



## LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Lugazi Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 788)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	2	40%
No	3	60%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	xxx	<p>7th October, 2017 – Final Performance Contract FY 2017/18 – <i>Source: MoFPED 'Status of Submission of Performance Contracts FY 2017/18</i></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>The Budget for FY 2017/2018 and the Procurement Plan were submitted together with the Draft Performance Contract on 5th May, 2017.</p>	Yes
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			
<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	xxxxx	<p>The Annual Performance Report for FY 2016/2017 was submitted late on 7th August, 2017.</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>Lugazi Municipal Council submitted Quarterly Reports for 2016/2017 FY on the dates below</p> <p>1st Quarter - Submitted 9th November, 2016 sn. 0025</p> <p>2nd QT - Submitted on 9th February, 2017 – Sn 0383</p> <p>Qt3 - Submitted on 23rd May, 2017</p> <p>4th Quarter Report was submitted under Receipt Sn 4524 of 7th August, 2017.</p> <p>The Municipality submitted all reports late</p>	<p>No</p>
---	---------------	---	-----------

Assessment area: Audit

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by April 30 (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action (PFMA Act 2015; Local Governments Financial and Accounting Regulations 2007; The Local Governments Act, Cap 243).</p>	<p>xxxxx</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Municipality started operations in the FY2017. Their first external audit report was signed on 31st December, 2017, hence the indicator is not applicable</li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>
---	--------------	---	------------

The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer

XXXXX

According to the Auditor General's report for the FY 2017, the audit opinion on the financial statements of the Municipality was unqualified.

Yes



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Lugazi Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 788)

Score 51/100 (51%)

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"> <li>• A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 2.</li> </ul>	0	<p>- Lugazi MC has no Physical Structural Plan – have requested Ministry of Lands and Urban Development to support the MC in this aspect.</p> <p>The Plan registration book is in place but the dates of submission are not recorded. Therefore not able to establish adherence to the 28 days. One submission sampled for Fellowship Primary School – submitted on 15th April, 2017 had not yet been approved.</p> <p>The Physical Planning Committee has so far been meeting on a quarterly basis – because cost implications and the fact that number of plans submitted for consideration is small.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2.</li> </ul>	0	<p>Not all infrastructure investments have approved plans and the Municipal Council does not have a Physical Plan.</p>
2	<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 1.</li> </ul>	0	<p>Was not able to verify in the absence of a clearly defined period of the work plan - in one place is it 2016/2017 and on the other it is 2017/2018 - and the contents were similar.</p> <p>Lugazi Municipality does not have a Five-Year Development Plan approved by the NPA. A draft (2015/16 – 2019/2020) was submitted to NPA on 21st October, 2015, The Municipal Council approved the draft on 15th March, 2015 under Min 12/C/2014-2015.</p> <p>No project profiles were prepared for the projects in the AWP.</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"> <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>Annual Statistical abstract not in place though Municipal Planners have been trained to prepare it for the next planning period.</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>A review of the infrastructure projects implemented during FY 2016/17 revealed that these had been from the Annual Work plan and approved Budget for FY 2016/17..</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>	4	<p>All four project implemented during FY 2016/17 were completed within the financial year.</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> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</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>	0	<p>Based on the sample of projects below, not all projects were completed within approved budget, and variances ranged as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construction of Municipal Council Building: Budget 150,000,000; Actual 88,893.000 Variance -40.74%</li> <li>- 2 (5 stance pit latrines at Bibbo C/U in Kawolo Division and Buwola Division in Najjembe Division: Budget 44,004.000; Actual 62,641.000 Variance 42.35 %</li> <li>- Street Lighting Facilities Constructed an Rehabilitated: Budget 146,883.000 Actual 143,960.000 98.Variance 1.99%</li> </ul>
		<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>Expenditure on operation and maintenance was for machinery and equipment and for fuel and lubricants since work was implemented under "force on account" - 3 vehicles and 2 mechanical plants were repaired. all available funds were spent.</p>

