



LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Kotido Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 797)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	3	50%
No	3	50%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	xxx	<p>Not Compliant – Kotido MC APC was submitted late (see Receipt dated 23rd/10/2017 and Receipt No: 4096), hence submitted after 30th/6/2017. NB: There was also no evidence that Kotido MC submitted the draft APC FY 2017/18 (Form B). According to the Municipal Planner, the problem of limited office space meant that the existing offices would be used as a pool – where different officers access the offices as and when the need arose. As such, documentation and record keeping was affected negatively. Both the officers and their clients often tampered with and misplaced official documents. Borrowed documents were never returned.</p>	No
Assessment area: Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	xxxxx	<p>Compliant - Signed and stamped documented evidence exists offering proof that the draft Kotido MC LG APC/Budget 2017/18 was submitted to MoFPED (on the 12th July 2017) accompanied by a Procurement Plan.</p>	Yes
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			
<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	xxxxx	<p>Not Compliant – There is no documented evidence that Kotido MC submitted the APR 2016/17 to MoFPED by 31st July 2017 (there was no dated Receipt with a Receipt Serial Number).</p>	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 – Only 3 quarterly reports (of the 4 quarters for FY 2016/17) were duly submitted (i.e. Q1 – on the 15th/11/2016 Receipt No: 0060; Q2 – on the 10th/3/2017 Receipt No: 0469; Q3 – on the 1st/6/2017 Receipt No: 0784). According to MoFPED official records, Kotido MC did not send Q4 Consolidated APR altogether.</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 to PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General Findings for the previous financial year by 30th April. Evidence is on the report dated 14th/3/2017 and submitted on 24th/3/2017.</p> <p>The number of queries raised was 22 and all were responded to although some issues had responses like no action taken.</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>Kotido Municipal council obtained a qualified Audit opinion as evidenced in the annual report of the auditor general FY 2016/2017.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Kotido Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 797)

Score 52/100 (52%)

797 Kotido Municipal Council Crosscutting Performance Measures

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality; and (ii) all Town Councils in a District are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a municipality/district has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 2. <p>• All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2.</p>	2	<p>The Urban Physical Planning Committee (PPC) was formed on the 14th/12/2016 by appointment from the Town Clerk. The PPC is composed of the Town Clerk – the chair – and officers in charge of public health, law enforcement and engineering/works). When Kotido Town Council (TC) was upgraded to Kotido MC, the Urban PPC continued its mandate and at the time of the LGPA 2018, the Urban PPC was functional - meeting to consider new investments but the sitting often timed on a quarterly basis reportedly because very few investments come through regularly.</p> <p>Documented evidence (minutes) was available as proof of the approval of plans consistent with the urban Physical Plan and new investments approved in this way. The requirement was for the PPC to meet every quarter. Between its inception and at the time of the assessment – 22nd/1/2018 – the urban PPC had met only 4 out of 8 times (i.e. on the 1st/6/2016, the 16th/9/2016, 4th/4/2017 and the 27th/10/2017). The Urban PPC minutes proved that it sat and that it deliberated on relevant issues such as approval of investments. According to official records got from MoLHUD, (Status of Physical Planning in Uganda 2017, the MoLHUD Physical Planning Department (2015) considered Kotido MC to have available a valid Structural Plan 2008-2018 but with an expired Detailed Plan 2008-2013 (see Page 5) all for Kotido Town Council but at the time of the assessment turned into a Municipality. Kotido MC indicated presence of a Detailed Plan 2008-2018, hence with an apparent discrepancy of the records at MoLHUD and Kotido MC.</p>

