inspector of Schools: CR/D/10778- Appraised on 20/6/17. Performance Plan and report dated 30/06/16 dully signed by DEO.</p> <p>2. Inspector of Schools: Appraised on 5/07/17. Performance Plan and appraisal report dated 30/06/17 on file dully signed by DEO.</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>	3	<p>14 Head Teachers (for the 14 public schools existing in the district) were all appraised (for calendar year 2016) by their respective sub county chiefs witnessed by the chairmen board of governors. Performance Assessment Plans and Reports are available on their respective personnel files. A sample of 4 files as indicated below confirmed this status:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CR/D/10733 -appraised on 31/12/16 2. CR/D/107/56-appraised on 15/2/17 3. CR/D/10574- appraised on 28/12/17 4. CR/D/11182- appraised on 28/02/17
--	--	--	---	--

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>	1	<p>Kotido DLG Education department communicated several guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in 2017 to schools. Verified evidence from the following communications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept note and program from the MOES to the CAO on 10/08/17 regarding the policy convention • Invitation of H/T of secondary schools to attend the on 2/09/17 by the Senior Inspector to attend a follow up of the convention workshop • Letter of invitation to the DEOs fora in April 2017 in Jinja • Invitation letter from the DEO to the H/Teachers in May 2017 • Report of the Senior /Teachers on their roles conducted by the DEO on 06/07/17 at Kacheri Rengen, Panyangar , Nakaripet sub-counties and Kotido Municipality. • August 2017 school feeding program communicated by the letter from HE the President of the Republic of Uganda of 15th May 2017
---	--	---	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level, including on school feeding: score 2 	2	<p>Kotido DEO held a meeting in 2017 with primary school head teachers to discuss national guidelines and policies.</p> <p>Verified evidence by the letter of invitation to the workshop for the dissemination of national level education policies for all Head teachers in the District dated 15th January 2017, signed by the Kotido CAO.</p>
7	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all private and public primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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"> 100% - score 12 90 to 99% - score 10 80 to 89% - score 8 70 to 79% - score 6 60 to 69% - score 3 50 to 59% - score 1 Below 50% - score 0. 	12	<p>100 % of P/S inspected every term/. Verified the evidence from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary report of 14/11/17 for Kotido Primary Schools inspection to the CAO by the Senior Inspector of Schools 3rd term opening report to the CAO dated 24/09/17
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 	4	<p>Verified the evidence from the following reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring of teachers' presence in schools during the 3rd term of 2017 signed by the SMC chairman of Nakeretu Primary School on 10/11/17. Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) implementation in Kotido District signed by the ACAO on 12/01/18. <p>Kotido is among the 10 pilot Districts submitting online inspection reports to MOES during the 2nd and 3rd term so was only able to see soft copies on the computer.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4 	4	<p>Verified evidence from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The warning letters signed by the CAO on 27/12/17 to the following teachers for continued misbehaviour even after initial warning by the individual SMCs <p>? Nalyawo Grace Amooti of Lokitelaebu Primary School</p> <p>? Ottim mDavid Seddan Lopuyo Primstry School</p> <p>? Oyang Walter Bellboy Lokekeraitu Primary School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report on teachers allocation of time and task of term 3 2017 signed the CAO on 27/12//17 to the Commissioner of pre pre-primary and primary Education MOES
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	<p>The list of Government aided schools' data submitted by the DEO is not consistent as evidenced from data obtained from the two sources of Kotido Local Government Budget Framework Paper (LGBFP) and EMIS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EMIS 26 LGBFP 21
		<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5</p>	0	<p>The P/ Schools' enrolment data for 2017/18 is not consistent as evidenced from the P/S enrolment data obtained from the two sources of LGBFPand EMIS</p> <p>EMIS 9784 pupils</p> <p>LGBFP 7,896 pupils</p>
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>Social Services Council Committee (SSC) is responsible for education on top of other social sectors. Evidence from the SSC minutes for the FY 2016/17 confirmed that it met 4 out of the 6 mandatory times (on the 21st/24th/27th/3/2017; 16th/17th/1/2017; 21st/22nd/11/2016 and 20th/21st/9/2016). It discussed education service delivery issues including departmental quarterly, HoD and sector reports as well as specifying challenges and recommendations to council. Even so, there was no direct evidence in the minutes covering discussions of results from performance assessments, inspection and monitoring. Page 12 of minute 20th/21st /9/2016 only points to somewhat indirect education sector self-assessments of enrolment rates or results.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2 	2	<p>The available minutes of council's deliberations FY 2016/17 (25th/5/2016, 2nd/9/2016, 30th/9/2016, 28th/11/2016 and 31st/1/2017) indicated that representatives of the SSC presented education sector issues and recommendations to council that required council's approval – also see minutes of the SSC meetings on the 21st/24th/27th/3/2017; 16th/17th/1/2017; 21st/22nd/11/2016 and 20th/21st/9/2016.</p>
11	<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO) • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80% schools: score 0</p>	5	<p>Kotido Primary Schools have functional SMSs. Verified the evidence from a sample of the following approved minutes by the SMC signed by the H/T (who is the SMC secretary) of Nakeretu Primary School submitted to the DEO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the joint end of year meeting for the SMS that took place on 7/12/17 Minutes of the dialogue meeting that took place on 30/10/17 that among others discussed the issues of encouraging children to attend and stay in school