Assessment area: Human Resource Management

6	<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</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>	2	<p>Not applicable since positions of HOD were not substantively filled.</p>
	<p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All positions of HOD are not substantively filled</li> <li>Requests have been sent to DSC transfer staff from Buikwe to Lugazi to fill the following positions; Finance, Physical Planning and Education, as well as Internal Audit. Letter dated 18th December 2017 seen. No action taken as at the time of assessment.</li> <li>For Environment Management, Community Based Services, as well Trade, Industry and Local Economic Development, they are vacant but MOPS has cleared the recruitment as per letter dated 31st October 2017.</li> <li>For Health the position is vacant because there is no wage MOPs has advised to stay recruitment pending availability of funds.</li> <li>Production is vacant because there is no wage .</li> <li>Deputy Town Clerk is vacant and is to be advertised.</li> <li>Works Unit is headed by an Acting Municipal Engineer whose appointment I as such is dated 7th January 2016. Appointment letter was seen.</li> </ul>



7	The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission were made to DSC to recruit people on transfer from Buikwe as per letter dated 18th December 2017. No action at the time of assessment.</li> <li>Another submission was made to DSC to transfer 355 Primary Teachers from Buikwe to Lugazi as per letter dated 3rd July 2017. No action taken by DSC at the time of assessment.</li> </ul>
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission made to DSC to transfer 9 people to Lugazi on promotion as per letter dated 18th December 2017. No action taken at the time of assessment.</li> </ul>
		<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	There were no cases that warranted submission to the DSC during the previous financial year.
8	Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months	<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>	3	No recruitment was done
	Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.	<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	Correspondences dated 27th September 2017 for Kalema Namazzi, Okwena Okecho and Nalubega Geradline were seen relating to 3 former employees of Lugazi Municipality. All the three had not been put on the pension pay roll within two months after retirement.
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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Municipality started operations in the FY 2016/17. This indicator could not be assessed because of lack of prior year balances</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>• From the financial statements verification was made to ascertain total Local Revenue collected and the budgeted local revenue.</li> </ul> <table border="0" data-bbox="906 907 1348 1086"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="906 907 997 940">Actual</th> <th data-bbox="1189 907 1284 940">Budget</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="906 940 997 974">Variance</td> <td data-bbox="1189 940 1284 974"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="906 1008 1077 1041">711,019,097</td> <td data-bbox="1157 1008 1348 1041">1,337,952,018</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="906 1041 1077 1075">626,932,921</td> <td data-bbox="1157 1041 1348 1075"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="906 1108 1452 1176">Revenue performance  <math>711,019,097 / 1,337,952,018 \times 100 = 53\%</math></p> <p data-bbox="906 1209 1396 1243">This is 47% below expected revenue.</p>	Actual	Budget	Variance		711,019,097	1,337,952,018	626,932,921	
Actual	Budget											
Variance												
711,019,097	1,337,952,018											
626,932,921												

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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The municipality collects only property tax. The rest of the Local revenue is collected by divisions which remit 50% to the municipality. In FY2016/17 a total of 711,019,097 was collected. Out of this 145,528,138 was property tax collected by the Municipality and 565,490,595 by divisions. I examined receipts issued by the municipal council to divisions for the revenue received and confirmed that 50% of the division collections totalling 282,745,480 were remitted to the Municipality. The Municipality in turn remitted 94,698,228 to the divisions as 30% Municipal grant to divisions broken down as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kawolo Division 19,247,922</li> <li>Najjembe Division 20,386,149</li> <li>Lugazi Central Division 54,064,157</li> <li>Total 93,698,228</li> </ul> </li> <li>This was higher than what the Municipality is supposed to have remitted (i.e 30% of 282,745,480 = 84,823,644)</li> <li>Examined vouchers, cashbooks confirmed that the municipality remitted 93,698,228 to the divisions</li> </ul>								
		<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>	2	<p>From the General Ledger was obtained expenditure on council emoluments:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Allowances</td> <td>32,069,638</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Travel inland</td> <td>1 2,945,890</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Travel abroad</td> <td>9,200,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>54,215,528</td> </tr> </table> <p>As % of local revenue  54,215,528/565,490,595 =9.58%</p>	Allowances	32,069,638	Travel inland	1 2,945,890	Travel abroad	9,200,000	Total	54,215,528
Allowances	32,069,638											
Travel inland	1 2,945,890											
Travel abroad	9,200,000											
Total	54,215,528											

