



LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Kumi Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 787)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	2	40%
No	3	60%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	xxx	<p>Kumi Municipal Council submitted a Draft Performance Contract for FY 2017/2018 on 16th June 2017 and issued with a receipt (No. 0655) by MoFPED. Thereafter, the Final Performance Contract was submitted on 14th July 2017 as indicated on the MoFPED Submission Schedule.</p> <p>The submission of the Final Performance Contract for FY 2017/2018 was done after the mandatory deadline of 30th June 2017.</p>	No
Assessment area: Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	xxxxx	<p>Kumi Municipal Council submitted a Budget for FY 2017/2018 including a Procurement Plan for FY 2017/2018.</p>	Yes
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			

<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>XXXXX</p>	<p>The Annual Budget Performance Report for FY 2016/2017 for the Municipality was submitted on 24th August 2017 (Receipt No. 4571) issued by MoFPED.</p> <p>This was a late submission - made after the deadline of 31st July 2017.</p>	<p>No</p>
<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>All the four Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for FY 2016/2017 were submitted to MoFPED as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter One submitted on 18th November 2016 (Receipt No. 0080) issued by MoFPED. • Quarter Two submitted on 8th February 2017 (Receipt No. 0291) issued by MoFPED. • Quarter Three submitted on 16th May 2017 (Receipt No. 0718) issued by MoFPED. • Quarter Four submitted on 24th August 2017 (Receipt No. 4571) issued by MoFPED. <p>All quarterly reports were submitted late. The requirement is that quarterly reports should be submitted by the end of the following month after the end of each quarter.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kumi Municipality started in FY 2016/17. Therefore, status of audit queries for FY 2015/16 does not apply. 	<p>N/A</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>xxxxx</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualified opinion for the FY 2016/17 • Reasons for Qualifying the opinion; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Un supported adjustments in the statement of changes in equity. ii. Utilization of supplies; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Un accounted for medicines o Stock out of medicine o Expired drugs iii. Domestic Arrears iv. Outstanding receivables v. Failure to Implement Budget as approved by Parliament vi. Lack of land titles <p>Therefore, compliant.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Kumi Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 787)

Score 38/100 (38%)

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. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Physical Planning Committee is functional as evidenced by the minutes of meetings held on 24th January 2017, and 27th June 2017. • There is a Registration Book for building plans submitted for approval. However, apart from the column indicating the 'Date of submission' of the plan, there is no column for 'Date of Approval'. <p>As such, it was not possible to ascertain whether the Physical Planning Committee considers new investments on time – within 28 days.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2. 	0	<p>The Municipal Council does not have a physical development plan covering the added areas, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Division - Amejei ward, Kabata Ward, Okouba ward, and Omolokonyo Ward. • South Division - Abubur Ward, Aputon Ward, Aterai Ward, Kelim Ward, Olungia Ward, and Otipe Ward. <p>However, there is a physical development plan (2008 - 2018) for the former Kumi Town Council.</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. 	0	<p>The priorities in the Annual Work Plan for FY 2017/2018 could not be linked with the Budget Conference held during the 14th November 2016, as these were not clearly spelt out.</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>The capital investments in the Approved Annual Work Plan for 2017/2018 were derived from the approved Five-Year Development Plan (2015/2016 – 2019/2020) for Kumi MC. Refer to Municipal Development Plan - Chapter Three – Strategic Direction and Plan (Section 3.6: Summary of Sectoral Programmes / Projects – Pages 95 - 100).</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. 	1	<p>Project profiles were developed as part of the Development Plan for Kumi MC. Refer to Chapter Seven (Pages 126 – 163).</p> <p>As such, the profiles were discussed by the Technical Planning Committee as part of the development plan before it was presented to Council.</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 Annual statistical abstract for 2016/2017 was not availed.</p>

4	Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.	<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	The infrastructure projects implemented during FY 2016/2017 (as given in the Quarter Four Performance Progress Report for FY 2016/2017) were derived from the respective AWP and Budget. For instance, under Education, the projects implemented (Pages 75 - 78 of the Quarter Four Performance Progress Report 2016/2017) were derived from the Work Plans and Budget Estimates FY 2016/2017 (Page 59).
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	4	There were sixteen (16) investment projects implemented (i.e. district-level) during FY 2016/2017; and all were completed as per work plan by end of FY 2016/2017.
5	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	<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	Sixteen (16) investment projects were implemented during FY 2016/2017. All these projects were completed within approved budget of UGX 191,527,672. The overall expenditure was UGX 189,827,031. This is 99.1% of the approved budget.
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.	<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	The total budget for O&M (for all departments) for FY 2016/2017 was UGX 92,680,000, while the actual expenditure was UGX 45,434,513. This was 49.0% of the budget for O&M [as per Financial Statements for the Year Ended 30th June 2017 – Pages: 56 - 72].