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	<p>There was nothing publicized on the DEOs nor on the CAOs notice boards regarding schools receiving UPE funds</p>
----	--	---	---	---

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

13	<p>The LG Education department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	0	<p>Did not see any procurement requests from the DEOs office even the search for them in the procurement office where DEO expected them to be was futile.</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"> • Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	3	<p>The LG education department certified and initiated payment for supplies on time . evidence viewed was;</p> <p>Request for payment for construction of a 2 classroom block at Lopuyo P/S dated 21/3/2017 and forwarded by DEO on 21/3/2017 and its payment voucher no PV-ED00030 dated 6/6/2017.</p> <p>Payment for supply of school furniture to Nakapelimoru Army SSS dated 12/6/2017 and recommended for payment by DEO on 12/6/2017 and payment voucher dated 26/6/2017, voucher number PV-ED00047.</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	<p>According to the LG Planner's records and evidence from the Q4 Consolidated APR for the FY 2016/17, while the education department submitted inputs to the planning unit for all 4 quarters for FY 2016/17 (i.e. Q1 - 9th/11/2016 Receipt No: 0026; Q2 – 24th/2/2017 Receipt No: 0409; Q3 – 23rd/5/2017 Receipt No: 0748; and Q4 - 15th/8/2017 Receipt No: 4555), the submissions were sometimes slow, hence the late submission of the Q4 APR (meant to be submitted before 31st/7/2017).</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"> 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>the sector had internal audit queries as per the quarterly internal audit reports. The quarterly Internal Audit reports 2016/17 show the implementation status of all audit findings for the previous FY. Evidence of management responses to internal audit report for first quarter FY 2016/17 dated 27th /10/2016 and for second quarter FY 2016/17 dated 13th/4/2017. Individuals respond to the internal audit queries and accountability is produced and forwarded to Chief accounting officer who forwards to District internal auditor to verify and if contented with the explanation, writes back to CAO and issue is dropped. However, evidence of accountability/ individual responses not seen at the time of 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 	2	<p>The Kotido LG disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, and reproductive health,</p> <p>Verified evidence from the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invitation letter of 11/06/12 by the DEO for senior women teachers organised by Kotido District partners who included UNICEF, Straight Talk Foundation Minutes of the Safe Space Club that was formed in August 2017 as result of safe hygiene Guidelines provided by the DEO

		<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 	2	<p>Kotido LG Education department issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls in primary schools.</p> <p>Verified the evidence from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mensuration Hygiene management (Monitoring report of 23th June 2017 by Programs Coordinator PMU/MOES) • Minutes of the meeting of 5/11/17 of the Safe Space Club a reproductive Health Club consisting of students and Teacher as Patron that was formed at Nakeretu Primary School in August 2017 as result of Mensuration Hygiene management provided by the DEO in July 2017. Among the activities sighted in the minutes that the Club had done was the production of local and reusable sanitary pads
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	1	<p>Verified evidence from the sample of Nakeretu Primary School the assessor visited during the assessment where 5/9 are women</p>
18	<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 3: 	3	<p>Verified evidence from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2017 School Environment improvement committee Work Plan for Nakeretu Primary School which included a tree planting activity that was planned to be conducted at the beginning of term 1 of 2018.



