



LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Kyotera District

(Vote Code: 621)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	1	50%
No	1	50%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	xxx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rakai DLG had submitted to MoFPED a Final Performance Contract for Kyotera DLG for FY 2017/18 on 7th/7/2017 and a Draft on 18th/05/2017. 	No
Assessment area: Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	xxxxx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rakai DLG had submitted to MoFPED a Budget for Kyotera DLG for FY 2017/18 that included a Procurement plan on 18th/05/2017. 	Yes
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			
<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	xxxxx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable. There was no evidence of submission of Annual Performance Report for FY 2016/17 by Kyotera DLG to MoFPED because the DLG became operational only in FY 2017/18. 	N/A

<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>• Not applicable. There was no evidence of submission of all 4 Quarterly reports for FY 2016/17 to MoFPED because Kyotera DLG became operational only in FY 2017/18</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Assessment area: Audit</p>			
<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by April 30 (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action (PFMA Act 2015; Local Governments Financial and Accounting Regulations 2007; The Local Governments Act, Cap 243).</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>The LG was established on 1st July 2017. The submission of the status of implementation of the internal audit findings for the FY 2015/16 is therefore not applicable.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>The District LG was established with effect from 1st July 2017. By the time of audit of LGs by the OAG, the district was not yet in place to be audited.</p>	<p>N/A</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Kyotera District

(Vote Code: 621)

Score 19/100 (19%)

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"> • District Physical Planning committee was formally constituted by CAO in communication dated 8th/08/2017 under ref. no.CR/214/1. • One set of Committee minutes for 15th/11/2017 was reviewed, where applications for titling and subdivisions, and complaints regarding physical developments were considered. In the same meeting building plans for Junju Joldan, Agaba Charles and Emoi Isaac were approved; while that for Muwonge Innocent for proposed maize mill in a residential area was rejected. • Registration book was in place. • Though some building plans had been approved within 28 days of submission others had been considered much after and others such as for Ninshaba Moses and Zalwango Tina both submitted on 18/10/2017 had not been considered for non-payment of fees.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District physical development plan was not in place. Out of the 5 TCs in the District (Mutukula, Kalisizo, Kyotera, Kasaari and Kasensero) only one (Mutukula TC) had an approved PDP 2009-2019. • In Mutukula TC all the three investments sampled had approved building plans and the land use matched what was prescribed for that area in the PDP. They included residential building for Agaba Charles on plot A3 Link road, storied commercial building for Luyiga Joramu and Jjunju Joludan along Nsalo road bordering Bukoba Tanzania, and Car parking yard for Isaac Emoi on plot 13&15 on A8 and plot 18,20,22 on A45 road all approved in meeting of 15th/011/2017.

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>Not applicable because the DLG became operational only in FY 2017/18.</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. 	0	<p>Not applicable because the DLG became operational in FY 2017/18 and has just commenced preparation of the district development plan (DDP).</p> <p>The capital investments in the approved Annual Work Plan for FY 2017/18 were said to have been drawn from the approved five year DDP 2015/16-2019/20 of Rakai DLG (mother district) -projects falling under Kyotera and Kakuuto Counties.</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>DTPC discussed the profiles in the meeting of 17th/07/2017 under Min.04/17/07/2017</p> <p>Profiles for FY 17/18 the following projects were reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Periodic maintenance of roads • Routine mechanised maintenance of roads • Borehole rehabilitation • Construction of 20 cubic Ferro cement tanks • Construction of a 5-stance lined latrine • Construction of 5-stance latrines in Primary Schools • Procurement and supply of desks to Primary schools • Construction of a 2-staff house block at Nabigasa HC III <p>The DLG needs to improve on statement of beneficiaries and technical description. Also mitigation of environmental concerns needed to be costed.</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>Not applicable because the DLG became operational in FY 2017/18 and had just commenced compilation of the Statistical Abstract.</p>
4	<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2 	0	<p>Not applicable because the DLG became operational only in FY 2017/18.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	0	<p>Not applicable because the DLG became operational only in FY 2017/18.</p>
5	<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects and assets during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	0	<p>Not applicable because the DLG became operational only in FY 2017/18.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	0	<p>Not applicable because the DLG became operational only in FY 2017/18.</p>