Assessment area: Human Resource Management

6	<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	0	<p>Heads of department were not appraised. No performance reports were presented</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administration , Principal treasurer, municipal engineer, environment, community development officer, are acting positions • staff structure 18th august 2017 ref ARC 135/306/01
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minute extracts DSC 212/1. 5th June 2017. Minute extracts of the 7th meeting of the DSC held on 2nd June 2017. • Minute extracts of the 5th meeting of DSC held on 11th 12th and 13th April 2017 • Notification of successful applicants interviewed for various positions Ref DSC 156/3. DATED 4TH MAY 2017 • Minute extracts of the 6th meeting of DSC held on 2nd, 4th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 16th 17th and 29th may 2017 • Submission paper no 1/2016. 23rd December 2016 <p>The staff submitted to the district service commission from the municipal council were considered.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minute extracts DSC 212/1. 5th June 2017. Minute extracts of the 7th meeting of the DSC held on 2nd June 2017. • Minute extracts of the 5th meeting of DSC held on 11th 12th and 13th April 2017 • Minute extracts of the 6th meeting of DSC held on 2nd, 4th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 16th 17th and 29th may 2017 <p>The staff submitted to the DSC for confirmation from the MC were considered.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no disciplinary case. So none was forwarded to the DSC.
8	Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months	<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recruited staff accessed the payroll. The appointments of June were on the pay roll for July and August.
	Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.	<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	<p>The staff that retire have not accessed the pay roll because of various reasons like wrong dates of birth, files delayed for MOPS.</p> <p>Some files delayed with the district.</p> <p>Lack of pre – retirement training.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable. • The LG attained Municipal status in the FY 2016/17 therefore, no comparative figures for FY 2015/16 to determine increase in local revenue. Therefore, score zero.
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>Local revenue was budget at UGX 687,431,000 during FY 2016/17 but UGX 250,817,366 was realized leaving a budget shortfall of UGX 436,613,634. This translates into - 63.5%, therefore being more than - 10%.</p> <p>Therefore, zero score.</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>UGX 1,405,000 and UGX 3,860,000 was remitted on 30th May 2017 to North and South Divisions respectively being 50% remittance to the Divisions.</p> <p>Therefore, score 2.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable. • UGX 24,100,000 was spent on council expenditure during FY 2016/17 which should have been compared with 20% of local revenue for FY 2015/16. Since Kumi Municipality attained Municipal status in FY 2016/17, then the question is not applicable hence, score zero.

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 Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	0 1 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Position of Procurement officer is filled with Acting Procurement Officer and no Assistant present TEC minutes are present (7No) CC minutes are present (28No) and Contracts committee reports for the works project are in the files of the subsequent project documents. Minutes are present and there are no deviations. The Evaluation committee follows the requirements.
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"> AWP 2017/18 presented and projects planned are seen in the Procurement plan 2017/18 Procurement plan for current FY presented and signed by CAO, Procurement Officer and prepared on 25th Oct 2017 Procurement plan 2016/17 had plans like construction of 5 stance pit latrine in Atatur P/S, 5 stance pit latrine at Kelim P/S and 5 stance lined pit at Kumi P/S, 2 stance pit latrine at Kumi HC IV all seen in AWP 2016/17

14

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

0

- Advert newspapers presented for the current year bidding was dated 6th Sept 2017 beyond the 30th Aug
- Best Evaluated Bidder notice was placed on the notice board on 19th Jan 2018 far beyond the required time.

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

2

- The Contracts register is fully updated plus the current FY projects that are on-going are also included in the current contracts register.

- For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2.