<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. 	0	<p>There was neither evidence that a Budget Conference had been conducted nor availability of the Budget Conference Report (BCR) at the time of the assessment (22nd/1/2018). As such, there was no evidence that the AWP 2017/18 was based on outcomes of the budget conference (with one-on-one correspondences between the 2 documents). This was attributed to there being no full time Planning Officer, with the Planning Officer in charge working in acting capacity and on seconded from the Kotido District beginning FY 2015/16.</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>There is some evidence that the capital investments in the approved AWP 2017/18 (undated) are derived from 5-year Municipal Development Plan (MDP) 2015/16-2019/20. For example, the approved AWP shows construction of office block (page 4) that appear broadly in the District Development Plan 2016/17-2019/20. This is in the annex on management and support services (seen in the 3rd last row in the table).</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 MDP 2015/16-2019/20. The LGPA (2018) revealed that several TPC minutes offered no documented proof that TPC meetings sat to discuss the developed project profiles with the specificity this requirement suggests. The TPC's deliberations appeared to be focused more on the more generic aspects of LG functioning (e.g. discussion of, budgets, development planning requirements, initiatives, previous minutes, projects, physical planning, reports (on monitoring, etc.)). this was opposed to covering more specific aspects (e.g. statistics that inform decision making, etc.). Being a new LG, for the FY2016/17, NPA's (2017) Certificated of Compliance with Planning Guidelines awarded Kotido MC no score with respect to the robustness of the planning process and an average when it comes to other aspects of planning.</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>The municipality lacked statistical abstracts and this attributed to the fact that it is a new LG (effective 1st July 2016). This probably explains why there was no documented evidence in the TPC minutes that TPC meetings deliberated on the statistical abstracts with data and information to guide decision making. As such, there was no proof of access to and effective evidence utilisation of gender dis-aggregated statistical abstracts, data and information.</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>All projects in the AWP were derived from the DDP 2016/17-2019/20 approved by council (on the 14th/10/2016 minute number 12/COU/010/2016). The AWP is a derivative from the approved DDP and is by definition approved by similar means. Accordingly, documented evidence drawn from the APC/Budget 2016/17 confirmed that 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>No projects are complete (hence below 80% project completion rate). This is because all investment projects are still on-going as per the AWP for the FY 2016/17, hence none completed (0%) as per work plan (see 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> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	0	<p>No evidence provided to confirm the LG budgeted let alone spent on O&M. According to the officials, all investment projects are still on-going as per the AWP for the FY 2016/17, thus not yet reached the level of O&M.</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>No evidence provided to confirm the LG budgeted let alone spent on O&M. According to the officials, all investment projects are still on-going as per the AWP for the FY 2016/17, thus not yet reached the level of O&M.</p>
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				

6

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

0

There was no verifiable evidence on file in the HRO's office to confirm that performance appraisals were conducted for the Heads of Departments existing during the previous year.

The HRO claimed that all HoDs were appraised and the files containing the performance agreements and reports were handed over to the former Town Clerk (who was outgoing at the time), but he left before endorsing the reports. At that time of the assessment, the files were still with the former Town Clerk (transferred to Namisindwa district as CAO). The HRO promised to follow up and ensure that the files are returned Kotido Municipal council.

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

0

No positions were filled substantively in FY 2016/17. No recruitments were done owing to lack of a wage bill. The existing staffs in FY 2016/17 were inherited from Kotido district. In addition the MoPS had not yet approved the staffing structure for Kotido municipality.

The existing Heads of Departments were appointed by the Town Clerk on *assignment of duty* as evidenced by verification of their personnel files. They were all appointed on the 17/7/17. The Existing HoDs on assignment are indicated below:

1. Principal Township Officer (assigned Deputy Town Clerk roles), file no. CR/D/10297
2. Senior Treasurer (assigned roles of Municipal Treasurer) File no. CR/D/10419
3. Senior Municipal Engineer (assigned roles of Municipal Engineer) File no. CR/D/10900
4. Senior Comm. Dev Officer (assigned roles of Principal Comm.Dev). File ref no. CR/D11133
5. Medical Officer in- Charge HC IV (assigned responsibilities for Medical Officer for Health Services) File no. CR/D/11326
6. District Education Officer (seconded from Kotido district and assigned the roles of Municipal Education Officer). File no. CR/D/10244
7. Internal Auditor (assigned roles of Principal Commercial officer) File no. CR/D/10567

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

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

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

2

No submissions were done by the Town Clerk to the DSC during FY 2016/17.

Verified information on file (in HROs office) indicates that the Town Clerk submitted a request to MoPS for approval of the proposed staffing structure dated 14/9/2016, Ref No. CR/151/1 but only received a response from MoPS dated 8/12/16, Ref. no. ARC/135/306/01 promising to provide approval in due course, but requested the municipality to customise the structure and seek adoption by the council before approval by MoPS.

MoPS provided final approval on the 3/10/17 after the expiry of FY 2016/17

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

1

No submissions were made by the Town Clerk to the DSC owing to the fact that no recruitments and appointments were made in FY 2016/17.

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

1

All (100%) of the submissions made by the Town Clerk to DSC were considered.

