



## LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Kyenjojo District

(Vote Code: 530)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	2	33%
No	4	67%

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>LG submitted the performance contract for 2017/2018 to ministry of finance draft by 21/04/2017 as per copy of counter yellow receipt issued and final on 10/7/2017 as per ministry register, beyond 30th June</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>LG submitted budget as part of the performance contract, but no accompanying approved procurement plan was seen at the ministry of finance.</p>	No
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>LG submitted the annual performance report to ministry of finance on 1/8/2017 as per counter copy of yellow receipt issued. This is beyond the mandatory 31st July</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>LG made all quarterly submissions Q1 21/11/2016, Q2 2/3/2017, Q3 26/5/2017 and Q4 1/8/2017 to ministry of finance as per counter copies of yellow. This is beyond the mandatory 31st July</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Assessment area: Audit</p>			
<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by April 30 (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action (PFMA Act 2015; Local Governments Financial and Accounting Regulations 2007; The Local Governments Act, Cap 243).</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district submitted the report on 23/3/2017 as indicated by the stamp on the report by the office Internal Auditor Generals.</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>The report from the Auditor General for 2016/17 obtained from their offices indicated that the district is No. 46 on page 200 of the report among 146 DLGs and MCs with unqualified opinion.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Kyenjojo District

(Vote Code: 530)

Score 54/100 (54%)



3	<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual statistical abstract, with gender disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making-maximum 1 point.</li> </ul>	0	<p>Statistical Abstract 2016/17 seen with disaggregated population figures, dwelling units by sex but still incomplete. No TPC minute discussing it was seen at assessment.</p>
4	<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Projects such as Haikona-Nyabikoni road, Kyakasura-Nyabanga road, Fencing of district headquarters, retension for classrooms (Iboroga and Kyakahirwa P/Ss) are both in 2016/17 AWP as well as implemented in the same year.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	2	<p>32 projects sampled, 30 were complete and 2 not. Completion is at 93%</p>
5	<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects and assets during the previous FY</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Haikona-Nyabikoni road budget 31,400 and spent 31,400, Retension for classroom budget was 11,464 and spent 11,464, Fencing district HQs budget was 981 and spent 981, Bwenzi-Kaisamba road budget was 36,641 and spent 36,641. Hence the above within budget. Figures in 000s</p>
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>O&amp;M budget for roads maintenance in Nyakwanzi S/C and Nyabuhanwa S/C plus retension for classroom blocks totalled 142,589 and spent 148,726 which is above 80%. Figures in 000s</p>

Assessment area: Human Resource Management

6	<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>Four (4) out of the nine (9) HoDs have their appraisals done (signed performance reports) as per the personal files i.e. CFO (file no. CR/D/00363), Commercial officer, DCDO (file no. CR/D/00663) and head Natural Resources department (file no. CR/D/00664).</p>
7	<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>The CAO made submissions to DSC for recruitment 2016/17 FY through submission Letters dated 9/8/2016 ref. CR/ 160/1, 12/01/ 2017 ref. CR/153 and 19/5/2017 ref. CR/153. The submissions were considered as per the comments on the submissions made by the chairman DSC as well as the minutes of the DSC e.g. the sitting on 19/4/2017 (minute 46/2017 - 48/2017) and the sitting of 28th – 30th June 2017 (minutes 81/2017-89/2017).</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>Submissions to DSC for confirmation were made by CAO during the FY 2016/17 e.g. letters dated 20/7/ 2016, 25/7/2016, 27/2/2017, 24/4/2017 and 25/5/2017. These were considered as per the comments written on submissions by the DSC chairperson and minutes of different DSC sittings e.g. DSC sitting of 17th-22nd August 2016 (minutes 111/2016 -113/2016, 118/2016 – 126/2016, 141/2016 – 149/2016) and the sitting of 20/2/2017 (minutes 7/2017 – 10/2017) etc.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>Individual submissions for 17 disciplinary cases were made to the DSC between 28th July 2016 and 30th June 2017. They were considered by the DSC as per the comments written on the submission letters by the chairman DSC as well as the DSC minutes e.g. DSC sitting of 17th – 22nd August 2016 (minute 128/2016), sitting of 8th February 2017 (minutes 3/2017 – 4/2017) and sitting of 9th March 2017 (minutes 31/2017 – 32/2017).</p>
8	<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<p>76 staff recruited during FY 2016/17 as per the recruited staff list obtained from human resource unit. Out of these, 72 accessed payroll not later than 2 months from the time of recruitment. i.e. <math>72/76 = 94.7\%</math>. The other 4 accessed payroll between 3 -4 months after recruitment.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>During 2016/17 FY, seven (7) staff retired between 7TH January 2016 and 23rd March 2017. They accessed payroll between February and November 2017. The quickest to access payroll (Kasangaki Elly) accessed payroll after 2 months i.e. 0% accessed payroll within two months. The others accessed payroll between 6 months and 23 months.</p>
Assessment area: Revenue Mobilization				
9	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If increase in OSR from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10% : score 4 points</li> <li>If the increase is from 5 -10% : score 2 point</li> <li>If the increase is less than 5% : score 0 points.</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Actual revenue collection in 2015/16 was 192,739, 894 as compared to actual collection in 2016/17 which was 283,943,071. An increase of 91,203,117, equivalent of 47% increase.</li> </ul>