2

LG follows the procurement thresholds see below:-

- Construction and Engraving a 5 stance pit latrine at Aputon P/S KMC787/wrks/16-17/00002 contract value 18,993,634 (selective bidding)
- Construction of 5 stance pit lined pit latrine at Kumi P/S KMC787/wrks/16-17/00002 contract value 18,900,000 (selective bidding)
- Partitioning board room and face lifting lighting system KMC787/wrks/16-17/00011 contract value 16,928,457 (selective bidding)
- Renovation of Administration Block KMC787/wrks/16-17/00001 contract value 9,313,410 (selective bidding)
- Construction of a wash slab at Kumi HC IV KMC787/wrks/16-17/00009 contract value 3,990,311 (selective bidding)

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"> Interim certificates presented in terms of payment certificate records of projects examples are construction of a 2 in Kumi Health centre IV dated 28th April 2017, lined VIP dated 21st Nov 2017, 02 Feb 2017 Completion certificates presented example is the construction of a 2 stance pit latrines HC IV KMC787/WRKS/2016/17/00008, Kumi P/S, Aputon P/S KMC787/WRKS/2016/17/00002,
		<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"> No site boards available for this current year.
Assessment area: Financial management				
16	<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4 	0	<p>There was no evidence of up to date monthly bank reconciliations as at the time of assessment; that is 2nd February 2018 therefore, reconciliation for the month of December 2017. The reconciliation statements available were for the period up to 30th June 2017.</p> <p>Therefore zero score.</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>There were outstanding bills as at 30th June 2017 and the following have not been settled as at the time of assessment (3rd February 2018) below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. NECO Enterprises – supply of sign post – UGX 1,400,000 ii. Good Day Holdings – Stationery – UGX 1,920,000 iii. Ofwoha Enterprises Ltd – Stationery – UGX 3,795,000 iv. ajowa – Photocopy – UGX 750,050 v. Taw-Max Civil Works – Photocopy –UGX 880,050 vi. Mbura (U) Limited – Tiling Office –UGX 557,769 vii. Corner Clerk Restaurant – Refreshments for council swearing-in –UGX 2,400,000 <p>Therefore, score zero.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the LG has a substantively appointed Internal Auditor with effect from June 2017, there was no evidence that all internal audit reports were produced during FY 2016/17. Only 3rd and 4th Quarter reports were produced as follows; • 3rd Quarter – dated 28th April 2017. • 4th Quarter – dated 28th July 2017. <p>Since only two out of four internal audit reports were produced in FY 2016/17, therefore, scores zero.</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. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence that the LG provided information to council on the implementation status of internal audit findings for the FY 2016/17. <p>Therefore, score zero.</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>Only two out of four internal audit reports were produced and submitted to the Accounting Officer and LG PAC in the FY 2016/17 as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3rd Quarter report – dated 28th April 2017 was submitted to TC and LG PAC on the same day 28th April 2017. 4th Quarter – dated 28th July 2017 was submitted to Town Clerk on 14th August 2017. Therefore, zero score.
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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assets register is available per format provided by the Accountant General but not LGAM 2007 format. Secondly, the register lacks details of the date/ year of purchase. Therefore, zero score
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 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualified audit opinion for FY 2016/17 as per Auditor General Report of December 2017. <p>Therefore, score 2.</p>
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				

21	<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2</p>	2	<p>The Council met and discussed service delivery related issues as per the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Min. C.O.U 2016/2017: Presentation and Approval of 2017/2018 Budget Estimates (Minutes of District Council meeting held 30th May 2017). • Min. C.O.U 11/3/2016/2017; Min. C.O.U 12/3/2016/2017: b; & Min. C.O.U 13/3/2016/2017: c (Minutes of District Council meeting held 21st March 2017). • Min. COU 20/2016/2017 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 24th November 2016). <p>The Assessor also noted from the Municipal Council attendance register that there was a meeting on 17th October 2016. However, no minutes were presented.</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 feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2. 	0	<p>There was no person who was designated to coordinate response to feedback (grievances / complaints).</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: • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</p>	0	<p>The Municipal Council has NOT published the LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on the public notice boards and other means due to lack of stationery.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1 	1	<p>The awarded contracts and amounts were published on the public notice board outside the Administration Block at Kumi MC headquarters.</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. The Central Government did not conduct the Annual Performance Assessment for LGs in 2016/2017.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Municipal Council did not have a website. However, there is a public notice board outside the Administration Block at the headquarters, which is utilised to display information.</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 	0	No evidence was availed to confirm that the MC communicated and explained to LLGs the guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level during FY 2016/2017.
	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	There was no documentary evidence to show that the MC conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, and radio programmes) with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation during FY 2016/2017.