6 submissions were made by the Town Clerk to the DSC for action about disciplinary cases involving 6 staff accused of diverting road construction funds to other municipal activities, as verified by a letter from the TC to the DSC dated 15/02/16 file Ref. no. CR/157/6.

DSC sat from the 16th to 17th January 2017 and acted on the submissions as per the 165th sitting of the DSC , minute extract dated 6/02/17 minute no. 06/DSC/KTD/2017. 3 staff received warning letters, 2 received strong reprimand and 1 staff that had been interdicted, the interdiction was lifted..

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 existing municipal staff in FY 2016/17 were inherited from Kotido district and had already accessed the salary payroll.</p> <p>No recruitments were done during the FY under review.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2 	2	<p>No municipal staff retired during FY 2016/17</p>
Assessment area: Revenue Mobilization				
9	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If increase in OSR from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10% : score 4 points • If the increase is from 5 -10% : score 2 point • If the increase is less than 5% : score 0 points. 	0	<p>Kotido Municipal Council became operational in financial year 2016/2017 on 1st July, 2016. The MC didn't collect any local revenue in 2015/16. However, the MC collected Ugx: 189,342,803 in FY 2016/17. there was no figure for comparison.</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 MC had planned (budget) to collect 222,916,000 Ugx in FY 2016/17 and the final accounts revealed Ugx 189,342,803 as actual revenue collected in FY 2016/17. The shortfall in local revenue collected was Ugx: 33,573,197 which is about 15%.(source of information was financial statements 2016/17 and budget 2016/17).</p>

11	Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	0	The Municipality didn't remit the mandatory LLG share of 50% of local revenue. The Divisions became operational in February 2017 but they also didn't remit to the MC. The reason for non-remittance of local revenue was that both the LLGs and the MC were still settling and had many issues to formalize. For example opening of Bank accounts where the Accountant General in his letter dated 25th/8/2016, reference KMC/106/1, gave permission to the MC to open up accounts.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2 	2	Evidence from the payment vouchers from the principal treasurer, show payments made towards council activities specifically from local revenue. When these figures were computed the total was 22,217,000 shillings. This is about 9% of the total revenue collected (189,342,803 Ugx). Therefore, the MC used 9% of OSR on council activities. The assessor could not base on the figure for statutory bodies in the final accounts for 2016/17 because part of it was from unconditional grants.

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

12	The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Kotido Municipal Council has no position of procurement officer and assistant procurement officer substantially filled. However the Municipal has advertised for the position of procurement officer on 16th January 2018 in the New vision newspaper
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TEC produced and submitted reports to the contracts committee for previous FY 16/17. Evaluation reports were submitted dated 20 February 2017 signed by secretary and Chairman TEC

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contracts committee considered recommendations of the TEC in committee meeting held on 21/Dec/2016 at the municipal hall and on 14/12/2017.5 bid documents were recommended which include; Construction of municipal Administration Block, supply of furniture to Lomukura primary school, Kotido army primary, Kotido mixed primary and Kotido girls primary school.
13	<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement and disposal plan for current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget stamped and signed by the procurement officer Kotido LG, Town clerk • Procurements were made in previous FY (vide letter, submission of procurement work plan for FY 2016/2017 to Executive Director PPDA dated 31Aug/2016 signed and stamped by Town council Clerk (Ofwono Emmanuel)
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 • 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"> • For the current FY,60% of the bid documents for investment/infrastructure were made. The procurement process started late . there were no activities for previous FY that were implemented concentrating on those projects so there was a delay in the bidding process. • The Municipal contracts register was taken by Auditor General to Kampala in an exit meeting. contracts register could not be traced during the assessment

