



## LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Nakapiripirit District

(Vote Code: 543)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	5	83%
No	1	17%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	xxx	<p>Not Compliant – Nakapiripirit District submitted the APC 2017/18 (Form B) late to MoFPED (see Receipt dated 28th/7/2017 and Receipt No: 0836), hence not submitted before 30th June 2017.</p>	No
Assessment area: Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	xxxxx	<p>Compliant – Signed and stamped documented evidence exists and offer proof that the draft – Nakapiripirit District's APC/Budget 2017/18 submitted to MoFPED (on the 12th July 2017) was accompanied by a Procurement Plan.</p>	Yes
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			
<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	xxxxx	<p>Compliant – Nakapiripirit District's APR 2017/18 was submitted to the MoFPED on the 28th/7/2017 (Receipt No: 2835). Therefore, the submission was in time (i.e. before 31st July 2017).</p>	Yes

<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>Compliant – All 4 quarterly reports for the FY 2016/17 were duly submitted by Nakapiripirit District and in time (i.e. Q1 - 25th/11/2016 with no Receipt No but OPM and MoLG stamps seen dated 25th/11/2016; Q2 – 1st/2/2017 Receipt No: 0266; Q3 – 5th/5/2017 Receipt No: 0682; and Q4 – 28th/7/2017 Receipt No: 0835).</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Assessment area: Audit</p>			
<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by April 30 (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action (PFMA Act 2015; Local Governments Financial and Accounting Regulations 2007; The Local Governments Act, Cap 243).</p>	<p>xxxxx</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG provided information to the PS/ST on the implementation status of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for the previous FY by April 30th from the submissions dated 24th /1/2017 and submitted/ received on 3/3/2017. The LG responded to all the 3 audit issues raised as evidenced in the conclusion.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>xxxxx</p>	<p>From the Annual report of the Auditor General 2016/2017, Nakapiripiriti DLG obtained an unqualified Audit opinion.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Nakapiripirit District

(Vote Code: 543)

Score 57/100 (57%)

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> <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>A Physical Planning Committee (PPC) existed in Nakapiripirit District (evidenced from CAO's letter dated 20th/5/2016 appointing PPC members e.g. District Planner, District Roads Engineer, District Water Officer, District Environment Officer, District Community Development Officer, District Agriculture Officer, District Health Officer, District Education Officer, District Natural Resources Officer and the Town Clerk). Even so, at the time of the assessment (2nd/2/2018), the committee was not functional. It had neither sat to consider new investments within 28 days nor did it sit regularly to execute that mandate. Since its inception, there was only one set of minutes for the PPC meeting dated 21st/2/2017 and even this focused only on discussing the roles of the PPC members. The PPC members also met during an orientation cum training session, and that marked their interaction in meetings format.</p> <p>Contrary to official requirements, the District Physical Planner had taken on the role of approving applications apparently on behalf of the PPC.. as such, there was no documented evidence in the PPC minutes to confirm that it sat to approve new investments in time (within 28 days after submission of applications). There was no proof that the PPC approved applications with some consistency with the existing Physical Plans. The Applications Registration Book existed, listings of applicants and their details but the record excluded the date of receipt of application as to enable to compute the turnaround with which the PPC approves the applications in line with available and valid physical plans. According to official records got from MoLHUD, (Status of Physical Planning in Uganda 2017, the MoLHUD Physical Planning Department (2015) considered Nakapiripirit District/Town Council had available a valid Structural Plan 2007-2017 and with an expired Detailed Plan 2007-2012 (see Page 7).</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

- Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.

2

Nakapiripirit District held a Budget Conference in Q2 and based on the contents of the summarized BCR, there was some evidence that the AWP 2017/18 was based on outcomes of the budget conference. The BCR contained departmental presentations that specified the priorities that were easy to glean from the AWP 2017/18. For education, construction of staff teachers houses was on page 21 of the AWP 2017/18 and on page 6 of the BCR. For health, rehabilitation/renovation of staff houses is seen on page 16 of the AWP 2017/18 and on page 5 of the BCR. For water, construction of piped water supply system is seen on page 26 of the AWP 2017/18 and on page 7 of the BCR.

- Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If different, justification has to be provided and evidence that it was approved by Council. Score 2.

2

There is some evidence that the capital investments in the approved AWP 2017/18 are derived from Nakapiripirit's 5-year Development Plan 2015/16-2019/20 (especially the project profiles in the appendix). On the AWP-DDP linkages, the approved AWP (pages 20) shows education sector investments e.g. construction of pit latrines that appears also in the DDP on page 62. The approved AWP (pages 16) shows health sector investments e.g. construction of maternity ward that appears in the DDP on page 162. Also, the approved AWP (pages 26) shows water sector investments e.g. drilling and rehabilitation of boreholes that appear also in the DDP on page 163.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	1	<p>During FY 2016/17, Nakapiripirit DTPC met 13 times (i.e. on the 15th/7/2016, 25th/7/2016, 30th/8/2016, 27th/9/2016, 31st/10/2016, 15th/11/2016, 11th/1/2017, 24th/1/2017, 28th/2/2017, 23rd/3/2017, 15th/4/2017, 16th/5/2017,30th/6/2017). However, none of the DTPC minutes on file for FY 2016/17 offered documented proof that the DTPC discussed the developed project profiles and by implication discussing the DDP 2015/16-2019/20.The way the DTPC minutes appeared to be documented reflected discussions of agenda items with more generalities than specifics of deliberations on projects. A case in point is agenda item, “implementation of projects” minute dated (see 24th/1/2017 and 30th/6/2017 DTPC meetings/minutes). For the FY2016/17, while NPA’s (2017) Certificate of Compliance with Planning Guidelines awarded Nakapiripirit District a score of 75% on the robustness of the planning process the emerging overall average score was 47.3% when all planning aspects were kept into view (see page 83).</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>	1	<p>The Statistical Abstracts (June 2016) were seen that captured some gender-related and gender dis-aggregated data and information (e.g. on page 19 – population by location – sub-counties as well as rural and urban). However, no DTPC agenda item and minute deliberated on gender disaggregated statistical abstracts in the way they would influence allocations and decision making in Nakapiripirit District. Therefore there was no documented evidence of effective evidence utilization by means of the DTPC taking recourse to such data and information.</p>