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

25	<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG gender focal person has provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities score 2. 	2	<p>Guidance is present in the Gender sector including among others the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report on training Kumi political leaders on Gender based violence dated 8th Nov 2016 Report on training on gender mainstreaming issues dated 30th Nov 2017 Report on the settled children in Kumi municipal dated 18th Dec 2017 Report on youth council sensitisation training beneficially groups YLP dated 22nd Dec 2017
----	---	--	---	---

		<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"> • No municipality activities are presented for the previous year. • Only activities of UWEP have been presented
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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Environmental Officer for the municipality, the office is worked on by Physical Planner • No EIA reports presented • No EMP reports for projects presented • No screening reports for projects presented
		<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"> • The presented works and infrastructure projects all integrated ESMP involving tree planting, growing grass, present in the BOQs of bids.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No documentations are presented.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No completed Environmental Certificate form were presented



LGPA 2017/18

Educational Performance Measures

Kumi Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 787)

Score 30/100 (30%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				
1	<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 	4	<p>According to the LG Performance Contract 2017/2018, the Municipality has a wage provision of 1,650,187,000/= for the Primary School Teachers (211 teachers)</p> <p>Each of the 16 schools has at least 10 teachers and a substantive Head Teacher.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4 	4	<p>According to the Kumi Municipal Council Education staff list 2017, all 16 Government aided schools have a minimum of 10 teachers and a substantive Head Teacher</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 	0	<p>At the time of assessment, there were 211 teachers on the payroll. Meanwhile the structure for Primary teachers with a wage bill provision is 268.</p> <p>This translates into 79%</p>

3	<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	0	<p>The approved structure of the Municipality (dated 18th August 2017) has 2 positions of school inspector, i.e. Inspector of Schools (1) and Assistant Inspector of Schools (1). Both positions are not filled</p>
4	<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of Primary Teachers: score 2</p>	2	<p>The HRO presented evidence that the Education Department had submitted recruitment requirements to HRM.</p> <p>In a letter dated 21st September 2017, the Ministry of Public Service granted permission to Kumi Municipality to recruit staff including; 34 teachers (32 Education Assistants, 2 Senior Education Assistants). This was in response to a request for permission to recruit staff for Kumi Municipality for the FY 2017/2018 dated 15th August 2017</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	2	<p>The HRO presented evidence that the Education Department had submitted recruitment requirements to HRM.</p> <p>In a letter dated 21st September 2017, the Ministry of Public Service granted permission to Kumi Municipality to recruit staff including 1 Inspector of schools. This was in response to a request for permission to recruit staff for Kumi Municipality for the FY 2017/2018 dated 15th August 2017</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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The municipal council does not have substantive inspectors of schools. To recruit this financial year
		<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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MC has 16 primary schools of which 12 head teachers' performance reports were availed. That is 75%
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>There is no evidence that the Municipality has a systematic way of communicating policies, circulars and guidelines from the national level to schools.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, the Municipality presented the following circulars;</p>

Maximum 3 for this performance measure

• Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1

0

- Comprehensive review on restructuring of Local Governments dated 14th September 2016 from Ministry of Public Service;
- Primary Schools and Other Institutions Calendar, 2017 dated 18th November, 2016 from MOES;
- Confirmation of data for presentation of IPFs for FY 2017/2018 dated 14th December 2016 from MOES;
- Indicative Planning Figures for Local Governments dated 3rd January 2017 from MOFPED
- Participation in the National DEAR Day event on 15th March 2017 dated 11th January 2017 from MOES;
- Operation of Unlicensed/ Unregistered Schools dated 16th January 2017 from MOES;
- Officers in Charge of Districts and Municipalities at MOES Head Quarters dated 18th January, 2017 from MOES;
- Performance Management in the Teaching Service dated 27th January, 2017
- Uganda National Primary School Performing Arts Festival Syllabus, Circular No.5 of 2017 dated 17th February 2017 from MOES;
- Updated List of Education Institutions dated 10th March 2017 from MOES;
- Comprehensive Education and Sports Sector Data Collection Exercise dated 10th March 2017 from MOES;
- Placement of Schools / Institutions for payment of capitation grants for FY 2016/2017 dated 23rd March