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

0

- The position of the procurement officer and assistant are not yet substantively filled. A letter from Buikwe district seconding the Procurement officer was available with HR. The position of assistant procurement officer is still vacant.

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

1

Minutes of TEC Meetings and reports were in place. Sampled reports include:

\* Evaluation report ref no: LUG 788/Supls/16-17/00008: Supply of 20 street lights (solar) dated 1ST February 2017

\* Evaluation report no: LUG 788/Saves/16-17/00004: Revenue Collection from Night parking from central division dated 31st August 2016

\* Evaluation report ref no: LUG 788/Wrks/16-17/00004; Construction of 2 in 1 Staff house at Lugazi Model dated 9th December 2016

- Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1

1

Evidence that the Contracts Committee adopted recommendations from TEC was in place. Sampled documents included:

\*TEC Report recommendations for project ref no; LUG 788/Wrks/16-17/00005 dated 9th December 2016 for construction of a 5 stance VIP Latrine at Buwola c/u and Busabaga P/s were adopted by Contracts committee minute no:04/MCC/2016-2017 dated 9th December 2016 (TEC and CC convened on the same day)

\*TEC Report recommendation for Supply of 35 school desks; Ref no: LUG 788/Supls//16-17/00007, dated 9th December 2016, was adopted by CC meeting ref no: 04/MCC/2016-2017

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"> <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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A revised procurement and disposal plan for FY 2016—2017 dated 30th September 2016 and received by PPDA on 12th October 2016 was seen</li> <li>• An Annual procurement and disposal plan for FY 2017-2018 dated July 29th 2017 and received by PPDA on 11th August 2017 was seen</li> <li>• Major infrastructure projects in the procurement plan were seen to have been included in the current approved annual work plan e.g items under Note 170 page 40 of the budget for education (Repair/construction of classrooms and office at primary schools are captured under items 43 and 44 of the procurement plan</li> <li>• There was evidence of adherence to the procurement and disposal plan. Sampled procurement include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Construction of a staff house at Lugazi model school, which was planned for FY 2016-2017 and was implemented according to the budget (Note 170</li> <li>*Installation of solar streets lights was planned for and implemented according to the approved annual work plan (Note 178)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
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"> <li>• For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>Bid documents for FY 2017—2018 were not ready by August 30th 2017, and at the time of assessment, a letter of award was just being made for construction of a classroom block at Ssenya Moslem (Najjembe division) and bids are still being prepared for Renovation of 4 classroom block at Najjembe C/U and street lighting (20 units) and supply of 194 RC Culverts etc.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>The contracts register was not available for review. It was neither printed or updated at the time of the assessment.</p>

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

2

• Supply of solar streets lights was above 50million and open-domestic bidding (Net value was approx. 143, 960,000 vat incl). A copy of the advert was seen (Monitor Jan 5th 2017). The procurement file for this activity was seen

• Open bidding was preferred for Procurement of various revenue services as seen on the advert in the monitor dated 2nd august 2016. Although the threshold was lower, to obtain competitive service providers (unique characteristic). The file for procurement of "Collection and management of Kinyolo Market ref no: LUG 788/SRVCS/16-17/00005' where four bidders responded to the bid was reviewed