10	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10% : then 2 points. If more than +/- 10% : zero points.</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The revenue budgeted in 2016/17 was 226,180,858 the revised to 284,500,000.</li> <li>• But actual collection was 283,943,071.</li> </ul> <p>Ratio = <math>\frac{283,943,071}{226,180,858} \times 100 = 125.5 - 100 = 26\%</math></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Or Actual collection was higher than budgeted amount by <math>283,943,071 - 226,180,858 = 57,762,213</math></li> <li>• An equivalent of 26%.</li> </ul>
11	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>The district remits only LST to LLG.</p> <p>From Trial balance code 111106 collecti</p> <p>Remittance code 263104 = 48,262,500 which is less than</p> <p>65% share to LLG = <math>89,106,080 \times .65 = 57,918,952</math></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>Of the 283,943,071 OSR collected, the council has spent under code (211103) 51,515,986 on Council allowances and under code (211103) 9,574,014 on standing committees allowances = <math>61,090,000 = 22\%</math></p>
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.

- Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2

2

The Senior and Procurement Officers are in Place:

Evidence

1. Principal Procurement Officer: DSC Minute 531/2016, dated 25th April 2016.
2. Senior Procurement Officer Ref: CR/156/7 dated 29th April 2011 DSC minute 88/2011, CAO's Letter Stamped
3. Procurement Officer:
  - a. Appointment Letter Assistant Procurement Officer DSC Minute 513/2016, dated 14th April 2016 CAO Appointment letter
  - b. Confirmation in Service DSC Min92/2016, dated 10th June 2016, CAOs letter
  - c. Assignment of Duty as Procurement Officer dated 3rd January 2018, CAO's letter

- Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1

1

TEC Reports are based on list of projects/Procurements. Sampled files:

- TEC Report dated 14th /10/2016- Kyey530/Wrks/2016-17/00003: Construction of Classroom Block with Office and Store at Kyakahirwa P/s: M/s Bropesham Professional Engineering Contractor (U) LTD 3 members Education, District Engineer and Head PDU evaluated the bid, cost 61,105,200UGX. Page 3
- Kyey530/Servs/2016-17/000013, Consultancy services for the design of piped water system Kyanyegaramire trading centre Sub County Under RWDG, 70,929,000 UGX, Hydroware Resource LTD, 5 evaluators, dated 6th February 2017 page 9.
- Keyn/530/Supls/2016-17/00011: Supply and Delivery of a double cabin pick up for Education Department, 132,825,000 UGX, MAC East Africa LTD TEC report Dated 14th /10/2016 page 32/33

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>DCC approved the TEC recommendation of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kyen/530/Servs/2016/2017/00001 Lot1, Drilling and Installation of eight (08) deep borehole with hand a hand pump. Min 073/Kyen/05/2016/2017 (c ) Cost 150,571,375 UGX Royal Techno Industries LTD. TEC revived 7 Bids and 4 reached the Financial Evaluation and Bid No.022 was recommended to CC as above.</li> <li>• CC minute 060/Kyen/05/2016/2017 (g), Kyen/530/Servs/2016-2017/00011 Sighting and Survey of 7 Borehole Lot 1, dated 6th October 2016 TEC recommendation 3 Bidder Evaluated, Hydroware Resource LTD BID No.2 Recommended below the reserve price.</li> </ul>
13	<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>DPP FY 2016/17 CR/105/5 dated 1th April 2016, CAO's Stamped and Received PPDA 17th May 2016, MoLG and MoFPED with 96 Infrastructure projects. DPP 201/18 dated 13th July 2017 CAO's Stamp submitted stamped received 27th July 2017bMoFPED, PPDA &amp; MoLG with 116 Infrastructure projects.</p> <p>Test of Adherence  Kyen/530/Supls/2016-17/00013 Supply of Fish feeds, Floating Fish fry and Fish Nets, S&amp;S General Supply LTD, 11,980,000UGX  Plan dates Vs Actual Dates  Bid Invitation Date 11th /7/2016 Vs 9th September 2016  Bid Opening 22nd July 2016 Vs 27th /09/2016  TEC Report 29th July 2016 Vs 4th October 2016  Award Notice 12th /08/2016 Vs 24th /10/2016 CAO's Letter  Tests of adherence show variation or deviation</p>

14

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

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

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

0

2

2

116 Investment and Infrastructure projects FY 2017/18

Bid Documents tested were produced by 29th September 2017

- Late initiation by User departments
- Bid documents are all in file
- Issue of funds releases brings in uncertainty by the user department thus the delay

The Districts has Kyenjojo District Local Government Procurement Contract Register, Started in FY 2016/17, manual entry book page 1-79 updated 2017/18 page 1-33