				<p>2017;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary Schools National Kids Athletics and SNE Championships dated 10th April 2017 from MOES; • Teachers Support Supervision in Schools and other Institutions dated 30th June 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>In FY 2016/2017, Head Teachers in the Municipality held meetings with Municipality officials on 20th July 2016, 25th November 2016, 3rd February 2017 13th February 2017 and 3rd May 2017</p> <p>The meeting of 13th February 2017 took note of the need to give teachers tips on how to fill appraisal forms (drawn from the circular of performance management)</p> <p>The meeting of 20th July 2017 discussed submission of EMIS data (drawn from the circular on Comprehensive Education and Sports Sector Data Collection Exercise)</p> <p>The meeting of 20th July 2017 also highlighted the need to adhere to the Calendar from MOES. At this meeting, teachers were asked to obtain a copy of the school calendar (drawn from Primary Schools and Other Institutions Calendar, 2017</p>

7	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all private and public primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	3	<p>The Municipality carried out inspections in the previous FY and produced reports as follows;</p> <p>Quarter 1 report is dated 20th October 2016. The inspection which focused on monitoring of learning achievements indicates that 16 schools were inspected;</p> <p>Quarter 2 report which is dated 16th December 2016, indicates that 21 schools were inspected;</p> <p>Quarter 3 report which is dated 14th July 2017 indicated that 20 schools were visited</p> <p>Quarter 4 report was submitted electronically (E-Inspection). All the 16 Government schools were inspected</p> <p>This translates into 61% (drawn from 16 Government Aided Schools and 14 Private Schools)</p>
8	<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	0	<p>There were no minutes to show that the Department had held meetings to discuss school inspection reports</p>

		<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 	0	<p>The Directorate of Education Standards (DES) required each LG to submit 4 Quarterly inspection reports for the FY 2016/2017.</p> <p>There were two submissions to the Directorate of Education Standards seen at the time of assessment. The submissions that were made in the 1st Quarter are as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspection report on monitoring learning achievements dated 20th October 2016 • Inspection report (General Inspection) dated 29/7/2016 which was received by DES on 20/12/2016
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4 	0	There is no evidence of follow up of inspection recommendations
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 list of schools in the Municipality Education Department is consistent with OBT 2017/2018 as far as the Government schools are concerned but inconsistent with EMIS</p> <p>The list of schools in the Municipality Education Department lists 16 Government schools and 14 private schools while EMIS lists 13 Government Schools and 5 private schools. OBT lists 16 Government Schools</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	0	<p>The enrolment data in the Department has very minimal discrepancies with OBT enrolment data. The discrepancies are wider with EMIS data.</p> <p>For instance, on the list from the Department Aburbur P/S has 669 pupils, OBT lists the same number of pupils for this school. EMIS data indicates that the school has 692 pupils</p> <p>Boma North has 549 pupils on the list from the Department, 548 on OBT and 596 on EMIS</p> <p>Kelim P/S registers 500 pupils on the list in the Department, 499 on OBT and 588 on EMIS</p> <p>Bazaar Ward has 940 pupils on the list in the Department, 939 on OBT and 898 on EMIS</p> <p>Meanwhile, the number of pupils in all the 3 data sources are similar for Kumi P/S</p> <p>Kumi P/S has 966 on the list in the Department, 965 on OBT and 965 on EMIS</p>
--	--	---	---	---

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council	<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 	0	Minutes of the Education, Health and Social Services Committee WERE NOT presented to the assessor.
	Maximum 4 for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2 	0	A 'Report of Education, Health, and Social Services Committee presented to Council on 12th October 2016 ' was seen by the assessor. However, as noted earlier the minutes of the meeting were not availed.