• Selective bidding was done for construction of Toilets at Buwola and Busabaga P/s was within a range of 1m- 50 million. Their net value was approx. 40million. The bidders were picked from the list of prequalified service providers 2016/2017, bid documents prepared, tenders submitted and contracts generated

• Micro procurement thresholds are for procurements of less than one million shillings. A file for micro procurements for FY 2016 was seen in which vouchers, receipts etc. were seen

• Selective domestic bidding was also done for supply of 35 desks to schools (ref no: LUG 788/Supls/16-17/00007. An LPO issued to the selected supplier dated 14th June 2017 was seen (LPO-00513)

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>Certified Works implemented in 2016-2017 included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Construction of Staff house at Lugazi model school completion certificate dated 20th February 2017 was seen</li> <li>*Construction of 2 VIP latrines at Buwoola and Busabaga P/s. An interim certificate; though its value is for the entire project value was seen dated 26th April 2017</li> <li>*Procurement and installation of solar street lights line. The completion certificate dated 24/04/2017 was seen attached to the payment voucher</li> <li>*Completion certificate dated 18th April 2017 was seen Construction of VIP Lined toilet at Nakawa Trading centre in Kawolo division</li> </ul> <p>Completion certificates were seen for all these projects. The projects did not request for interim payments</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>One project is being implemented at the municipality for the current year under Force account for Opening up of Kikati-Kabanga, Opoka, Tenga-Monde, Church road (11.5km) was seen. However there was no site board</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>A review of the cashbook for all municipality bank accounts established that the bank reconciliation statements for the 12 months to December, 2017 were prepared by the accounts assistant, reviewed by a finance officer and approved by the head of finance.</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>	<p>• 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.</p>	0	<p>• From the creditors ledger 10 creditors were sampled and it was found that 6 invoices were outstanding for more than two months as shown in details below;</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="901 280 1516 1422"> <thead> <tr> <th>Payee date</th> <th>Payment date</th> <th>Invoice date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Urban Authorities Assoc</td> <td>25/11/2016</td> <td>7/10/ 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UEDCL</td> <td>28/09/2016</td> <td>1/7/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>National water</td> <td>16/11/2016</td> <td>7/11/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kulubya estates (Kinyoro)</td> <td>22/02/2017</td> <td>1/7/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>275</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kulubya estates (Taxi park)</td> <td>22/02/2017</td> <td>1/7/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>275</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kulubya estates (Central) )</td> <td>22/02/2017</td> <td>1/7/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>275</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lugali Cleaners</td> <td>24/08/2016</td> <td>1/7/2916</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Baba Gapco</td> <td>11/08/2016</td> <td>18/5/2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UEDCL</td> <td>22/02/2017</td> <td>1/1/2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>55</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Traco Ltd</td> <td>22/02/2017</td> <td>1/7/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>275</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Payee date	Payment date	Invoice date	Urban Authorities Assoc	25/11/2016	7/10/ 2017			48	UEDCL	28/09/2016	1/7/2016			89	National water	16/11/2016	7/11/2016			9	Kulubya estates (Kinyoro)	22/02/2017	1/7/2016			275	Kulubya estates (Taxi park)	22/02/2017	1/7/2016			275	Kulubya estates (Central) )	22/02/2017	1/7/2016			275	Lugali Cleaners	24/08/2016	1/7/2916			54	Baba Gapco	11/08/2016	18/5/2017			84	UEDCL	22/02/2017	1/1/2017			55	Traco Ltd	22/02/2017	1/7/2016			275
Payee date	Payment date	Invoice date																																																																	
Urban Authorities Assoc	25/11/2016	7/10/ 2017																																																																	
		48																																																																	
UEDCL	28/09/2016	1/7/2016																																																																	
		89																																																																	
National water	16/11/2016	7/11/2016																																																																	
		9																																																																	
Kulubya estates (Kinyoro)	22/02/2017	1/7/2016																																																																	
		275																																																																	
Kulubya estates (Taxi park)	22/02/2017	1/7/2016																																																																	
		275																																																																	
Kulubya estates (Central) )	22/02/2017	1/7/2016																																																																	
		275																																																																	
Lugali Cleaners	24/08/2016	1/7/2916																																																																	
		54																																																																	
Baba Gapco	11/08/2016	18/5/2017																																																																	
		84																																																																	
UEDCL	22/02/2017	1/1/2017																																																																	
		55																																																																	
Traco Ltd	22/02/2017	1/7/2016																																																																	
		275																																																																	
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>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor and produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 3.</p>	3	<p>The position of senior internal auditor is held by Yusuf Kiiza who is substantively appointed as accountant, and has been acting since August 2017. The substantive auditor was appointed acting senior commercial officer in July, 2016. However, the acting senior auditor prepared all the quarterly reports for FY 2016/17.</p>																																																															