		<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 municipal adhered to procurement thresholds for Micro procurements are made below 1 Million Shs, and above 1 million there's selective bidding that is done in the Municipal council <p>There was Open bidding for construction of Municipal Administration block amounting to 214,562,700 shs.</p>
15	<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was 1 project for previous FY 16/17 which was the construction of municipal administration block. There was an interim payment certificate signed by the senior Municipal Engineer Kotido on 13/04/2017 and 5/5/2017. .
		<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"> For Current FY, Panyangara secondary school, the girls dormitory under construction (slab stage) was visited in the municipal council .However, there was no evidence of siteboard indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding within the vicinity during time of assessment.
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>There was evidence that the Municipal Council makes up to-date bank reconciliation. Cash books for urban roads, Operations, Development, Youth livelihood Programmes (YLP) and UWEP had been reconciled up to 31st /12/2017. The MC is not on IFMIS.</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. 	2	<p>The MC made timely payments to suppliers during the previous financial year as seen from the payment vouchers from administration. For example payment request for completion of substructure and superstructure dated 30th /5/2017 from Sembrik Uganda LTD was paid on payment voucher dated 8/6/2017. Also request for payment for construction works and materials for the new MC Administration block by Sembrik dated 10/4/2017 and payment voucher dated 2/5/2017. There was no payment register to view overdue bills. The contracts register had been taken to Auditor General because the MC had an audit query so it was not available at the time of assessment.</p>
18	<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor and produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 3. 	0	<p>According to the structure, the Municipal council is supposed to have a principal auditor, senior internal auditor and internal auditor. However, all the three are not yet recruited; the MC has just an acting caretaker internal auditor. The advert for senior internal auditor appeared in the new vision dated 13th /01/2017.</p> <p>Therefore, the MC doesn't have a substantive senior internal auditor. The acting caretaker produced all the quarterly audit reports for the previous FY. The quarterly audit reports were submitted to the Directorate of internal audit as follows. First quarter submitted on 19/12/2016, second quarter on 21/4/2017, third quarter on 23/6/2017 and the fourth quarter was submitted as a soft copy.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries: score 2. 	2	<p>Evidence that the MC has provided information to Council and LGPAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year can be viewed from the small delivery book for submissions of internal audit reports. Responses to management letter for the audit of Kotido MC for FY 2016/17 dated 29/9/2017 signed by TC cited 16 audit queries. Some staffs were issued with audit queries as a way of follow up e.g. Ekemem Patrick clerk to council on 21/3/2017, Robert Anewa (Planner) and Otalamoe Wilfred (Town agent) on 22/3/2017.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1 	0	<p>Evidence of submission of internal audit reports for the previous financial year to Accounting officer and LGPAC was in the small delivery book for submission of internal audit reports. For example RDC, town clerk, LGPAC and chairperson finance received third quarter audit reports on 28/5/2017. LGPAC has not reviewed the internal audit reports. The minutes of District PAC meetings held on 18th-21st April 2017, 3rd, 4th and 10th May 2017 and 1st-2nd August, 2017, all have review of Kotido MC internal quarterly audit reports on their Agenda but it was not deliberated on due to time constraints. The MC has a lot of backlog to be handled. They use the same LGPAC with the district.</p>
19	<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	4	<p>The MC maintains a detailed and updated asset register/file as per the format in the accounting manual. The register was updated up to end of financial year 2016/17. At the time of assessment, the MC had just finished awarding contracts for solar, furniture and computers for functionalising the new administration block. Therefore, no assets have been procured in FY 2017/18. The contracts register had been taken to Auditor General because the MC had an audit query so it was not available at the time of assessment</p>

20	<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY: • unqualified audit opinion: score 4 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</p>	2	<p>Kotido Municipal council obtained a qualified Audit opinion as evidenced in the annual report of the auditor general FY 2016/2017.</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 Municipal Council Minutes that council met 6 out of 6 times (i.e. on the 23rd/5/2017, 31st /3/2017, 20th/1/2017, 16th/12/2016, 14th/10/2016 and 31st/8/2016 that it met as per requirements to deliberate on relevant service-delivery issues (e.g. formation of committees and discussion of committee and departmental reports; approval of the DDP 2016/17-2019/20 (14th/10/2016) work plans and budgets, budget estimates//BFP; presentation and approval of departmental plans, budgets and infrastructure investments, etc). However, what appeared to be missing in its discussions in the FY 2016/17 were deliberations on TPC reports, monitoring reports and performance assessment reports. The Multi-Sectoral Monitoring Report was presented only to DEC.</p>
22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2.</p>	0	<p>No documented evidence - only self-reported assertions made that the Town Clerk (through the divisions) is the designated official meant to coordinate lower-level feedback on and responses to (grievances /complaints) in the municipal council.</p>