11	<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO) • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80% schools: score 0</p>	0	<p>Each of the 16 Government aided schools has a file in the Municipality Education office. These files have several documents pertaining to the school, some of which include SMC Minutes.</p> <p>On reviewing some of the minutes, it is clear that the SMCs in the Municipality have held meetings and have discussed various issues including budget and resource matters.</p> <p>However, some of the schools are either not holding the 3 mandatory meetings per year or they are not submitting minutes to the Municipality office which is contrary to the requirements of a functional SMC. Of the 5 sampled schools, 3(60%) had held the 3 mandatory meetings and submitted minutes to the Municipality.</p> <p>For 2017, Kelim P/S submitted only 2 sets of Minutes, St. Mathias Aputon P/S, Aterai P/S and Wiggins P/S submitted 3 sets of Minutes each while Bazaar Ward P/S had not sent in a single set of Minutes to the Municipality office.</p>
12	<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</p>	3	<p>At the time of assessment, the LG had publicised all schools receiving non-wage grant for 2017/2018 on the notice board of the Municipality.</p> <p>All the schools that were sampled had the latest non-wage grants in the office of the Head Teacher</p>

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 Education Department made late submissions to PDU as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Aterai and Kabata Primary Schools at 17,500,000/= each. Submissions to PDU were made on 22/6/2017 Supply of 52, 3 seater desks at Otiye and Kelim Primary Schools at 6,592,000/=. Submission was made to PDU were made on 22/6/2017
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 are no delays in certification, recommendation, and payment of suppliers in the education sector for example, some of the major contracts in the sector during the year were;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Name of Contractor – Kumi Workers Enterprises Ltd <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Nature of Contract – Construction and engraving of 5 stance pit latrine at Kumi Primary School b. Award dated – 6th January 2017 c. Contract amount – UGX 18,990,000 d. Payment request – 28th May 2017 e. Date of Certificate – 19th June 2017 f. Payment approval – 27th June 2017 g. Payment date – 27nd June 2017 ii. Name of Contractor – Manjiya Boys (U) Ltd

			<p>a. Nature of Contract – Construction and engraving of 2 stance lined pit latrine at Boma North Primary School</p> <p>b. Award dated – 23rd March 2017</p> <p>c. Contract amount – UGX 8,294,609</p> <p>d. Contract date – 24th May 2017</p> <p>e. Payment request – 23rd June 2017</p> <p>f. Certificate date – 28th June 2017</p> <p>g. Payment approval – 30th June 2017</p> <p>h. Payment date – 30th June 2017</p> <p>Therefore, score 3.</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 	<p>0</p> <p>The Department submitted the Annual Performance Report for 2016/2017 (as well as all four quarterly reports) to the Planner. Information obtained from the department was that at the end of each quarter, the Planning Unit used to bring all heads of department together to work on the OBT Baby Files, and thereafter integrate the departmental files into the Master OBT.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the dates of the meetings were not given, and as such it could not be established whether the submission was by mid-July 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 	4	<p>No internal audit issues raised in 2nd and 3rd Quarter internal audit reports of FY 2016/17.</p> <p>Therefore, score 4.</p>
----	---	---	---	--

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

17	<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</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>There was no evidence of dissemination of guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills</p>
	<p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</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>There is no evidence of issue and explanation of guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	1	<p>The requirement of the gender composition as per the 2nd Schedule of the Education Act 2008 is at least 2 women on the Foundation Body which has a total of 6 people.</p> <p>One of the schools that was sampled, i.e. Bazaar Ward P/S, had only 4/13 women on the SMC. This particular school is a community school with no Foundation Body.</p> <p>The other 3 schools that were sampled i.e. Kumi Girls P/S, Kelim P/S and Okouba P/S met the guideline on gender composition for SMCs</p> <p>Kumi Girls P/S and Okouba P/S have 3 women and 3 men each on the Foundation Body of the SMC. Kelim P/S has 2 women and 4 men on the Foundation Body</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: 	0	<p>There is no evidence of issue of guidelines on environmental management to the schools by the Education Department in collaboration with the Environment Department</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Health Performance Measures

Kumi Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 787)

Score 15/100 (15%)

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 Municipality presented a structure of 50 health workers 10 of which not recruited and 40 already deployed. Therefore the Municipality has filled exactly 80% of Health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</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>The principle nursing officer Alice who is the acting head of Health department reported to this assessment that no recruitment plan was submitted because the process of recruitment to fill up the 10 vacant positions spilled over from FY 2016/17 and it is currently on going with interviews conducted at the District . apparently the Municipality is still using the District public service commission.</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 Municipal council has 1 health centre IV and the health facility in charge was not appraised.</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 	0	<p>A deployment list presented and 40 Health workers plus support staff Deployed but 10 health workers are yet to be recruited this year.</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>The Municipality has only on health centre called Kumi HCIV. The communication to health centres would be Kumi health centre itself. It had the guidelines.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	0	<p>One health centre and this is not applicable</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>Kumi HCIV itself is the only facility</p>
		<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY: • If 100% supervised: score 3 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	0	<p>Municipality has one Health centre. N/A</p>