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	2	The Municipality was granted this status in 2015/16 and started operations in FY 2016/17. This indicator therefore does not apply to the municipality.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	0	The quarterly audit reports were submitted to accounting officer, who turn forwarded it to the Internal Auditor General on 8th December, 2016; 20th February, 2017 and 5th October, 2017 for 1st 2nd and 4th quarters respectively. There was no evidence to show that the 4th quarter report was submitted to accounting officer and Internal Auditor General. However, only the report for 2nd st quarter 2016/17 was submitted to LGPAC 16 March, 2017..
19	<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	4	<p>The district maintains four separate asset registers for;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Transport equipment</li> <li>ii. computers and equipment,</li> <li>iii. motor vehicles, motor cycles and heavy plant,</li> <li>iv. furniture and fittings,</li> <li>v. land</li> <li>vi. Buildings.</li> </ul> <p>The asset registers are also in a format that complies with treasury accounting regulations.</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>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the Auditor General's report for the FY 2017, the audit opinion on the financial statements of the Municipality was unqualified.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minute 31/C/2016/2017 of the Council Meeting held on 30/06/2017 that approved reports from the Committees</li> </ul>
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 feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2.</li> </ul>	0	<p>There was no evidence of designating a person for this responsibility.</p>
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>	2	<p>The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule were displayed on the LG Noticeboard.</p>
	<p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>Lists of awarded contracts with amounts was displayed on the LG Notice Board</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	0	N/A. The Central Government did not conduct the Annual Performance Assessment for LGs in 2016/17
24	The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	0	There was no documentary evidence that the Municipal Administration shared information with the Divisions.
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	0	There was no documentary evidence availed to the assessment team at the time of the assessment.
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				
25	The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	0	There was no evidence that guidance and support was provided to the departments to mainstream gender in their activities. No action plans or minutes of the meetings were availed at the time of the assessment.
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.			

		<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>	2	<p>The scoring is based on the following</p> <p>*Gender mainstreaming work plan was incorporated in the approved annual work plan and mainly includes skills training of women. The following Reports on gender activates for 2016-2017 were seen.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training of women in Entrepreneurship programme dated 5th may 2017</li> <li>• Gender Mainstreaming workshop held on 13th March 2017</li> <li>• Training on disability policy and life skills dated 20th February 2017</li> </ul> <p>FOR 2016-2017, the GFP budget for gender mainstreaming was 2 million shillings and 1.4million was spent as per funds requisition form seen dated 2nd January 2017 (less than 90%). According to the CDO, no funds were received for UWEP and YLP grants. Generally, from the budget expenditure obtained from the Finance Officer, more than 90% of the funds for Community based services was spent</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> <li>• Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>The Physical planner who also acts as the environmental officer did not present (had no) monitoring reports and screening for mitigation measures for activities.</p> <p>Sampled Contract/bid documents reviewed did not integrate environmental and social management activities</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>	1	<p>Land title for garbage disposal area at Butinindi, Kakubansili village, Block 174, Plot 46, East Buganda</p> <p>Titled lease land for the central market located on Plot 122B, Block 316, Kyagwe. Land belongs to the Estate of Wofunira Kulubya (Admin case no. 26 of 2001 of the high court Uganda. Lease is for 49 years effective 25th January 2010</p> <p>The municipality infrastructure is located on Leased land (under Uganda Land Commission) certificate of title dated 14th September 2006</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>The Physical planner who also acts as the environmental officer did not present (had no) certificates for ESMP or completions forms.</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Educational Performance Measures