National Bidding Above 50 million  
Kyen/530/Servs/2016/2017/00001 Lot1, Drilling and Installation of eight (08) deep borehole with hand a hand pump. Min 073/Kyen/05/2016/2017 (c) Cost 150,571,375 UGX Royal Techno Industries LTD  
Selective Bidding 30 million  
Kyen/530/Supl/2016-17/00013 Supply of Fish feeds, Floating Fish fry and Fish Nets, S&S General Supply LTD, 11,980,000UGX  
Micro Bidding 1 Million  
Procurement of a self-inking stamped 13th /11/2017, Holland Engravers, 1,000,000 UGX

15	<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Kyen/530/Works/2016-17/00004 Construction of a 2 classroom Block with Office and Store at Butiiti Boys P/S, 62,500,000UGX, M/s Katooke United Agencies LTD Certificate 3 dated: 2nd may 2017 attached inspection Report. Asst Engineering Officer, Completion Certificate dated 7th August 2017.</p> <p>Kyen/530/Works/2016-17/00003: Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Kyakahirwa P/S, Completion Certificate dated 30th January 2017 Commissioning letter by District Engineers dated 3rd February 2017</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>Only Road works have provision for signage's in the BOQs the Rest of infrastructure projects do not have site boards provision</p>
Assessment area: Financial management				
16	<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bank reconciliations are done on monthly basis as verified from General Fund and Treasury Single Accounts the cash books presented by the CFO on 13/1/2018 and 15/1/2018 respectively.</li> </ul>
17	<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2.</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no payment claim register and could not easily verify overdue bills</li> </ul>

18

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.

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

3

- There is a substantially appointed Senior Internal Auditor by the District Service Commission minute No. DSC.278/215 and effective date of appointment is 4/5/2015.

- All quarterly reports produced

Quarter 1 on 8/12/2016

Quarter 2 on 28/2/2017

Quarter 3 on 27/5/2017

Quarter 4 on 8/9/2017

- Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries: score 2.

0

Although reports were produced and distributed as below, evidence of status of implementation was not provided.

Secretary PAC, CAO, LCV, and RDC as shown on the delivery book.

Quarter 1 on 8/10/2016

Quarter 2 on 30/1/2017

Quarter 3 on 30/4/2017

Quarter 4 on 12/10/2017

PAC has one report for quarter 1 & 2 but lacked minutes to back it up

- 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

submissions quarterly Internal Audit reports were made as follows:

Secretary PAC, CAO, LCV, and RDC as shown on the delivery book.

Quarter 1 on 8/10/2016

Quarter 2 on 30/1/2017

Quarter 3 on 30/4/2017

Quarter 4 on 12/10/2017.

No evidence of follow up was presented.

19	<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Assets register though in place, the one in the IFMIS cannot be printed. The system does not allow for the values to be entered. Values for the road equipment from ministry of works not provided.</li> </ul>
20	<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>unqualified audit opinion: score 4</li> <li>Qualified: score 2</li> <li>Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kyenjojo District local government obtained unqualified opinion as reflected in the Auditor General Report on page 200 and No. 46 from the list.</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				
21	<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2</p>	2	<p>Council sitting 22/05/2017 discussed and approved budget estimates 2017/18 min.64.KJD/COU/05/2016/17, also discussed and approved supplementary budget 2016/17 min.63.KJD/COU/05/2016/17. Council 27/4/2017 discussed and approved multi sectoral nutrition plan 2016/17-19/2020 min.50.KJD/COU/04/2016/17. Also among others discussed capacity building plan, Revenue enhancement plan, AWP 2017/18 and HIV/AIDS strategic plan.</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"> <li>Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2.</li> </ul>	0	<p>No person has been designated yet.</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	2	Jan 2018 payroll seen on main notice board. Also veterans to access pension / gratuity 30/9/2016.
	Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1	1	Best evaluated bidder notice dated 19/01/2018 on procurement notice board indicating award /contract amounts eg. Supply of KTB Hives by S&S general suppliers at 7,920,000/= , supply of surveying equipment by Peak Partners at 34,704,800/=
		• 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	N/A.
24	The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens	• 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	Distribution and dissemination of DDEG guidelines and IPFs and budgeting figures to S/Cs dated 6/4/2017 signed by selected sub county chiefs.
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	• Evidence that LG during previous FY has conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc..) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1.	0	No evidence of conducting barazas, radio programmes etc..) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity at assessment.
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				

<p>25</p>	<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"> <li>Evidence that the LG gender focal person has provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p>Kyenjojo DLG Second 5-year Development Plan 2015/16-2019/2020 District Situational Gender Analysis Page 31-41, dated February 2015. Project Profiles per sector FY 2016/17 page 1-26 has no gender concerns in the projects</p> <p>Report on Gender mainstreaming, 31st July 2017 by the Gender Focal Person List of Worker on Road Construction appended.</p> <p>Minute of the DTC 29th May 2017 Minute 079/DTPC/2016/2017 showing Sector and Town council reports showing approval of YLP/UWEP projects. In addition, YLP Recommended project to MoGLSD December 2016, Report on YLP to the Hon Minister of Gender labour and Social Development, dated 15th August 2017 progress report.</p> <p>Community Development Standing Committee of Council Report to District Council dated 14th December 2017,</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that gender focal point has planned activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and that more than 90% of previous year's budget for gender activities has been implemented: score 2.</li> </ul>		<p>Current FY Budget Provisions on Gender Mainstreaming Vide vote 530, Proposed Activities under Budget estimates are on Page 83 total Allocation 309,260,270UGX, local revenue is 3,000,000UGX, dated 31st May 2017</p> <p>Previous FY AWP 2016/17 for Activities implemented: Outputs page 9/12, Previous Budget in AWP 7,900,000UGX and Total Expenditure per vouchers FY 2016/17 Amounts to 7,947,728 UGX a 100.6% utilisation</p>