23	The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)	Evidence that the LG has published: • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2	0	No evidence seen of posting/publishing of payroll and pension schedule on LG notice boards.
	Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1	1	The procurement plan and awards of contracts and amounts were posted and published on Kotido MC's notice board.
		• Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications, are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1.	0	Not Applicable (N/A) – There was no LGPA in the FY under review.
24	The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	• Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1	1	The officers do not have office space at the division level but use meetings and radio announcements and programmes as well as Parish Development Committee (PDCs) to communicate to lower levels. NB: All officers at Kotido MC are in acting capacity are also acting at MC division levels. The info they secured from the MC or the center is relayed by the same officers to the divisions.
		• Evidence that LG during previous FY has conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc..) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1.	1	Documented evidence seen that Kotido MC practiced downward accountability through radio programmes and barazas, radio events, etc. A visit to Voice of Karamoja (92.7 FM) presented signs that Kotido MC used radio to communicate to divisions and citizens in the municipality (the Radio's Visitors Books had signed participation of MC officials including the Town Clerk).
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. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The community Development Officer and Gender focal person was not in office at the time of assessment, no information could be accessed
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that gender focal point has planned activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and that more than 90% of previous year's budget for gender activities has been implemented: score 2. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By the time of assessment the community Development officer and Gender Focal Person was not available and no information could easily be got.
26	LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<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"> • Environmental screening and social reports for fencing of office and slaughter house and construction of office block at Municipal HQ were appropriate , viewed and signed by lands supervisor on 20th June 2017. Environmental screening for construction of girls dormitory in Panyagara SS was signed by Lands supervisor on 20th June 2017. • Mitigation measures were addressed for the construction of office block at Municipal HQ and slaughter house .
		<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"> • Environmental and social management issues were viewed in the contracts bid.A01 states that all grass, weeds bushes cleared and burning of rubbish. • A02-spread and level the soil. in the BOQ for construction of Dormitory block at Panyagara Secondary school was budgeted at 1,479,000/= . shs

		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was proof of land ownership and agreements between Mr Lokwii Akii for his land measuring 105m x 130m municipal office space on for the construction of Kotido Municipal HQ signed by the Town clerk on 1st Dec 2009 ,by Hon Achaboi Francis chairperson Kotido town council and Land supervisor Kotido Municipal. • There was also land agreement signed by Mr Napido Lokala who sold land to Kotido Town Council (Municipal now) for the slaughter house/Abattoir signed by Town clerk, land supervisor and LC III chairperson Kotido town council on 1st Dec 2009. Receipts of first, second and third instalment payment were issued on 3/09/2003,8/08/2008,and 21/05/2009 respectively.
		<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"> • Environmental social mitigation Certification forms for higher local governments were viewed for Fencing of Abbatoir/slaughter house signed by Ag Municipal Environment Officer on 20 June 2017



LGPA 2017/18

Educational Performance Measures

Kotido Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 797)

Score 53/100 (53%)

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>	<p>• 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</p> <p>• Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4</p>	4	<p>KMC had budgeted for one head teacher and 7 teachers in all the 7 MC schools as evidenced in the original supplementary wage bill request of 1/07/17 to the P/S MFPED.</p> <p>Kotido MC has deployed a head teacher and 7 teachers in the current FY as evidenced in the Kotido MC staff list of 83 teachers of the 7 government aided P/S as provided for in the original supplementary wage bill request of 1/07/16 to the P/S MFPED where each of the school had more than seven teachers and one head</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>	<p>• 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</p>	6	<p>100% filled. Verified evidence from the supplementary bill request letter of 23/07/16 to the P/S S/T MFED received and stamped by the office of Accountant General's office MOFED</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>	0	Positions of schools inspectors not filled.
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	KMC has submitted a recruitment plan to fill vacant teacher positions to the MOFED. Verified evidence from the supplementary bill request letter of 23/07/16 to the P/S S/T MOFED received and stamped by the office of Accountant General's office MOFED
		<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>	0	There was no evidence to show that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of School Inspectors:
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	The Municipality had no Inspector of Schools in FY 2016/17. The education office was being assisted by the Ag. DEO of the district on secondment (the Ag. DEO had already been appraised by the district) who also doubled as the School inspector.