Lugazi Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 788)

Score 19/100 (19%)

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	<p>From the budget, it was confirmed that at least 1 head teacher and 7 teachers were budgeted for.</p> <p>performance contracts and Staff lists, payrolls and list of schools were seen</p> <p>All serving teachers were on the pay roll</p>
		<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	<p>Performance contract, staff lists, payrolls and list of schools were seen. However, of the 44 head teachers, 22 are substantive, the rest (22) are acting (they are at the rank of deputies). There is a gap for 21 teachers that need to be filled. Reasons for gap include; retirement, promotion to headship, abs-condiments and death</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"> <li>Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% score 6</li> <li>If 80 - 99% score 3</li> <li>If below 80% score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	3	<p>The gap for teachers is 21 that need to be filled is 20%. Reasons for gaps include retirement, promotion to headship, staff retired, abscondment and death.</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"> <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>	0	<p>According to the structure, 3 inspectors are required but only 1 substantive inspector is in place. The wage bill provision is for only 2 inspectors. Even the MEO is in acting position. There was no evidence of advertisements to fill the inspector positions.</p> <p>According to the MEO, the reason for not having filled the positions is that Lugazi is a new Municipal Council cut off from Buikwe</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>No written recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of Primary School Teachers was in place at the time of this assessment.</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>No written recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of School Inspectors was in place at y the time of this assessment.</p>



5	<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY • 100% school inspectors: score 3</p>	0	<p>There is no evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY. The acting Inspector of Schools is a Head teacher by substantive appointment. He has been acting since 2nd March 2017 as per Appointment Letter. The Termly Performance Review September 2117- Dec 2017 Form on his file was not signed by the Education Officer.</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>	2	<p>There are 44 primary schools. 31 head teachers were appraised and appraisal forms were in place This is 70%. As for the rest there was no evidence of appraisal at the time of assessment.</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>	<p>• Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1</p>	1	<p>A few circulars were available in the DEOs office (feeding circular in particular). From the 4 sampled schools, none had a copy of the circular. However, communication of guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the Ministry and DES was disseminated by the DEO and acting inspector to be communicated through meetings with head teachers. Meetings of this nature take place at least once every term.</p>
---	--	---	---	--

		<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	<p>The Municipal Education Officer (MEO) holds meetings with head teachers as evidenced by minutes of meetings at beginning and end of terms for FY 2016/17 were seen. A full fill containing minutes of meetings for 2016 and 2017 was seen. The communications in the minutes highlight information from feeding circulars and general school improvement.</p>
7	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all private and public primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	0	<p>The inspection reports were available in the MEOs' office, although not detailed.</p> <p>Of the 4 sampled schools, only 3 had copies of inspection reports and the inspection sheets were just improvised and different from those issued by the Ministry of Education and Sports</p> <p>The inability to inspect all schools as pointed out by the DEO was lack of inspection staff. Some 2 senior headteachers are also are also charged with additional responsibility of inspecting schools.</p>