LGPA 2017/18

Health Performance Measures

Kotido District

(Vote Code: 528)

Score 70/100 (70%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human resource planning and management				
1	<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY • More than 80% filled: score 6 points, • 60 – 80% - score 3 • Less than 60% filled: score 0</p>	3	<p>The district adopted the structure approved by public service in 2015 for staffing of health facilities. At the time of the assessment, 74% of the positions were filled and an advert to recruit 2 more nurses and 2 midwives had closed on January 15, 2018 to improve staffing levels.</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>The recruitment plan for the current financial year was available duly signed by the HR and the DHO on September 30th 2017. A copy is available at the DHO's office.</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>	8	<p>There are no HC IVs in Kotido district. After the creation of Kotido municipality, Kotido Hospital was included in the municipality. Therefore there was no appropriate health facility in-charge to be appraised by the DHO.</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>Staff transfers at health facilities during the time of the assessment had been communicated (on 11/12/2017). It was not clear which staff had taken up their responsibilities at the new stations. Some staff has shifted while others were reported to still be in transition. It was not possible to accurately report on this indicator due to this challenge.</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 	3	<p>Guidelines and new policies during the previous financial year provided included <i>maternal and perinatal death surveillance guidelines, Family planning, Service standards for the health sector, M&E guidelines for HIV care 2015/2016 and 2019/2020. investment case, reproductive, child and adolescent health sharpened plan for Uganda</i>. Meetings were used as a mode of dissemination of the guidelines above with partner support.</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 	3	<p>Meetings were used as a mode of dissemination of the guidelines above with partner support. On 6/12/2017, a dissemination meeting was held for guidelines of integrated management of malaria, the period November 26-December 1, guidelines for HIV AIDs care were disseminated in a joint meeting with all health facility in charges and staff.</p>

6	<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3</p>	3	<p>This is not applicable. The district has no district hospital and records of previous support supervision activities for the municipality during 2016/17 FY were reported to be in the former office of the DHO which had been condemned for use due to major structural defects. Objective assessment of this indicator was not possible.</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>	3	<p>There are 19 health facilities in Kotido of which 16 are government and 3 are the NGO. The DHT supervised all the facilities over the previous FY according to the support supervision report of July/2017.</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>	6	<p>There is no substantive HSD in Kotido. The proposed GIYE county HSD has not been approved by council or the MOH. Supervision of lower level health facilities is done by the DHT not the HSD as indicated in the support supervision report of the DHT for July 2017.</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>Gaps identified in the support supervision exercises were presented to council in the committee meetings and discussed accordingly. Minutes of the such meeting held on 21-22/11/2016, page 6, heads of departments including the DHO presented sector reports for corrective actions to be taken where gaps were identified in the previous support supervision exercises.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 	6	<p>Follow up of suggested actions from support supervision has been done. E.g for human resources for health staff who had overstayed at facilities were recommended for transfer and this was effected on 11/12/2017. Other proposed actions are being followed up in departmental and HUMC meetings at health facilities.</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>There is consistency between reporting health facilities and the facilities included in the annual work plan. Although tow facilities reporting through the DHIS2 (Kotodo HC IV and Panyangara HCIII) were taken up by the municipality which was curved out of the district.</p>