7	<p>The Health Sub-district(s) have effectively provided support supervision to lower level health units</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities have been supervised by HSD and reports produced: • If 100% supervised score 6 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 4 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 2 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	0	<p>In this case since the facility was curved off from the district. It is the only facility and not supervised by any entity</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> <p>• Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</p>	0	<p>No supervisions and recommendation since the facility in only one in the municipality</p> <p>Not applicable since there were no recommendations</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>	<p>• 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</p>	0	<p>The Municipality still reporting through the District and submits reports using the district reporting system</p>
<p>Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>				

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</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 	0	<p>Minutes of the Education, Health and Social Services Committee WERE NOT presented to the assessor.</p>
	<p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	0	<p>A 'Report of Education, Health, and Social Services Committee presented to Council on 12th October 2016 ' was seen by the assessor. However, as noted earlier the minutes of the meeting were not availed.</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 	3	<p>Kumi health centre IV is a facility in the municipality and has a functioning committee of 5 women and 5 men. No sufficient evidence presented that the HUMC discussed budgets and resources although the minutes of December 2017 meeting presented by the in-charge just mentioned issues of funding gaps to the HC</p>
12	<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	0	<p>No funds published at all notice boards at the municipality</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 	0	No evidence presented
		<p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	0	No evidence presented
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	Municipality has one health facility
15	<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 2 for this performance measure</p>			<p>There are no delays in certification, recommendation, and payment of suppliers/contractors in the health sector as confirmed in 2 contracts executed in FY 2016/17 as follows;</p> <p>i. Name of Contractor – Otaaba Youth General Enterprises Ltd</p> <p>a. Nature of Contract – Construction and engraving of 2 stance pit latrine at Kumi Health Centre IV</p> <p>b. Award – 19th January 2017</p> <p>c. Contract signed – 23rd</p>

		<p>• Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points</p>	2	<p>January 2017</p> <p>d. Contract sum – UGX 9,945,795</p> <p>e. Payment request – 3rd May 2017</p> <p>f. Certificate – 28th April 2017</p> <p>g. Payment approval – 24th May 2017</p> <p>h. Payment date – 29th May 2017</p> <p>ii. Name of Contractor – Mbura (U) Limited</p> <p>a. Nature of Contract – Construction of wash slab at Kumi Health Centre IV</p> <p>b. Award dated – 6th January 2017</p> <p>c. Contract date – 20th January 2017</p> <p>d. Contract sum – UGX 3,990,311</p> <p>e. Certificate – 28th April 2017</p> <p>f. Payment approval – 24th May 2017</p> <p>g. Payment date – 25th May 2017</p> <p>Therefore, score 2.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				

16	<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>The Health Department submitted the Annual Performance Report for 2016/2017 (as well as all four quarterly reports) to the Planner. The information obtained from the department was that at the end of each quarter, the Planning Unit used to bring all heads of department together to work on the OBT Baby Files, and thereafter integrate the departmental files into the Master OBT.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the dates of the meetings were not given, and as such it could not be established whether the submission was made by mid-July 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 • If sector has no audit query score 4 • If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points • If all queries are not responded to score 0</p>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unaccounted for funds totalling UGX 725,650 at Kumi Health Centre IV – PHC account as follows; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. UGX 41,250 – URA 6% WHT – no receipt ii. UGX 12,400 – URA 6% WHT – no receipt iii. UGX 266,000 – cleaning services – 6% WHT not deducted iv. UGX 40,000 – Bickers – no receipts v. UGX 366,000 – cleaning services – 6% WHT not deducted. • There was evidence that the DHO cautioned the Accountant about failure to deduct 6% WHT on all qualifying payments. • Therefore, score 2

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 	2	Kumi HCIV has a HUMC of 50% women and 50% Men
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2 	0	No evidence presented that the Municipality issued sanitation guidelines to its only one facility
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	No evidence presented on Medical waste disposal as well