Assessment area: Human Resource Management

6	<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable. All the HoDs and acting heads of units have not yet attained period for appraisal, that is 1 year of service in positions whether calendar or financial year. They are therefore al not yet eligible for appraisal as they are newly recruited.
		<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"> Only 5 out of 14 HoDs position are filled substantively in Kyotera district. This figure of five is derived from reference numbers of letters of appointment ie. 27th July - 2017 and ref CR/D/10640, 3RD June 2017 and Minute extracts KLS/TC/10019, 19th Sept 2016 and ref: DSC/20/2006/1, LDSC/3/7/2017/R/2, 3/6/2017/LDSC/R/47 and LDSC/3/6/2017/R/29/29. The number of HoDs filled represents 36%.
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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable. There is no District Service Commission yet constituted in Kyotera district. This is the commission that handles all recruitments at District level. Therefore the 7 month old district has not yet conducted any recruitment of staff because of lack of a District Service Commission.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There being no recruitment yet submitted, conducted and accomplished in Kyotera district, no submissions for confirmation have been handled so far yet. The district is therefore not eligible for assessment in this area since the year of assessment has been 2016/17 when then district was not borne yet. This is therefore not applicable.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable yet. The district is only 7 months old but has not yet encountered any case for disciplinary action.

8	<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not eligible. There has not been any new recruitment yet in the district because it is still new. In addition, the financial year to be assessed. is a previous year in which the district was not yet in existence. This measureable indicator is therefore not possible to assess.
		<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>So far, Kyotera district has had a total of 7 staff retiring as per the dates of retirement 22nd August 2017, 14th July 2017 and 5th Oct 2017. On viewing the pensions payroll list, none of the retired staff accessed pension payroll within 3 months of retirement.</p>
Assessment area: Revenue Mobilization				
9	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If increase in OSR from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10% : score 4 points • If the increase is from 5 -10% : score 2 point • If the increase is less than 5% : score 0 points. 	0	<p>The LG was established on 1st July 2017. It was therefore not possible to assess it by its OSR increase or decrease.</p>
10	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10% : then 2 points. If more than +/- 10% : zero points. 	0	<p>The LG was established on 1st July 2017. It was therefore not possible to assess it by its revenue collection ratio.</p>

11	Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	0	The LG was established on 1st July 2017. It was therefore not possible to assess it by its remission of revenues to lower local governments.
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2 	0	The LG was established on 1st July 2017. It was therefore not possible to assess it by its expenditure on the council allowances.

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

12	The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The position of Senior Procurement Officer is substantively filled (Letter from CAO Ref. CR/D/17984, DSC/3/6/2017/40(R)(61)). <p>The district does not have a Procurement Officer.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	0	Not applicable. This is a new district that began in July 2017.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	0	Not applicable. This is a new district that began in July 2017.

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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the procurement and disposal plan for FY 2017-18 shows that the infrastructure projects are reflected in the annual work plan. E.g. Construction of staff house at Nabigasa HC III is item no.2 page 1 in the Procurement Plan and is matching with the item no.1 page 14 under planned output 088181 (staff houses construction and rehabilitation), Workplan 5: Health of the Local Government Workplan Vote:621 Kyotera District. • Not applicable. This is a new district that began in July 2017.
14	<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the consolidated procurement plan for FY 2017/18 shows that 55% of the bid documents for infrastructure were prepared by August 30. • However, this is a new district and systems were not yet in place to prepare and receive sectoral procurement plans in time.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable. This is a new district that began in July 2017.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable. This is a new district that began in July 2017.

15	The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments	<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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable. This is a new district that began in July 2017.
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<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	Current project sites visited were not labelled e.g. Renovation works at Kalisizo Hospital and construction of a staff house at Nabigasa HC III.
Assessment area: Financial management				
16	The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4 	4	The district makes monthly reconciliation statements on time. They are signed by the sector accountants and counter-signed by the Chief Finance Officer.
17	The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2. 	2	A sample of 7 transactions from departments showed that all payments were fully within the period of payment timelines of 30 days as indicated in Contracts.
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure			