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	2	<p>The Social Services Council Committee (SSC) is responsible for health (on top of other social sectors). Evidence from the SSC minutes for the FY 2016/17 confirmed that it met 4 out of the 6 mandatory times (on the 21st/24th/27th/3/2017; 16th/17th/1/2017; 21st/22nd/11/2016 and 20th/21st/9/2016). It discussed health service delivery issues including departmental quarterly, HoD and sector reports as well as specifying challenges and recommendations to council. Even so, there was no direct evidence in the minutes covering discussions of results from performance assessments, inspection and monitoring. Page 6 of minute /21st /22nd/11/2016 only points to somewhat indirect health sector self-assessments of challenges in the district.</p>
----	---	---	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	2	The available minutes of council's deliberations FY 2016/17 (25th/5/2016, 2nd/9/2016, 30th/9/2016, 28th/11/2016 and 31st/1/2017) indicated that representatives of the SSC presented health sector issues and recommendations to council that required council's approval e.g. recommendations to council seen in minute of the SSC meeting on the 20th/21st/9/2016.
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 	3	List of HUMC members and minutes of HUMC meetings are available and issues of resources for operation and other projects at the health facilities are discussed. E.g Min3/01/2016 for the HUMC meeting at RENGEN HC III on 18/11/2016, discussed PHC funds disbursed for implementation of PHC activities.
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	There were no publicized PHC releases on the notice boards at both the district and sampled health facilities.
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>A comprehensive procurement plan was developed. This was in line with the 2017/2018 annual work plan for the department. A copy of this plan is available at the DHO's office</p> <p>The office of the DHO had submitted a procurement request to PDU for the 2017/2018 on 30/06/2017. A copy of this request is available at the office of the DHO</p>
14	<p>The LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time: • 100% - score 8 • 70-99% – score 4 • Below 70% - score 0 	0	<p>This evidence was not accessible. Medicines for HC IIIs were accessed through the HC IV (by a push system) which was removed from the district to the municipality. It was challenging to access drug orders to ascertain timeliness of placement of drug orders since the DHO had very little/no role to play.</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>The LG Health department timely certified and recommended suppliers for payment. Evidence was from a sampled document for request for payment of supply of solar and accessories to Panyangara H,C III dated 21/12/2016, recommended for payment by DHO on 11/1/2017 and payment voucher dated 11/1/2017, voucher no PV-HE00043. This had contract, request and voucher attached. Other documents could not qualify for sampling because they were mainly for facilitation and micro procurement.</p>

Assessment area: Financial management and reporting

16	<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	0	<p>According to the LG Planner's records and evidence from the Q4 Consolidated APR for the FY 2016/17, while the health department submitted inputs to the planning unit for all 4 quarters for FY 2016/17 (i.e. Q1 - 9th/11/2016 Receipt No: 0026; Q2 – 24th/2/2017 Receipt No: 0409; Q3 – 23rd/5/2017 Receipt No: 0748; and Q4 - 15th/8/2017 Receipt No: 4555), the submissions were sometimes slow, hence the late submission of the Q4 APR (meant to be submitted before 31st/7/2017).</p>
17	<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If sector has no audit query score 4 If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points If all queries are not responded to score 0 	0	<p>The sector audit reports are embedded in the internal quarterly audit reports. All the quarterly internal audit reports provide information on the implementation status of all the internal audit findings. Audit queries are handled at individual level where whoever is affected has to report to CAO with accountability and CAO will forward the accountability to auditor to verify whether it qualifies and if it qualifies, then the case is dropped if not Auditor comments and sends it back to CAO. However no written document to that note was available. There was no evidence to show that all audit queries were responded to.</p>
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				
18	<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2 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	<p>The HUMC at the health facility did not meet gender requirements. Only 2/9 members were females</p> <p>These guidelines had not been issued to health facilities. The DHO thought that these had not been provided although he was about 18 months in this office.</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">• 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	<p>This evidence was not established. The DHO did not remember ever receiving these guidelines in the district from the MOH although these are among the guidelines included for assessment of this area having confirmed from the MOH that they were provided.</p>
----	---	---	---	---



LGPA 2017/18

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Kotido District

(Vote Code: 528)

Score 63/100 (63%)