26	<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Seen Project Profiles per sector FY 2016/17 page 1-26. showing Environmental concerns and Mitigation measures</p> <p>Screening only done on 6 DDEG projects found in DDEG AWP 2016/17 and 2017/18, dated 24/08/2017 with 6 Construction works. It has Environment Management Plan dated 7th November 2017 by Senior Environments Officers.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>No Evidence provided by the Environment Officer</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>No Evidence provided by the Environment Officer or the Lands Officer</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>No Evidence provided by the Environment Officer</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Educational Performance Measures

Kyenjojo District

(Vote Code: 530)

Score 59/100 (59%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				
1	<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the list of schools and staff list from performance contract pg 19-20, department has 128 schools and budgeted for 1192 teachers. This leads to an average of 9 teachers per school.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the staff list LG deployed a head teacher in each school.</li> <li>But a minimum of a teacher per class is not applicable. Example; some schools are below the thresholds, like Nsanja p.7 school has 3, Nyamyez p.7 school has 3, Rajuma P7 has – 4, Mabale P.7 has 6 teachers.</li> </ul>
2	<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision o If 100% score 6 o If 80 - 99% score 3 o If below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The approved structure is 1,582 teachers, but currently the wage bill can only allow 1,138 teachers.</li> <li><math>1138/1582 * 100 = 72\%</math></li> </ul>

3	<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6</li> </ul>	6	<p>Basing on the staff list indicates 4 school inspectors dully filled; (DIS, 2 area inspectors, special needs)</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruitment plan for P/s teachers; Communication letter from Permanent secretary MOPS; REF: CR/151/1, dated 14/1/2017, advised to recruit teachers in FY 2017/18 using wage bill for 2016/17.</li> </ul>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of School Inspectors: score 2</p>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No recruitment plan for school inspectors because all posts are filled up.</li> </ul>
5	<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY • 100% school inspectors: score 3</p>	0	<p>The District has four (4) school inspectors including the DIS. Three (3) have their appraisal s done as per the personal files. One Kabanyoro Stella has no evidence of appraisal on her file (no.CR/D/10712) i.e. 75% appraisal done.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised head teachers during the previous FY. • 90% - 100%: score 3 • 70% - 89%: score 2 • Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<p>All the 10 sampled head teachers had no evidence of appraisal (performance agreements and reports) completed and endorsed by their supervisors (Sub-County Chief and DEO) i.e. 0% appraisal done.</p>

Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection

6	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	1	<p>Copies of circulars reviewed from DEOs circular file and also found at sampled schools, include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School feeding program in education institution; dated 15/5 2017, received and signed on 22/6/2017.</li> <li>• Teachers support supervision tool for primary and secondary schools from DES – MOES seen disseminated.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through general meetings, department communicates at every beginning and end of term to all head teachers.</li> <li>• All private schools meeting on 15/11/2017; Disseminating processes of registration and licensing. (50 private head teachers signed attendance)</li> <li>• Briefing for PLE officials, head teachers, invigilators and supervisors; dated on 22/10/2017.</li> </ul>
7	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all private and public primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all private and public primary schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: 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.</li> </ul>	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG has 128 government schools and 143 private schools registered with the department, totalling to 271.</li> <li>• School Inspection coverage for 2017 was 240 schools (sampled term 1)</li> <li>• <math>240/271 * 100 = 89\%</math></li> </ul>

LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations

Maximum 10 for this performance measure

- 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

- Inspection reports in department meeting Minute book, Min. no. 2b/2017 on 31/1/2017, Subject: 15 Errant Teachers should write apology.

- Followed up with Meeting inviting errant teachers (23 teachers summoned) on 15/8/2017.

- 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

- Acknowledgement note, DES, Form 4, dated 24/8/2017; Inspection reports acknowledgement note, FY 2017/18. Received by secretary – 0782614358.

- DES chart of records confirm all 4 quarter reports 2017/18, received.

- Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4

4

- Inspection Report on acts of misconduct and insubordination by teacher dated 21/7/2017.

- Incidence followed up: DEOs letter inviting a teacher for disciplinary committee at 9.00 am, on 15/8/2017, signed by SEO.