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. 	3	<p>The Head of Internal Audit department (Mr. Kyambadde Robert) was substantively appointed an Senior Internal Auditor on 31st July 2017 under DSC/8/7/2017(14) in a letter signed by the then CAO. He is therefore not a substantively appointed Senior Internal Auditor or above as required by the LGPA Manual. The district internal audit department also produced the first two quarterly internal audit reports for the FY 2017/18. It was not possible to assess the existence of the previous year internal audit reports because the district was not yet in existence.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries: score 2. 	2	<p>There was evidence that the LG provided information to Council and LGPAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings. The Ag District Internal Auditor produced and submitted the 1st quarter report for the FY 2017/18 to the LGPAC, CAO and the Speaker LCV on 31st October 2017. The quarterly internal audit report was duly acknowledged by the above offices. It was not possible to assess the status of implementation for the previous FY internal audit findings because the LG was not yet in place.</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>The Accounting Officer and the LGPAC received the first two quarterly reports for the FY 2016/17. However, the LGPAC had just been formed by Council and was yet to be inducted to start its duties . It was not possible to assess the submission of internal audit reports for the previous FY 2016/17 because the LG was not yet in place.</p>
19	<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	4	<p>The LG maintains updated assets registers. The latest update on the assets register was the entry of the following District Road equipment: Fuso Dump Truck Reg No UG-2296W acquired on 7th February 2018 and a Double Cabin Ford Ranger Reg. No. LG-001-157 procured at UGX 15,000,000 on 15th November 2017. There was on evidence of any other asset not in the Register.</p>

20	<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY: • unqualified audit opinion: score 4 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</p>	0	<p>The LG was established on 1st July 2017. It had, therefore, not been audited by the OAG.</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>	0	<p>Not applicable because the LG became functional only in FY 2017/18.</p> <p>Nonetheless review of Council minutes confirmed that service delivery issues had been discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting of 29th/09/2017: elected Speaker and Deputy, swearing in of DEC, election of some Standing Committee Chairpersons • Meeting of 31st/10/2017: finalised election of Standing Committee chairpersons and members, considered DEC reports under which Council resolved under 07/KTRCOU/10/2017 to change from procurement of vehicle under Education to construction of latrines in selected Primary Schools; Renovation works in Kalisizo Hospital be commenced expeditiously; approved the staff structure for the District and the Sub counties; resolved on sharing of DANIDA funds between Kyotera and Rakai DLGs; and resolved that support staff (e.g. secretaries, drivers, office attendants, cleaners and watchmen) across many departments be recruited • Meeting of 21st/12/2017: considered members to LG PAC, District Land Board, District Service Commission and approved them under Min. 08/KTRCOU/12/2017; reports from all the four Committees including Works and Technical Services (includes Water); and, Health, Education and Community Services. <p>The first two meetings held on 3rd and 10th/07/2017 where to constitute an interim leaders of the District Council.</p> <p>The LG PAC had only been constituted recently in meeting of 21st/12/2017 and were yet to be oriented and commence work thus no LG PAC reports had yet been considered by Council.</p>
----	---	--	---	---

22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Human Resource Officer, Ms. Teddy Nakyanzi, had been assigned as Complaints desk officer in a letter dated 25th/08/2017 under reference no. CR/157/1 by the CAO. However no evidence of response to complaints was availed.
23	<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published: • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Though the LG Payroll was published on notice boards at the District headquarters the Pensioner Schedule had not been published.
	<p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procurement plan FY 2017/18 and awarded contracts and amounts dated 17th May 2018 were published on the notice boards at the District headquarters.
		<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 because the DLG became operational only in FY 2017/18.</p>
24	<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p>	<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	<p>Not applicable because the DLG became operational only in FY 2017/18.</p>
	<p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<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	<p>Not applicable because the DLG became operational only in FY 2017/18.</p>

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. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable. This is a new district that began in July 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"> The work plan for FY 2017-18 indicates that the gender focal person has planned activities to strengthen women's roles e.g. support to district TPC on gender responsive planning and budgeting, women's entrepreneurship program (UWEP), Youth Livelihood Programme, among others. Not applicable. This is a new district that began in July 2017.
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	<p>Not applicable. This is a new district that began in July 2017.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	0	<p>Not applicable. This is a new district that began in July 2017.</p>
		<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	<p>Not applicable. This is a new district that began in July 2017.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2 	0	<p>Not applicable. This is a new district that began in July 2017.</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Educational Performance Measures