		<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>There are 7 Head Teachers (heading 7 primary schools in the municipality). All Head Teachers were appraised for the calendar year 2017 (note that they were appraised for calendar year 2016 while still under Kotido district). Personnel Files of the 7 Head Teachers were verified and contained performance agreements and reports dully signed by the division town clerks and the chairmen of School Management Committees. File reference numbers and appraisal dates are indicated below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CR/D/11170- Appraised on 15/12/17 2. CR/D/11150- Appraised on 12/12/17 3. CR/D/10877- Appraised on n19/12/17 4. CR/D/11025- Appraised on 20/12/17 5. CR/D/11166- Appraised on 15/12/17 6. CR/D/11162- Appraised on 13/12/17 7. CR/D/10621- Appraised on 15/12/17
--	--	--	---	--

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>	0	<p>There was no evidence to show that the Municipal Education Officer (MEO) has communicated or explained any guidelines or circulars by the central government, although the MEO reported a number of workshops funded and conducted by the Municipal partners including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNICEF • Save The Children • Core PTC (Teachers' attendance VS Absenteeism • Effective supervision of public and private primary schools. •
---	--	---	---	--

		<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 	0	There was no evidence to show that the Municipal Education Officer (MEO) has communicated or explained any guidelines or circulars by the central government,.
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"> o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59% score 1 o Below 50% score 0. 	12	<p>During FY 2016/17 Kotido MC inspected all schools (public and private) in Kotido MC as evidenced by :</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 	4	<p>Inspection reports were discussed and duly acted up on. 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.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	2	<p>Kotido MC is among the 10 pilot LGs submitting online inspection reports to MOES during the 2nd and 3rd term so was only able to see soft copies on the computer and the following Municipality summary inspection reports</p> <p>signed by the Municipal education office the Town Clerk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Term 3 2017 on 15/12 Term 2 of 2016 on 14/09/16
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4 	0	There is no evidence to show that the inspection reports' recommendations are followed up.
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: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5 	0	<p>The KMC data on government aided schools available in two report of EMIS and PBS is not consistent as evidenced by the data below from the two sources:</p> <p>EMIS – 11 Primary schools (1.Caicaon Community, 2. Kadokini, 3. Kakuloi, 4. Kanawat, 5. Kanayete, 6. Kotido Army, 7. Kotido Girls 8. Kotido Mixed 9. Lomukura,10. Mary Mother Of God and 11. Panyangara)</p> <p>PBS – 7 schools</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5</p>	0	<p>The 2017/18 KMC data on enrolment in government aided schools is not the same in the two reports of EMIS and OBT as evidenced below by the data collected from the same sources:</p> <p>EMIS---- 18965 pupils</p> <p>OBT---- 7560 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>Kotido MC has 2 standing committees Finance, Planning and Administration Standing Committee (FPASC) and the General Purpose Standing Committee (GPC). Education, health and water issues are addressed in the GPC. The GPC sat 4 out of 6 times (i.e. on the 11th/5/2017, 22nd/3/2017, 27th/2/2017 and 10th/11/2016) and evidence from the GPC were available to confirm that it met and discussed education service delivery issues including departmental quarterly budgets, plans, updates, priorities and departmental reports (see GPC minutes of 27th/2/2017 and 10th/11/2016). What was lacking was discussion of education-related supervision reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports.</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>Councils minutes (23rd/5/2017, 31st /3/2017, 20th/1/2017, 16th/12/2016, 14th/10/2016 and 31st/8/2016) and minutes of the GPC deliberations indicated marginally that representatives of the education sector presented sector-specific issues to council for council's approval.</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>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 Kotido mixed Primary School submitted to the DEO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 21/03/17 for approval of the budget for UPE funds for 1st term of 2017 5/7/17 for approval of UOE funds for 2nd term of 2017
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 no evidence to show the LG had publicized all schools receiving non- wage grants. H</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>The procurement documents seen were signed and submitted after 30/ 4/17. These include the ones for following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Procurement Plan for 2017/18 signed in December 2017 Making of desks for P1 and P2 signed 18/11/17. Construction of the girls dormitory at Panyangara 30/08/17
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>There was no evidence of written documents like payment vouchers, payment requests, and certificates for supplies or works to ascertain whether payment was timely. However, there was payment for services for regional music, dance and drama; request was made on 18/8/2016, recommended on 19/8/2016 by DEO and payment on 19/8/2016. Therefore, this payment was timely.</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 Q4 Consolidated APR, the education department submitted inputs to the annual performance report for financial year 2016/17 to the planning unit (see page 38). However, this covered only 3 quarters (out of the 4 quarters for FY 2016/17) were duly submitted (i.e. Q1 – on the 15th/11/2016 Receipt No: 0060; Q2 – on the 10th/3/2017 Receipt No: 0469; Q3 – on the 1st/6/2017 Receipt No: 0784).</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 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 Quarterly internal audit reports dated 12/12/2016(first quarter),28/2/2017(second quarter),30/4/2017(third quarter) and 13/9/2017(fourth quarter) all contain the implementation status of the previous audit recommendations, detailed findings for the quarter, criteria, issues, consequences and corrective actions. Individuals respond to Town Clerk with their responses for example accountability of un accounted for funds, the Town clerk directs them to internal auditor to verify and comment, the auditor clears them in his audit working book/papers and after forwards them to accounts section where they are cleared in the ledger book by the accountant. The ledger book was not available at the time of assessment but the working book/papers were availed to the assessor. However, there was no evidence that all the internal audit queries were responded to. LGPAC didn't sit to review the Quarterly internal audit reports FY 2016/17</p>
----	---	--	---	--