9	The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5</li> </ul>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DEOs EMIS data report 2017/18 indicates 128 govt schools and 143 private schools, totalling to 271, which are consistent with MOES records .</li> </ul>
	Maximum 10 for this performance measure	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EMIS report on enrolment of pupils from DEOs office has 34,312 females and 34,594 males totalling to 68,906 as opposed to 6,869 pupils in govt schools as indicated in the performance contract 2017/18, pg 19-20.</li> </ul>

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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	2	Committee for education, health and sports sitting 15/2/2017 discussed and passed the sector annual operational plan 2017/18, as well as discussing sectoral performance reports. The formatting and organisation of minutes needs improvement though.
	Maximum 4 for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	2	Committee presented multi sectoral nutrition plan 2016/17-19/20 which covered even nutrition issues even for school going children to council of 27/4/2017 which was approved under min.50.KJD/COU/04/2016/17.

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>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No single SMC file or report submission seen in DEOs office, However;</li> <li>• Basing on the sampled schools; All SMCs are functional and members were appointed.</li> <li>• Out of the sampled schools; 2/3 had meetings in term I, II, &amp; III.</li> <li>• All discussed resource issues especially when UPE releases are disbursed.</li> </ul>
12	<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No display of schools receiving UPE grants seen at the LG notice boards</li> <li>• However, in all schools sampled, Capitation grants were displayed in head teacher's office.</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				
13	<p>The LG Education department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement requisitions for construction of classrooms, Latrines and staff houses for FY 2017/18 were signed by DEO on 10/8/2017 and submitted and received PDU on 13/9/2017.</li> <li>• Submissions are within the time lines.</li> </ul>

14	<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	3	<p>Construction of 2 class room blocks with office and store at Butiiti Boys primary school at Butiiti Sub County worth 62,500,000 by Katooke United Agencies Ltd.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contract date: 10/11/2017</li> <li>• Certificate No.3 2/5/2017</li> <li>• Payment date: 12/6/2017</li> <li>• Voucher No PV-ED00212</li> </ul>
----	---	---	---	---

Assessment area: Financial management and reporting

15	<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>Q1 18/11/2016, Q2 13/02/2017, Q3 25/05/17 and Q4 31/7/2017 as verified from planner's computer records. This is beyond mid-July.</p>
----	--	--	---	---

16	<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</li> <li>o If sector has no audit query score 4</li> <li>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</li> <li>o If all queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	0	<p>No evidence of implementation of audit issues raised were presented. Eg Quarter 1 there was unaccounted for UPE funds of 23,034,075</p>
----	---	--	---	--

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

<p>17</p> <p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc...: Score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attended district engagement meeting and training on menstruation hygiene management for DEOs, Head teachers and Senior women/ men teachers, from, 15-17/2/2017, in the districts of Western region. Signed by PS/ST MOES.</li> <li>• Guidelines on; Understanding and managing menstruation 2013, were provided by UKAID.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through gender guidelines from MOES, Toilets stances for girls, with changing shower rooms in sampled schools were seen separate and well labelled, and also ramps for PWDs included on all constructions.</li> <li>• Forums like; Kyenjojo district status report on adolescent girls; with a strategic objective of healthy and productive population; dated 12/10/2017 were held to create awareness.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All SMCs are gender sensitive; it is mandatory to have 2 or more female members out of 6 founding members. Example Kayihura p/s has 5/12, Rwamukoora has 3/12, and Nyantungo 3/12 members are females.</li> </ul>

18	<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 3:</li></ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No guidelines on environment seen</li></ul>
----	--	---	---	---



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Health Performance Measures

Kyenjojo District

(Vote Code: 530)

Score 56/100 (56%)

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>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Local Government Performance contract 2017/18 FY submitted by CAO on 30th June 2017 and signed by Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic development on 1st Aug 2017; Pages 17 -18 provide for PHC wage 8,537,496,000</li> <li>The district through advert Number 2/2017 advertised for 18 vacant posts in health. Shortlisting is currently being done.</li> </ul> <p>The approved structure of the district is 454 PHC workers with 372 currently in post. Those planned for recruitment is 18</p> <p>% filled <math>390/454=85.9\%</math></p>
2	<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 4</p>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The recruitment plan is dated 4th Aug 2017 is an annex of the Local Government Performance contract and provides for 18 vacancies in health for FY 2017/18</li> </ul>

3	<p>The LG Health department has ensured that performance appraisal for health facility in charge is conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the health facility in-charge have been appraised during the previous FY: o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<p>The District has one (1)) HCIV i.e. Kyarusenzi HCIV and one (1) Hospital i.e. Kyenjojo General Hospital. The In charge of Kyarusenzi HCIV has appraisal done for the period 1//7/2016 to 30/6/207 as per the personal file while the in charge of the hospital has was last appraised 2014 ( file no.CR/D/00173) i.e. 50% appraisal done.</p>
4	<p>The Local Government Health department has equitably deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers equitably, in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current staff list has 372 health staff in post; all the 18 Public and 10 Private not for Profit health facilities have at least one qualified staff deployed.</li> <li>The budget of the current FY is 3,045,296,340 for PHC.</li> <li>The staff are deployed as stated in the staff list</li> </ul>