Kyotera District

(Vote Code: 621)

Score 25/100 (25%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				
1	<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4 	4	<p>According to staff lists, pay roll and list of schools examined, Kyotera district has budgeted for a head teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school in the current FY 2017/18.</p> <p>The staff lists and list of schools examined indicate that Kyotera District education department has deployed a head teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY 2017/18.</p>
2	<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision o If 100% score 6 o If 80 - 99% score 3 o If below 80% score 0 	3	<p>The LG approved structure for primary school teachers for Kyotera district provides for 1,299 teachers. Verification from the HRM department indicates that the structure has been filled with 1,293 teachers with a wage bill provision, which represents 99.5% of positions filled.</p>
3	<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	6	<p>The staff structure for Kyotera district education department provides for 3 inspectors (1 DIS, and 2 inspectors). Two inspector positions are filled by staff shared from its mother district, Rakai disitric. The filling of the remaining position is pending the inauguration of the District Service Commission. The district was created in July 2017 and it has not got a District Service Commission yet.</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>	0	<p>Recruitment plan for the current FY 2017/18 to fill positions for primary teachers was not available for review and validation.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of School Inspectors: score 2</p>	0	<p>Recruitment plan for the current FY 2017/18 to fill position for inspector of schools was not available for review and validation.</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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% school inspectors: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Inspectors of Primary schools are appraised on yearly basis. Whether calendar or financial year, Kyotera district has not yet completed a period that warrants Inspectors of school to be appraised. Therefore this indicator is not applicable for the district.
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised head teachers during the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 90% - 100%: score 3 • 70% - 89%: score 2 • Below 70%: score 0 	0	<p>Similarly, Head Teachers of Primary schools are not yet eligible for appraisal because they have not lasted a full calendar year which period is used to assess them. Therefore this is not applicable for Kyotera district.</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"> 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	This indicator is not applicable to Kyotera district since it had not yet acquired the status of a district local government.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level, including on school feeding: score 2 	0	This indicator is not applicable to Kyotera district since it had not yet acquired the status of a district local government.
7	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all private and public primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all private and public primary schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59% score 1 o Below 50% score 0. 	0	The only inspection report availed for verification was that of Quarter 1 for FY 2017/18, which revealed that inspection of government-aided and private schools stood at 50% and 40% respectively.
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	This indicator is not applicable to Kyotera district since it had not yet acquired the status of a district local government.
		<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	No evidence was presented to show that inspection reports are submitted to DES or MoES.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4 	0	No reports presented as evidence that inspection recommendations are followed up.

9	<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5 	0	<p>The completed statistical forms were left in Rakai when Kyotera became a district and had not yet been brought to Kyotera by the time of this assessment.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5</p>	0	<p>The completed statistical forms were left in Rakai when Kyotera became a district and had not yet been brought to Kyotera by the time of this assessment.</p>

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc...during the previous FY: score 2 	0	<p>Not applicable because the LG became functional only in FY 2017/18.</p> <p>Nonetheless under FY 2017/18 minutes of 17th/11/2017 of the Health, Education and Community Services Committee affirmed that service delivery issues were discussed: received Education departmental report and discussed provision of desks to primary schools and the proposed change in workplan from procurement of vehicle for the department to construction of latrines in selected primary schools.</p>
----	--	--	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2 	0	<p>Not applicable because the LG became functional only in FY 2017/18.</p> <p>Nonetheless review of Council minutes for the current FY 2017/18 indicated that Health, Education and Community Services Committee presented to Council issues that required approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting of 31st/10/2017: considered DEC reports under which Council resolved under 07/KTRCOU/10/2017 to change from procurement of vehicle under Education to construction of latrines in selected Primary Schools; approved the staff structure for the District and the Sub counties; resolved on sharing of DANIDA funds between Kyotera and Rakai DLGs; and resolved that support staff (e.g. secretaries, drivers, office attendants, cleaners and watchmen) across many departments be recruited Meeting of 21st/12/2017: considered reports from all the four Committees including Health, Education and Community Services.
11	<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO) • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80% schools: score 0</p>	0	<p>Lists of SMCs and minutes of meetings were examined to verify status of SMCs. Only 65 schools were found with functional SMCS, representing 73% of the 112 schools.</p>