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"> Evidence that the LG Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: score 10 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Safe Water Coverage data for Kotido LG show that the district has safe water access of 79%. Only two sub-counties had safe water coverage below district average i.e Kacheri-66% and Rengen-64%. From the annual workplan for 2017/18 submitted on 28th June 2017, Kotido LG planned for drilling and siting of boreholes an in Kacheri S/C and Rengen S/C.
2	<p>The LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY: score 15 	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the annual Progress report (quarter 4) dated 18th July 2017 and received by MoWE on 22nd August 2017, it was revealed that DWO had implemented budgeted water projects in subcounties with safe water coverage below district coverage i.e Kacheri and Rengen Forinstance Kanamwar & Nariwo boreholes in Rengen S/C were drilled and installed. Also Natir borehole in Kacheri S/C was drilled and installed. Physical visit of the assessor on Saturday 20th January 2018 also confirmed.
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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A DWO monitoring report of Water facilities in Kotido district addressed to CAO was seen dated 18/08/2017. Hence the score is 100%.
4	<p>The LG Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Performance Contract for Kotido shows that Rengen S/C had Safe Water Access of 64% and Kacheri S/C had safe Water access of 66% below Kotido district average coverage of 79. • This was contrary to the MIS report that showed that Rengen S/C had safe water access of 75% while Kacheri S/C had 68% safe water access.
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				
5	<p>The LG Water department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the assessor saw Procurement requests for FY 2017/18 by the Kotido DWO, these requests were submitted later after April 30th 2017 for instance, • Procurement request for siting and drilling of hand pump boreholes provided with cattle troughs was initiated on 11th August 2017 by the DWO, approved by the District Engineer on 29th August 2017 and the CAO confirmed funding on 11th September 2017. • Similarly, procurement request for borehole rehabilitation was initiated by the DWO on 11th August 2017, approved on 29th August 2017 while the CAO confirmed funding on 11th September 2017.

The DWO has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts

Maximum 8 points for this performance measure

• 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

2

• From the AWP for FY 2017/18, the assessor saw the monitoring and supervision in Appendix 4 on page 26. The DWO said that they have just completed handing over of WSS sites for construction hence cannot conduct monthly site visits. For instance, the assessor saw evidence of;

• Certificate of Site handover for rehabilitation of 18 boreholes dated 09th January 2018. Procurement reference no.KOTI/528/Wrks/17-18/00019. Contractor:XTRI Trust Limited . Contract period of 3 months. Start date: 27th December 2017. Date of completion:26th March 2018.

• Certificate of site handover for the rehabilitation of Panyangara Piped Water Supply Scheme. Procurement Reference No.KOTI/528/Wrks/17-18/00018. Contractor:Kal Bros Company Limited . Contract period of 3 months. Start date: 27th December 2017. Date of completion:27th March 2018.

• If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2

2

• Since the projects were still on-going, verification of the facilities on whether constructed as per the designs is expected to be done after project completion date.

• If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2

2

• For the water project of FY2016/17, 12 boreholes were successfully drilled however the contract was to address construction of other boreholes in the current FY 2017/18.

• Contracts committee at their sitting on 06th October 2017 under Minute No. CC.04/5/2017 extended contract period for Reddy's borehole & Technical Services for drilling 10 boreholes in FY 2017/18.

• If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2

2

• The DWO has not certified the water project for FY because the project is still ongoing and completion report is prepared after six months to enable payment of retention fee of 10% to the contractor.

7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	3	<p>The DWOs certified and recommended for timely payment of the suppliers for example;</p> <p>Requisition from Teracon Technical Works UG LTD for payment for the design of Napumpum RGC piped water system dated 14/6/2017 was recommended for payment by DWO on 14/6/2017 and was paid on 23/6/2017. Payment voucher number PV-WK00158. Although only one transaction was recorded as evidence but others also showed timely payment.</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"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	0	<p>According to the LG Planner's records and evidence from the Q4 Consolidated APR for the FY 2016/17, while the water department submitted inputs to the planning unit for all 4 quarters for FY 2016/17 (i.e. Q1 - 9th/11/2016 Receipt No: 0026; Q2 – 24th/2/2017 Receipt No: 0409; Q3 – 23rd/5/2017 Receipt No: 0748; and Q4 - 15th/8/2017 Receipt No: 4555), the submissions were sometimes slow or late, hence the late submission of the Q4 APR (meant to be submitted before 31st/7/2017).</p>
---	--	---	---	---

9	<p>LG Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	3	<p>The sector had audit queries but provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of audit findings for the previous financial year. the quarterly audit reports show the implementation status of the internal audit findings (page 2) Management responses to the quarterly internal audit reports were seen dated 27/10/2016 and 13/4/2017. Evidence of accountability from the water department was from Ocan Patrick accounting for Ugx: 31,980,000 for training of hand pump mechanics for Nakapelimoru dated 10/01/2018 and others. Most of the queries are for un accounted for funds.</p>
---	--	--	---	---