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"> <li>Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<p>No communication letters were seen nor minutes of DHT meetings on circulars and guidelines. The following guidelines were seen at DHOs office Uganda Clinical guidelines; practical guidelines for dispensing at lower health centres; new HIV/AIDS treatment guidelines; approaches to medical waste management; Health service commission client charter.</p> <p>Guidelines on sanitation and approaches to medical waste management were not found in the health facilities visited e.g. Butiiti HCIII, Villa Maria Kaihura HC</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DHT meetings are irregular and the minutes not available because the secretary is reportedly on leave.</li> </ul>
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is one HCIV and the support supervision reports were not seen nor minutes of DHT meeting. According to DHO the reports and minutes are attached as part of accountability to finance. Copies are not available at DHOs office</li> </ul>
		<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>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only 60 % of the health facilities are supervised. The minutes available are dated 22nd March 2017.</li> </ul>

7	<p>The Health Sub-district(s) have effectively provided support supervision to lower level health units</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities have been supervised by HSD and reports produced: • If 100% supervised score 6 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 4 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 2 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support supervision log books are available and show monthly supervision by the HSD with support from Baylor Uganda.</li> <li>• In Butiiti HC the support supervision was conducted on 4th July 2016;26th Aug 2016;23rd Sept 2016;3rd Oct 2016;3rd Nov 2016;6th Dec 2016;2nd Jan 2017;1st Feb 2017;18th May 2017;21st June 2017</li> </ul>
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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>The support supervision reports and Minutes of DHT meetings are not available at the time of assessment</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</li> </ul>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The support supervision log books at the health facility show recommendations and actions followed up by the DHT.</li> </ul> <p>some of the recommendations and actions followed up include redistribution of supplies from overstocked facilities to those with shortages,training of in charges in governance,leadership and management,renovations of health facilities , provision of water to health facilities, introduction of decentralised service delivery models for HIV/AIDS services</p>

9	<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for health facility lists as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All the 28 health facilities in OBT/PBS are similar to the HMIS reporting list.</li> <li>The 28 Health facilities report monthly and completely to MOH</li> </ul>
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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	2	<p>Committee for education, health and sports sitting 15/2/2017 discussed and passed the sector annual operational plan 2017/18, as well as discussing sectoral performance reports. The formatting and organisation of minutes needs improvement though.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Discussed and presented for approval the HIV/AIDS strategic plan 2015/16-2019/20 in council of 12/12/2016 which was approved</p>
11	<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 5 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5</li> <li>If 80-99% : score 3</li> <li>If 70-79%: : score 1</li> <li>If less than 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some facilities e.g. Butiiti HC held 4 mandatory HUMC meetings as per minutes of 25th July 2016;26th Nov 2016;12th Dec 2016;7th April 2017. However some health facilities held less HUMC meetings.</li> </ul>

12	<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG website is non-active; DHO has not published the health facilities receiving PHC non-wage for 2017/18 FY.</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				
13	<p>The LG Health department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2</li> </ul> <p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	2	<p>The health sector procurement requests are on pages 3-4 of the consolidated district procurement plan.</p> <p>These requests were submitted on 27th July 2017 to PDU</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"> <li>Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>100% - score 8</li> <li>70-99% – score 4</li> <li>Below 70% - score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	4	<p>Only 16 health facilities out of 28 were allocated funds or supplies from NMS. The acknowledgement letter from NMS is dated 1st July 2017.</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>	<p>• Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points</p>	0	<p>Construction of Medical Store at Kyejojo Head District Quarter Phase 1 worth 44,098,358 by Donee of Code Contractors Ltd.</p> <p>Contract date 28/10/2016</p> <p>Certificate No. 2 23/6/2017</p> <p>Payment date 24/6/2017</p> <p>Voucher No. PV-WK01350</p> <p>DHO was not involved in certification and initiation of payment</p>
----	--	---	---	--

Assessment area: Financial management and reporting

16	<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• 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</p>	0	<p>Q1 17/11/2016, Q2 13/02/2017, Q3 24/5/2017 and Q4 30/7/2017 as per planner's computer records. This is beyond mid-July.</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	<p>DHO responded to the queries on 28/8/2017, Ref: MED 101/2 and on 17/3/2017, Ref: MED/101/1</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"> <li>• Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>The minutes of the HUMC e.g in Butiiti HC show female representation as per the guidelines. The MOH guidelines for HUMC is not explicit on number of men or female in the committee. At least it must have female representation and the total number of HUMC members varies because of the grade of the health facility and the number of parishes it serves since the members are drawn from each parish</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidelines on sanitation were not found at the DHO nor in the health facilities visited e.g. Butiiti HC and Villa Maria Kaihura HC</li> <li>• In these facilities the toilets are used interchangeably between male and female patients because they are not labelled.</li> </ul>
19	<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LGs has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal : score 2 points.</li> </ul>	0	<p>Guidelines on medical waste management were not found at the health facilities visited e.g. Butiiti HC and Villa Maria Kaihura HC</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Kyenjojo District

(Vote Code: 530)