12	<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	0	<p>List of schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants not displayed anywhere in the premises of the district headquarters.</p>
----	--	---	---	---

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

13	<p>The LG Education department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	0	<p>This indicator not applicable to Kyotera district since it acquired the district local government status on 1 July 2017, after due date of submission, ie April 30.</p>
----	---	--	---	--

14	<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	3	<p>The education department certified and recommended payments to suppliers timely. The only 2 payment vouchers and 2 contracts/LPOs found at the district indicated that the payment were made within 7 days compared to a maximum period of 30 days indicated in the LPOs.</p>
----	---	---	---	--

Assessment area: Financial management and reporting

15	<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	0	<p>This indicator does not apply to Kyotera district since it is only 7 months old as a district local government, having acquired the status on 1 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 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 	2	<p>The education department's status of implementation of all internal audit issues were given. For example, the Ag .District Education officer submitted the status of implementation on all the seven internal audit recommendation in a letter REF CR/302/1 dated 27th November 2017 to the CAO arising out of internal audit findings. The CAO forwarded it to Ag DIA.</p>

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

17	<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc...: Score 2 	2	<p>The education department has had 1 workshop held 20 Nov 2017 & 21 Nov 2017 to provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc</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>No evidence was availed on issuing and explanation of guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in te 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>Functional SMCs in 65 schools out of 112 schools are compliant to the guideline on gender composition.</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>No plan or report of activities carried out in schools to promote environmental awareness.</p>
----	--	---	---	---



LGPA 2017/18

Health Performance Measures

Kyotera District

(Vote Code: 621)

Score 47/100 (47%)

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	<p>- The wage bill budgetary allocation for the 2017/18 amounts to 3,354,398,000/= and the quarterly wage expenditures was 836,849,000/=, when prorated to four quarters will be 99% consumption</p> <p>- The district has filled the established structures to 85%</p>
2	<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 4</p>	4	<p>- The recruitment request covering the vacant posts (20 in number) with the available wage allocations was submitted to the CAOs office on January 12, 2018.</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>- N/A - There are two HSD but the year for appraisal is not yet complete since the district became operational from July 2017</p>

4	<p>The Local Government Health department has equitably deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers equitably, in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY: score 4 	4	<p>- The deployment plan indicated that most of the technical staff were in place and had been deployed according to the established structures.</p>
---	--	--	---	--

Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision

5	<p>The DHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 	0	<p>- N/A - the district has been in existence for only the past 7 months</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>- N/A - the district has been in existence for only the past 7 months</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>- N/A - the district has been in existence for only the past 7 months</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>- N/A - the district has been in existence for only the past 7 months</p> <p>However, for the past two quarters support supervisions have been made. Report for quarter one is in place dated October 21, 2017, and that for quarter two is being written</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>- N/A - there are two health sub-districts of Kyotera and Kakuuto, but the district has been in existence for only the past 7 months</p> <p>- However, there are support supervision reports for the two HSDs for quarter one and two - to be considered in the next assessment</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>-N/A - but the supervision report for Quarter 1, in the current FY was discussed in a meeting held December 18, 2017</p> <p>- N/A - but an issue from the support supervision concerning redistribution of staff was discussed and action was taken to transfer one particular staff as indicated in letter of February 5, 2018</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>	10	<p>- There are 40 facilities receiving PHC funds (31 are public and 9 are PNFP). All the facilities are reflected in the HMIS although the HMIS list is longer (60 facilities) due to presence of returns from Private-for-profit</p>

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10

The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council

Maximum 4 for this performance measure

• Evidence that the council committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2

0

Not applicable because the DLG became operational only in FY 2017/18.