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3 	3	<p>The Technical Services, Security, Finance and Administration Committee (TSAC) is responsible for water on top of other areas. Evidence from the TSAC minutes for the FY 2016/17 confirmed that it met 3 out of the 6 mandatory times (on the 21st/26th/9/2016; the 21st/22nd /11/2016; and the 16th /17th /1/2017). It discussed water service delivery issues including departmental quarterly, HoD and sector reports as well as specifying challenges and recommendations to council. Even so, there was no direct evidence in the minutes covering discussions of results from performance assessments, inspection and monitoring. Page 6 of minute 21st/22nd/11/2016 only points to somewhat indirect water sector self-assessments of the management of constructed water sources.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	3	<p>The TSAC presented water sector issues, challenges and recommendations that required council's approval. For example, all the 3 TSAC minutes confirm that the meetings involved departmental recommendations to council and these reflected in the district council's meetings and minutes (see 25th/5/2016, 2nd/9/2016, 30th/9/2016, 28th/11/2016 and 31st/1/2017).</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"> 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 	2	<p>The Assessor saw on Kotido LG noticeboard WSS grant releases of the 4th quarter FY2016/17 dated 17th May 2017. Advocacy meetings were also done to the district council meeting on Wednesday 15/11/2017 and invitation letters for the advocacy meeting were sent out on 9/11/2017.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the field visits on Saturday 20th January 2018, the assessor observed that all 3 boreholes visited were clearly labelled using mark stones. For instance, Nalimo borehole in Rengen S/C, Kanamwah borehole in Rengen S/C and Natir borehole in Kacheri S/C.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on tenders and contract awards was seen on the Kotido LG noticeboard as indicated; Rehabilitation of boreholes Method of Bidding: Open domestic bidding. Procurement Reference: KOTI 528/Wrks/17-18/00019. Best Evaluated Bidder:XTRI Trust Limited. Contract Sum: Ugshs 50,315,430. Date of Display: 10th November 2017 Date of removal:23rdth November 2017
12	<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application letters for water facilities seen including payment evidence of Ugshs 200,000 community contribution. For instance, Morulokwang village in Panyangara S/C applied for a borehole. Minutes of the community meeting held on 17/9/2017 and were signed by 332 village members. A bank slip from Stanbic Bank Kotido branch of shs 200,000 paid on 16/11/2017 was seen. Another application for a borehole from Lokitela village of Panyangara S/C including minutes of village meeting were seen by the assessor dated 13/01/2017. Community contribution of Ushs 200,000 was paid to Kotido Local Government and a general receipt no.7366 was issued.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O&M funds and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, for the current FY: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence of functioning WSCs seen at DWO and field visit.
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"> • 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 • Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1 • Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>No environmental screening done for the boreholes constructed. The DWO said that after identifying location where a borehole is to be constructed, DWO engages a surveyor and after drilling of boreholes begins.</p> <p>• The DWO indicated that there has never been cases of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY 2016/17.</p> <p>• Agreement letter for rehabilitation of 15 boreholes by Mastak Investments Ltd Procurement No.KOTI/528/WRKS/15-16/00021 dated 4th January 2016 had a clause on environmental protection. It read “the contractor shall execute the works in an environmentally friendly manner and shall avoid all unnecessary damage to property and flora”.</p>
14	<p>The LG Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If at least 50% WSCs are women as per the sector critical requirements: score 3 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of the Water Sanitation Committee out of 5 different water points had more than 50% of their members as females. For instance, Natir borehole(M=3, F=4), Natapaporon borehole(M=3, F=4), Karakak borehole(M=2, F=5), Nalakas borehole(M=3,F=4) & Kangimanang borehole(M=4,F=3). This was seen on the attendance list of WSC training by the Water and Sanitation Department of Kotido district on 21st February 2017.

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"> • If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3 	3	<p>In the previous FY 2016/17 and the current FY 2017/18, no public sanitation facilities have been budgeted and constructed. The District LG has been conducting sensitization by encouraging communities to construct their own latrines through CLTS approach.</p>
----	--	--	---	---