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

17	<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc...: Score 2 	0	<p>The MEO reported the training on gender guidelines by World Vision where the head of women teachers were equipped with skills of making reusable pads and another one for ball game teachers which was also conducted by World vision.</p> <p>However the MEO could not come up with any documentary evidence for these workshops because the workshops were fully funded and implemented by World Vision who did not share the workshop reports with the MEO's office.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2 	0	<p>The MEO reported the training on gender guidelines by World Vision where the head of women teachers were equipped with skills of making reusable pads and another one for ball game teachers which was also conducted by World vision.</p> <p>However the MEO could not come up with any documentary evidence for these workshops because the workshops were fully funded and implemented by World Vision who did not share the workshop reports with the MEO's office.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	1	<p>Verified evidence of equal or higher than 30% gender composition from the following sample of Primary Schools the assessor visited during the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kotido Mixed Primary School 4/12 • Kotido Army School 3/6
18	<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 3: 	0	<p>Environmental protection is supported by CARITA as reported by the MEO and confirmed by the Head Teacher of Kotido mixed school where in 2017 CARITA supported the school with some tree planting efforts as well as setting up environment, sanitation and hygiene clubs for students and a teacher as the patron.</p> <p>The CEO and the Head Teacher could not however come up with any documentary evidence for CARITAs support since they (CARITA) had directly supported the activities and were yet to share any report.</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Health Performance Measures

Kotido Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 797)

Score 36/100 (36%)

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>There are 2 health Centers in the Municipal Council (Kotido Health Center IV and Panyangara HC III). The approved structures and OBT/PBS shows that Panyangara has 80% of approved staff positions filled while Kotido HCIV has 75% of approved positions filled with a wage bill available.</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>	0	<p>A comprehensive recruitment was developed but it was still electronic and lacked approval signatures</p>
3	<p>The LG Health department has ensured that performance appraisal for health facility in charge is conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the health facility in-charge have been appraised during the previous FY: o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<p>The facility in-charge for the only HC IV (Kotido HC IV) in the municipality was away for study leave and therefore could not be appraised during the previous FY. He left the station in October 2016. Currently there is an in-charge who was formerly appointed in that role during FY 2017/18.</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>According to the deployment list and the and the OBT pages 3&4 and the wage bill, there is equity in deployment of staff in both facilities.</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 • 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>There are no guidelines, circulars, policies accessed at the municipal council. This municipality is new with about 18 months in existence at the time of the assessment. The MOH has therefore not begun sending these directly but through the District Health office for the DHO to disseminate.</p>
6	<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3</p>	0	<p>The Municipal Council has not accessed PHC funding to undertake this assignment. PHC funding either goes to the district health office or directly to health facilities. This funding has not been harmonized to allow municipal health office play the support supervision role.</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	0	The Municipal Council has not accessed PHC funding to undertake this assignment. PHC funding either goes to the district or directly to health facilities. This funding has not been harmonized to allow municipal health office play the support supervision role.
7	The Health Sub-district(s) have effectively provided support supervision to lower level health units Maximum 6 points for this performance measure	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	0	The HCIV has not supervised the HCIII (Panyangara)the only one in the municipality due to lack of funding since the municipality was established.
8	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 Maximum 10 points for this performance measure	• Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4	0	Since support supervision at both the Municipal and HSD level is not done, such reports/minutes to this effect were not available at the municipal health office.
		• Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6	0	There were no supervision activities done for any discussions to be done in order to make appropriate recommendations