Score 65/100 (65%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: score 10</p>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11 sub-counties are below Kyenjojo's average coverage estimated to be 80% as of end-June 2017</li> <li>• The low-coverage sub-counties are Bufunjo (53%), Bugaaki (51%), Butiiti (69%), Butunduzi (28%), Katooke (46%), Kihuura (59%), Kisojo (63%), Kyarusenzi (51%), Nyabuharwa (45%), Nyantungo (74%) and Kigaraale (39%)</li> <li>• Review of the FY 2017/18 workplan and budget showed all the 11 sub-counties have been targeted for WSS investments as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Bufunjo: Construction of Kanyegaramire piped WSS Phase I; two deep boreholes due for rehabilitation</li> <li>o Bugaaki: one new borehole; two due for rehabilitation</li> <li>o Butiiti: two boreholes due for rehabilitation</li> <li>o Butunduzi: two boreholes due for rehabilitation</li> <li>o Katooke: one new borehole; two due for rehabilitation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Kihuura: two boreholes due for rehabilitation</li> <li>o Kisojo: one new borehole; two due for rehabilitation</li> <li>o Kyarusenzi: two new boreholes; two due for rehabilitation</li> <li>o Nyabuharwa: two boreholes due for rehabilitation</li> <li>o Nyantungo: two boreholes due for rehabilitation</li> <li>o Kigaraale: one new borehole; one due for rehabilitation</li></ul>
--	--	--	--

2	<p>The LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY: score 15</li> </ul>	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly progress reports for FY 2016/17 were assessed, and they showed all the low-coverage sub-counties were catered for as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Bufunjo: one new borehole; four rehabilitated</li> <li>o Bugaaki: one new borehole; three rehabilitated</li> <li>o Butiiti: three boreholes rehabilitated</li> <li>o Butunduzi: six boreholes rehabilitated</li> <li>o Katooke: three boreholes rehabilitated</li> <li>o Kihuura: one rehabilitated</li> <li>o Kisojo: one new borehole; three rehabilitated</li> <li>o Kyarusenzi: one new borehole; three rehabilitated</li> <li>o Nyabuharwa: two boreholes; four rehabilitated</li> <li>o Nyantungo: one new borehole; five rehabilitated</li> <li>o Kigaraale: one new borehole; three rehabilitated</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision				
3	The LG Water			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Five major WSS</li> </ul>

department carries out monthly monitoring and supervision of project investments in the sector

Maximum 15 points for this performance measure

Evidence that the LG Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually. • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15 • 80 - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10 • 70 - 79%: score 7 • 60 - 69% monitored: score 5 • 50 - 59%: score 3 • Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored -score 0

7

projects have been realized in the recent past as follows:

- o Construction of 3-stance lined VIP latrine at Kitongole by Unitech

- o Siting, drilling and installation of 15 No. deep boreholes – 14 No. with hand-pumps and one motorized by Sumadhura Technologies Ltd and Royal Technologies Ltd

- o Design of Kanyegaramire piped WSS to serve Bufenjo sub-county

- o Rehabilitation of 30 No. deep boreholes and 20 No. shallow wells by Kyenjojo Hand Pump Mechanics Association

- Implementation monitoring reports for aforesaid WSS projects were reviewed as follows :

- o Final Inspection Report by Borehole Maintenance Technician dated June 21, 2017: covered rehabilitation of 8 No. shallow wells

- o Report on boreholes and shallow wells rehabilitated in FY 2016/16 dated August 28, 2017

- o Status report dated May 5, 2017: evaluated progress of drilling and installation of deep

				<p>boreholes by Royal Technologies Ltd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 out of 4 construction Projects: 75%</li> </ul>
4	<p>The LG Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kyenjojo LG intends to undertake six major WSS projects during FY 2017/18: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Construction of 3-stance lined VIP latrine – UGX 15.4m</li> <li>o Drilling of 6 No. deep boreholes (hand-pumps) – UGX 138m</li> <li>o Drilling of one motorized deep borehole – UGX 25m</li> <li>o Rehabilitation of 17 No. boreholes – UGX 37.7m</li> <li>o Rehabilitation of 8 No. shallow wells – UGX 16m</li> <li>o Construction of Kanyegaramire piped WSS Phase I – UGX 234m</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The above list is consistent with MWE’s MIS records for district WSS facilities FY 2017/18</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				

5	<p>The LG Water department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement requests for the projects cited in performance measure No.4 were submitted on the following dates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 3-stance lined VIP latrine – August 8, 2017</li> <li>o Drilling of 7 No. deep boreholes – August 10, 2017</li> <li>o Rehabilitation of 17 No. boreholes and 8 No. shallow wells - September 7, 2017</li> <li>o Construction of piped WSS – August 10, 2017</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The PDU records confirmed submission of the PRs was beyond the stipulated time (April 30)</li> </ul>
6	<p>The DWO has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the DWO prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DWO is on study leave, and his Assistant acts as contract manager for WSS projects</li> <li>• Documentation and field assessment suggest harmony among the water department, contractors and supervising consultants</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field assessment was conducted on January 31, 2018 for select WSS projects; i.e., deep boreholes and public sanitation facilities</li> <li>• Details of visited projects are provided in subsequent sections; it was established all the facilities were built as per designs</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the field assessments, it was established the WSS projects are functional, and user committees are handling O&amp;M issues properly</li> </ul>