Under FY 2017/18 minutes of 17th/11/2017 of the Health, Education and Community Services Committee affirmed that service delivery issues were discussed: received Health departmental report and discussed the need to reactivate some HCs that were less functional, challenges faced by the sector including inadequacy of gas cylinders making immunisation difficult, planned interventions by one of the partners -Brick by Brick, renovation works required in some HCs arising from effects of the earthquake.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	0	<p>Not applicable because the DLG became operational only in FY 2017/18.</p> <p>Review of the minutes of Council affirm that the Health, Education and Community Services Committee presented issues that required approval to Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting of 31st/10/2017: considered DEC reports under which Council resolved under 07/KTRCOU/10/2017 that renovation works in Kalisizo Hospital be commenced expeditiously; approved the staff structure for the District and the Sub counties; resolved on sharing of DANIDA funds between Kyotera and Rakai DLGs; and resolved that support staff (e.g. secretaries, drivers, office attendants, cleaners and watchmen) across many departments be recruited • Meeting of 21st/12/2017: considered reports from all the four Committees including Health, Education and Community Services.
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>- There were HUMCs in place but lacking in others. Of the visited facilities only one (Kasaali HCIII) did not have a functional HUMC and yet its located at the district headquarters</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The PHC allocation lists to facilities were available but not published because the district has not yet bought or acquired a notice board
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				
13	<p>The LG Health department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The procurement plans were available and submitted in July 2017 because the districts started in the current FY - For the current FY there were two capital development expenditures namely rehabilitation works at Kalisizo hospital and the construction of staff houses at Nabigasa, both of which projects were underway
		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The procurement process was done during the first quarter of current FY
14	<p>The LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time: • 100% - score 8 • 70-99% – score 4 • Below 70% - score 0 	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ordering process was supported but through Kalisizo hospital where there was electronic infrastructure. Plans and requests were made for all facilities in the districts and delivery notes/receipts from NMS are available for all facilities at the DHO

15	<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 2 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points 	2	<p>The LG Health department certified and recommended payments to suppliers on time. Health department had only two payment vouchers with contracts/contracts for the FY 2016/17 which indicated that one was paid within 5 days while the another one was paid within 15 days respectively compared to maximum period of 30 days indicated in the contracts and LPOs.</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>Not applicable because the DLG became operational only in FY 2017/18.</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>The health department gave the status of implementation of all internal audit findings. For example, the responses to all the 11 audit issues was given in a letter dated 14th November 2017 signed by the DHO DR Waggumbuluzi George addressed to the CAO.</p>
----	---	--	---	--

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

18	<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2 • Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2 	2	<p>- There were one or more female members in all the HUMCs</p>
19	<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LGs has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal : score 2 points. 	2	<p>- There was evidence that medical waste management guidelines were issued and they were available in all the facilities that were visited</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Kyotera District

(Vote Code: 621)

Score 31/100 (31%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: score 10 	10	<p>Kyotera district is a newly constituted and has approximately safe water coverage of 55 % as per the quarterly report on file.</p> <p>Kyotera is a new district, that started FY 2017/18. It has three sub counties that are below the District water coverage eg:</p> <p>Kirumba, Kyebe and Kabira. And the following were planned for in FY 2017/18; Kakuuto S.C (ferrocement), Rehabilitate 2 bore holes in Kasaasa S/C, drill 1 deep borehole, carry out 2 borehole rehabilitations in Kyebe S/C, construct 1 ferro cement, drill 1 borehole, 3 Rehabilitations in Nabigasa , construct 1 Ferro cement, drill 1 deep borehole, 3 rehabilitations in Kabira, 3 rehabilitations, in Rwankoni, protected spring, 2 deep borehole, 2 rehabs in Kirumba, 1 deep borehole, Kalisizo 1 protected spring, 3 rehabs in Kasaali rehabs 4, water borne 1 latrine, new connection on a system in Kyebe (150 HH)</p> <p>Therefore all Sub counties below the district water coverage are planned for.</p>

2	<p>The LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY: score 15 	0	<p>There was no Annual Progress report for the previous financial year (2016/17), that was submitted to MoWE since the district began this current FY 2017/18</p>
---	---	---	---	---

Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision

3	<p>The LG Water department carries out monthly monitoring and supervision of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually. • 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</p>	0	<p>Not applicable since the district started this FY, there were no facilities to monitor.</p>
---	--	--	---	--

4	<p>The LG Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: o List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10 	0	<p>Not applicable since Contractors began in December so no water facilities are yet to be reported on.</p>
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>	4	<p>Submissions were made on 20th July 2017 and the district started in the same month so they were on time.</p>
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"> 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 If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	0	<p>Contract management plan was not file</p>
			2	<p>One deep borehole and one lined pit latrine were visited. They were well installed and constructed as per design in the BOQs.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	0	Not applicable since most WSS facilities are still under construction.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2 	0	Not applicable since Contractors have not yet completed works to be certified.
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	3	The LG Water department certified and recommended the contract for payments to suppliers within the recommended timelines in the contract of 30 days. Sample of 3 payment vouchers and contracts/LPOs indicated that payments were made between 1 day and 10 days compared to maximum recommended timeline of 30 days indicated in the contracts and LPOs.