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: o List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10 	10	<p>The list of health facilities in the OBT/ performance contracts and HMIS was consistent. The two health facilities in the Municipality consistently appeared in all these documents although HMIS data for these facilities is collected by the district biostatistician.</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>Education, health and water issues are addressed in the General Purpose Committee (GPC). The GPC sat 4 out of 6 times (i.e. on the 11th/5/2017, 22nd/3/2017, 27th/2/2017 and 10th/11/2016). Evidence from the GPC were available to confirm that it met and discussed health service delivery issues including departmental quarterly budgets, plans, updates, priorities and departmental reports (see GPC minutes of 27th/2/2017 and 10th/11/2016). What was lacking was discussion of health-related supervision reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	2	<p>Councils minutes (23rd/5/2017, 31st /3/2017, 20th/1/2017, 16th/12/2016, 14th/10/2016 and 31st/8/2016) and some minutes of GPC deliberations indicated rather marginally that representatives of the health sector presented sector-specific issues to council for council's approval.</p>

11	<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 5 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5 • If 80-99% : score 3 • If 70-79%: : score 1 • If less than 70%: score 0 	0	<p>HUMC meetings are not held quarterly as required. For Panyangara HCIII, only one meeting was held on 3/03/2017. Minutes were not signed and lacked an attendance list of the HUMC members. For Kotido HC IV, no HUMC meeting was held in the previous FY since no minutes were accessed to confirm this.</p>
12	<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	0	<p>Publicizing of PHC funds was only found at Panyangara where a disbursement of Ugx.1,144,550/= was posted on the health facility notes board along with disbursements for the other health facilities on 29/11/2017. This was not established at Kotido HCIV.</p>

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

13	<p>The LG Health department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2 	2	<p>The sector submitted a procurement plan for a 4-stance pit latrine at Panyangara HC III costed at Ugx. 23,000,000/= This is in line with the 2017/18 annual work plan.</p>
		<p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	0	<p>Submission of procurement request form (form PP5) by the 1st quarter to PDU was not established.</p>

14	<p>The LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time: • 100% - score 8 • 70-99% – score 4 • Below 70% - score 0 	8	<p>100% (2)of the health facilities were supported. A procurement plan was available for Kotido Health center IV for the medicines, developed in 03/2017.</p> <p>For panyangara HC III, it was reported that a push approach from NMS is applied</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 DHO certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment. Evidence was on payment for installation of litter bins and requisition date was 18/7/2016, DHO recommended payment on 19/7/2016 and payment on 19/7/2016 as per voucher.</p> <p>Payment for cleaning town abattoir, office and public latrines request on 1/9/2016, DHO recommended for payment on 23/9/2016 and payment was on 23/9/2016.</p> <p>All these are services provided; there were no documents for supplies or works for comparison.</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 Q4 Consolidated APR, the health department submitted the annual performance report timely for FY 2016/17 to the planning unit (see page 37). However, there reports only for 3 quarters (out of the 4 quarters for FY 2016/17) were duly submitted (i.e. Q1 – on the 15th/11/2016 Receipt No: 0060; Q2 – on the 10th/3/2017 Receipt No: 0469; Q3 – on the 1st/6/2017 Receipt No: 0784).</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 Quarterly internal audit reports dated 12/12/2016(first quarter),28/2/2017(second quarter),30/4/2017(third quarter) and 13/9/2017(fourth quarter) all contain the implementation status of the previous audit recommendations, detailed findings for the quarter, criteria, issues, consequences and corrective actions. Individuals respond to Town Clerk with their responses for example accountability of un accounted for funds, the TC directs them to internal auditor to verify and comment, the auditor clears them in his audit working book/papers and after forwards them to accounts section where they are cleared in the ledger book by the accountant. The ledger book was not available at the time of assessment. the audit working book/papers was available but could not show whether all the audit issues were responded to. LGPAC didn't sit to review the Quarterly internal audit reports FY 2016/17</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 list of HUMC members of Panyangara HCII was not available for verification of gender composition although the gender composition of Kotido HCIV has 3/9 members as females according to the attendance list of a meeting held on 5/07/2017</p> <p>These guidelines were not available and had not been provided to the municipal health office. Worth noting on this indicator was the absence of toilet facilities at Panyangara HCIII for the last one year since the previous pit latrine collapsed. Both staff and patients use open defecation (in the bush). Separation of such facilities for males and females was therefore not applicable.</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>These guidelines were not available at the Municipal Council Health Office</p>