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

2

• The DWO prepared completion reports and issued interim certificates for the assessed WSS projects. Certified works included:

o Construction of 3-stance VIP latrine at Kitongole – Unitech Engineering (final inspection and certificate February 9, 2017 – UGX 15.3m)

o Rehabilitation of 10 No. boreholes and 6 No. shallow wells – Kyenjojo Hand Pump Mechanics Association (final inspection and certificate April 12, 2017 – UGX 26m)

o Rehabilitation of 10 No. boreholes and 6 No. shallow wells – Kyenjojo Hand Pump Mechanics Association (final inspection and certificate June 22, 2017 – UGX 29m)

o Drilling and installation of 7 No. deep boreholes – Sumadhura Technologies (final inspection and certificate June 8, 2017 – UGX 127.2m)

7

• Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points

• Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points

3

• Two contracts sampled prove that the DWO certified and initiated payments in time.

1) Drilling and installation of 7 deep boreholes with hand pumps including 1 production Borehole in selected Sub Counties in the district worth 127,186,866 by Sunadhura Technologies Ltd

• Contract date 16/10/2016

• Certificate 1: 8/6/2017

• Payment date 23/6/2017

• voucher No.PV-WK01330

2) Consultancy Services for design of piped water systems at Kanyegaramire Trading Centre in Kanyegaramire Sub County worth 70,929000 by Hydroware Resources Ltd

• Contract date 13/3/2017

• Certificate No 2: 20/6/2017

• Payment date 22/6/2017

• voucher No.PV-WK01306

8	<p>The LG Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5</li> </ul>	0	<p>Q1 15/11/2016, Q2 13/02/2017, Q3 23/05/2017 and Q4 31/7/2017 as per planner's computer records. This is beyond mid-July</p>
9	<p>LG Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 5 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 If queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	0	<p>No evidence of implementation of audit issues raised were presented. Eg Quarter 2 there was unaccounted for fuel advance of 2,600,000</p>

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>Works and water sectoral committee in place but minutes missing. Only set for 18/05/2017 seen and discussed sectoral reports and implementation plan 2017/18. The formatting and organisation of minutes requires serious improvement.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<p>Committee did not present anything to council for approval.</p>	

11

The LG Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency

- The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2

0

- Neither is the annual workplan/budget nor development releases displayed on district notice boards

Maximum 6 points for this performance measure

- All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2

0

- Field assessment conducted on January 29, 2017 established some WSS facilities lack details of contractors and source of funding:

- o Borehole #1 – Village: Kichwamba; MWE/DWD No.: 53502; Funder and Contractor: Missing; Date: 4.06.2017

- o Borehole #2 – Village: Kikorongo; MWE/DWD No.: 60389; Funder and Contractor: Missing; Date: 17.01.2017

- o Borehole #3 – Village: Kakikumbu; MWE/DWD No.: 52009; Contractor: ICON Projects; Funder: RWSG; Date: FY 2014/15

- o Borehole #3 – Village: Kakikumbu; MWE/DWD No.: 52009; Contractor: ICON Projects; Funder: RWSG; Date: FY 2014/15

- o Public Sanitation Facility – RGC: Kitongole; Funder: RWSG; FY: 2016/17; Contractor: Unitech Engineering

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the time of assessment, the district notice board had the following WSS-related info: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Pre-qualification of firms for latrine construction and drilling supervision consultancy services</li> <li>o Evaluation results for Construction of Kanyegaramire WSS: Ortis Engineering was awarded the contract (UGX 34.4m)</li> <li>o Invitation for selective bidding for Construction of 2 No. Shallow</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The notices were posted on January 19, 2018</li> </ul>
12	<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community applications on file included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Kyarusura LC I, March 11, 2015; subject: new shallow well</li> <li>o Muhikiro Village, February 22, 2015; subject: borehole</li> <li>o Nyamirundi Village, October 15, 2015; subject: shallow well</li> <li>o Kigugu Village, November 12, 2015; subject: shallow well</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O&amp;M funds and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, for the current FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Functionality of water sources and user committees is evaluated annually, and data is disaggregated to sub-county level</li> <li>• Average functionality of water sources is estimated at 85%</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---	---

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

13	The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence of environmental screening was availed</li> </ul>
	Maximum 4 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence of environmental certification was availed</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contracts for both drilling and rehabilitation of deep boreholes provide for environmental protection of sites</li> </ul>
14	The LG Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.  Maximum 3 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If at least 50% WSCs are women as per the sector critical requirements: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Composition of user committees for assessed sources could not be established as the Water Department was yet to update records of the same</li> </ul>

15	<p>Gender- and special-needs sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/RGCs.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 3-stance lined public toilet serving Kitongole RGC is sex-separated and has ramps to enable access by PWDs</li> <li>• Limitation of funds was cited for restricting the local government to a handful of public sanitation facilities</li> </ul>
----	--	--	---	---