8	<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	0	<p>From the 4 sampled schools, apart from the acting inspectors signing in the visitors books, there was no written evidence that Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY. Generally, support supervision was lacking. The sampled schools were</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lugazi East P/S</li> <li>2. Victory P/S</li> <li>3. Buwoola C/U P/S</li> <li>4. Kawolo C/U P/S</li> </ol>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	0	<p>From DES records, no Inspection reports were submitted. The reason for not submitting was that the MEO is overwhelmed with work</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>There was no evidence of follow up of inspection recommendations. Generally inspection capacity seemed to be lacking in Lugazi MC</p>
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"> <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>	0	<p>The number of schools given by EMIS data is different from that availed by Lugazi Municipal Education Officer.</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>Lugazi Municipal Education Department has enrollment data for only government aided schools but not for the private schools. Even the number for private primary schools (both licenced and unlicenced) was not available</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"> <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	<p>Minutes of quarterly meetings were available from Clerk to Council for FY 2016/17: Social Services Committee met on 27th April, 2017 to discuss Sector reports under Min 13/SS/2016-2017. These minutes talked of need for increased inspection of both private and government aided schools.</p>
		<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	<p>Social Services Committee Meeting of 13th April, 2017, discussed Budgetary estimates for Education and sports; Health and Environment; Community Based Services and Council Statutory bodies under Min/13/55/2016/17</p>
11	<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO) • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80% schools: score 0</p>	3	<p>Minutes of SMCs for some schools had been filed in the Education department but there were no minutes for private schools.</p> <p>Minutes of SMCs in the 4 (100%) sampled government schools were available. However, none of the 2 sampled private schools had Minutes of SMCs. Private Primary Schools constitute about 20% of the schools in the Municipal Council.</p> <p>The sampled schools were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lugazi East P/S</li> <li>2. Victory P/S- Private</li> <li>3. Buwoola C/U P/S</li> <li>4. Kawolo C/U P/S</li> </ol>

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	<p>The education department has no notice board. Schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants were not listed on notice boards by the time of this assessment</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"> <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>	0	<p>The written procurement request documents were not available at the time of this assessment.</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"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	0	<p>No sample contracts or payment requests were in place at the time of this assessment. The acting Education officer attributed this to lack of adequate staff in the department.</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"> <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>There was no record or official logging of the submissions from departments to the planner to enable ascertain timeliness.</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 o If sector has no audit query score 4 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points o If all queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	0	<p>The Municipality was granted this status in FY 2015/16 and started operations in FY 2016/17. therefore the indicator does not apply to this assessment.</p>

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

17	<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	0	<p>No guidelines for addressing gender and equity issues in the budget framework paper were available</p> <p>No minutes for meetings between DEO and the schools discussing gender issues were availed. Documents or minutes for the departments to provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc were not available both in the education department and in the gender and environment department.</p>
----	--	--	---	--

		<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>	0	<p>There was no documentary evidence from both the education and gender department to enable ascertain that there had been efforts to disseminate or explain guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools</p> <p>There was no gender policy for schools in place, and no evidence that the education department consults or collaborates with the gender department.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>From the 3 sampled schools (government aided), both male and female were in on the SMC team. School Management Committees reviewed had only 3 female representatives was 3 out of the 11 or 12 members. This was less than the recommended 1/3. There was no SMC in the private school sampled.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lugazi East P/S</li> <li>2. Victory P/S- Private</li> <li>3. Buwoola C/U P/S</li> <li>4. Kawolo C/U P/S</li> </ol>
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	<p>Circulars on environment were not in place. There were no minutes of meetings to evidence collaboration with Environment department on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc. However, from the sampled 4 schools, there was a deliberate attempt to plant trees by headteachers on the school compounds.</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Health Performance Measures

Lugazi Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 788)

Score 46/100 (46%)