Assessment area: Financial management and reporting

8	<p>The LG Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	0	Not applicable because the DLG became operational only in FY 2017/18.
9	<p>LG Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 5 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 If queries are not responded to score 0 	3	The Water department responded to the internal audit findings that had been raised. The status of implementation of all audit recommendations for the quarter 4 was submitted in a letter dated 28th December 2017, signed by the District Engineer (Nabagala Annet S.) addressed to the the CAO which was forwarded to the DIA. There were no other audit issues for the water sector during that FY.

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3 	0	<p>Not applicable because the DLG became operational only in FY 2017/18.</p> <p>None the less review of the Minutes of 21/11/2017 of the Works and Technical Services Committee affirmed that committee discussed service delivery issues. Recommended for Council consideration increase in number of boreholes to be rehabilitated from 13 (as in the AWP) to 28.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	0	<p>Not applicable because the DLG became operational only in FY 2017/18.</p> <p>Nonetheless review of Council minutes for the current FY 2017/18 indicated that Works and Technical Services Committee presented to Council issues that required approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting of 31st/10/2017: approved the staff structure for the District and the Sub counties; resolved on sharing of DANIDA funds between Kyotera and Rakai DLGs; and resolved that support staff (e.g. secretaries, drivers, office attendants, cleaners and watchmen) across many departments be recruited Meeting of 21st/12/2017: considered reports from all the four Committees including Works and Technical Services. Presented recommendation of change in workplan to increase number of boreholes to be rehabilitated from 13 in the AWP to 28.

11	<p>The LG Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2 • All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2 • Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	<p>0</p> <p>2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>By 15th Feb there were no water development grant releases displayed on the notice board.</p> <p>WSS facilities were well labelled as below:</p> <p>One deep borehole in Zziwa village, Kabira S/C,</p> <p>Contractor: Sumadhura Technologies Ltd,</p> <p>Funder: Kyotera DLG, DWD 53583, DOC 17th Dec 2017.</p> <p>By 15th Feb 2017, information on tenders and contract awards was not displayed on the notice board.</p>
12	<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	1	<p>There was evidence that communities apply for WSS facilities and these are:</p> <p>A request for a pit latrine by Kasaali HC III, on 10th Aug 2017.a request for an extension of a piped system in DdonaLC1, Kyebe sub county on 23rd/04/2016.</p> <p>Land agreement by Nakabugo Rebecca of Kabugimbi LCI, Kakuuto SC, on 8th Nov 2017, Kizito John, of Namikomago village, Nabigasa Sc on 6/12.2017.</p> <p>Three receipts from three villages for the villages to benefit this current FY, and these are: Nkenge village in Kasaali S/C, Kakuuto village for ferro cement, Kakuuto S/C, Gamba village for rehabilitation of a borehole in Kakuuto, Baseza zone in Kasaali for Borehole rehabilitation.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O&M funds and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, for the current FY: score 2 	0	There was no O&M collections made in the village visited.
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"> • 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 	0	Environmental screening was not done since the report was not on file.
	Maximum 4 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1 	0	There was no evidence that environmental concerns raised were followed up in the reports that were on file
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	0	There was no evidence of environmental protection in the contracts signed on file.
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"> • If at least 50% WSCs are women as per the sector critical requirements: score 3 	3	One completed borehole that was visited they had 2 females and 3 males on the committee. This indicates 50% participation of women on the committee.

15	<p>Gender- and special-needs sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/RGCs.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3	3	<p>One lined pit latrine was visited at Kyotera DLG. It has separate stances and well marked (Gents, Ladies), had a ramp and had separate stance for the PWDs.</p>
----	--	--	---	--