No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human resource planning and management				
1	<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY • More than 80% filled: score 6 points, • 60 – 80% - score 3 • Less than 60% filled: score 0</p>	3	<p>Staffing norm is at 64%. The key cadre of staffing for technical staff need to be recruited for both the municipality and lower level health facilities-3 government health facilities. (2 HC IIIs and 1 HC II)</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>Recruitment plan was submitted to the Town Clerk on 6th July 2017 with key cadres outlined at the Municipality Headquarters level and lower level health facilities.</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>There are 3 Health Facilities namely Najjembe HC/III, Busabaha HC/III and Kizigo HCII . Only one the IC Najjembe, filled in the appraisal form, It was signed by the supervisor was but had not been signed by the Town Clerk at the time of assessment. As for the other two, no evidence of appraisal at the time of assessment. .</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	<p>List of health workers distribution exists for the 3 government Municipality health facilities analysed against the recommended staffing norms for health workers. The municipal health office is inclusive and only 2/7 staff posts are filled</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"> <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 evidence. Correspondences about meetings, staff issues exist in the DHO' office and health facility records</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	<p>No evidence of meetings to disseminate guidelines and policies. There are no minutes of meetings availed except signed attendance list</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>Not applicable. There are no HC IVs and hospitals in Lugazi municipality</p>
		<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY: • If 100% supervised: score 3 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	3	<p>All 5 health facilities have been supervised (3 government health facilities and 2 PNFP health facilities)</p>

7	<p>The Health Sub-district(s) have effectively provided support supervision to lower level health units</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities have been supervised by HSD and reports produced: • If 100% supervised score 6 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 4 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 2 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	6	<p>The 5 health facilities have been supervised (3 government and 2 PNFPs) by both the districts, partners and Kawolo hospital</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>There was no evidence of discussion of reports.</p> <p>There was no evidence of follow up in the absence of discussion of reports and generation of recommendations.</p>
9	<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for health facility lists as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: o List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10</p>	10	<p>The municipality has 5 health facilities that are reflected in OBT and at district level-Buikwe district.</p>

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social Services Committee met on 27th April, 2017 to discuss Sector reports under Min 13/SS/2016-2017</li> <li>Social Services Committee Meeting of 13th April, 2017, discussed Budgetary estimates for Education and sports; Health and Environment; Community Based Services and Council Statutory bodies under Min/13/55/2016=2017</li> <li>Meeting of March 2nd, 2017 under Min: 9/SS/2016 – 2017 – discussion of second Qtr Performance reports</li> </ul>
		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minute 31/C/2016/2017 of the Council Meeting held on 30/06/2017 that approved reports from the Committees</li> <li>Min 24/C/2016-2017 Motion seeking approval of the Proposed budgetary estimates for Financial Year 2017/2018 – 14th June, 2017.</li> </ul>
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>	1	<p>The 3 health facilities visited had minutes of meetings where budget and resource issues were discussed. Last quarter meetings were held in December, 2017. Lugazi muslim HC III (3 meetings), Najjembe HC III (2 meetings), Busabaga HC III (2 meetings)</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"> <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>	3	<p>Health facilities that receive PHC funds have been publicised for the 5 health facilities</p>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				
13	<p>The LG Health department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	0	<p>Procurement plan seen but submitted on 11th July 2017, after the deadline</p>
		<p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	0	<p>PP5 form not seen</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>	0	<p>Not applicable under the push system for medicines and supplies by National Medical Stores</p>

15	<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 2 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points</li> </ul>	2	<p>During the FY 2016/2017 the Department did not have any contracts and supplies from suppliers.</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"> <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 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>There was no official record of the submissions from departments to the Planning Unit and therefore not possible to ascertain compliance.</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>	0	<p>The Municipality was granted this status in 2015/16 and started operations in FY2016/17. This indicator is not applicable to the entity.</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 HUMC exist and have females membership of at least 30%</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>	2	<p>Waste management guidelines have been developed and issued in health facilities. A copy was availed in Najjembe HC III dated 30th June 2017.</p> <p>Lugazi Muslim Health centre had developed its guidelines on waste management and no guidelines were found in Busabaga HC III.,</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"> <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>	2	<p>The sanitation guidelines are integral with the waste management guidelines dated 30th June 2017. The guidelines were issued to all health facilities.</p>