4	<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>According to documented evidence drawn from the APC/Budget 2016/17, all projects implemented in the FY 2016/17 were drawn from AWP 2016/17 but not always implemented on budget. For example, as seen on page 181 of the Approved Final Accounts (AFA) for FY 2016/17, under education, pit latrine construction had an approved budget of 45m but the actual expenditure was over and above 45m (in fact was 46,421,900), hence not on budget by 103%. Also, there was no proof that the AWP was approved by council.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	2	<p>Only some projects (87%) implemented in FY 2016/17 were completed as per work plan – with education department the least compliant (63%) compared with health and water that hovered in the region of 100%. Consequently, the average came to 87% only.</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>	2	<p>According to details in the Q4 Consolidated APR 2016/17, only some investment projects (87%) implemented in FY 2016/17 were completed within approved budget.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>The district budget for O&amp;M but actual expenditure on O&amp;M exceeded the budget (by 103%). The Approved Final Account (AFA) for the FY 2016/17 revealed that Nakapiripirit's O&amp;M budget was 730,196,000/= but actual expenditure for FY2016/17 amounted to a total of 752,893,140/=, slightly above budget).</p>
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				



6

LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.

- Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2

0

Only 3 out of the 7 existing HoDs were duly appraised (with signed Performance Agreements and Performance Reports on file) during the previous FY. While 3 HoDs had completed Performance Agreements but with no Performance Reports on file, two HoDs had neither Agreement nor Reports on file at the time of the review. See details below:

- District Engineer: CR/OP/1027: Appraised on 17/07/2016, Performance Agreement dated 17/07/2016 on file and duly signed by CAO. Performance Report dated 17/07/17 on file and duly signed by CAO

- District Health Officer: CR/PF/1379 , Appraised on 27/07/17, Performance Agreement dated 01/07/2017 on file and duly signed by CAO. Performance report dated 27/07/2017 on file and duly signed by CAO

- District Community Dev. Officer: CR/ACRO/1333. Performance agreement dated 4/07/2016 on file but not signed by CAO. Performance Report seen on file, signed by the staff and CAO but note dated.

District Education Officer: CR/ 159/2. Performance agreement dated 4/07/2016 on file and duly signed by CAO. Performance Report dated 14/07/2017 signed by the DEO but not signed by CAO.

Chief Finance Officer: CR/1309. No performance Appraisal documents were available on file at the time of the assessment on the 2/02/2018.

Verifiable evidence indicated that only 4 out of the existing 8 HoDs of departments positions at Nakapiripiriti district were filled by the time of the review.

Verified evidence included:

- A review of the staffing list (69 Pages) which was in soft copy ( updated from time to time) , available in the HRM office

- MoPS approved staffing structure for all district local government as per letter from PS MoPS dated 14/09/2016 and as per Nakapiripiriti DLC meeting that customized the structure as indicated by DLC minutes dated 16/12/2016, Minute extract 18/NDLC/16.

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

0

The positions that are substantively filled include:

1. District Engineer: Personal File Ref. No.CR/OP/1027. Appointed on 12/12/2003 Ref-CR/156/2 and confirmed as District Engineer on 10/02/2005 as per minute extract no. 16 (VIII) 2004.

2. District Health Officer: Personal File Ref No. CR/PF/1379. Appointed on promotion from Moroto District as per letter dated 20/03/2008 ref: CR/160/1

3. Chief Finance Officer: Personal File Ref. CR/1309. Appointed on 1/09/2005 as per letter ref.no. CR/156/2, Minute extract no. 10/NDC/2005.

The rest of the positions are held by staff in care taking capacity ( appointed by CAO on Assignment of Duty) as indicated below:

1. District Comm. Dev. Officer: Personal File Ref. CR/ACRO/1333. Appointed on assignment of duty on 28/06/2016 as per letter ref. no. CR/157

2. District Education Officer: Personal File Ref. CR/159/2. Appointed on assignment of duty on 6/11/2015, letter ref.no. CR/159/2

3. District Production& Mktg. Officer: Personal File Ref: CR/OP/136. Appointed assignment of duty on 1/07/2016 as per letter ref.no. CR/156

4. District Natural Resources Officer: Personal File Ref: CR/OP/1373. Appointed on assignment of duty on 8/07/2016 as per letter ref.no. CR/156

The position of Commercial Officer is still vacant.

<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>The DSC considered all (100%) of the submissions made by CAO to DSC for recruitment. This followed the MoPS approval of the recruitment of ONLY 9 positions out of 32 positions planned for the FY 2016/17 as per Staff Recruitment plan 2016/17 available in the HRM office.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MoPS response dated 8/11/2016, ref.no. ARC 6/ 293/05 approved of 9 key positions including: Principal Human Resource Officer, District Internal Auditor, Senior Land Management Officer, Inspector of Schools, Physical Planner, and Senior Agricultural Officer among others.</li> <li>CAO made submissions to DSC dated 5/05 2017 for the recruitment for the 9 approved position by MoPS.</li> <li>DSC of the 35th and 36th meeting sat from the 27th April to 2nd May and considered the submissions. Out of the 9 positions ONLY 4 attracted suitable and successful applicants that were appointed on probation as per letter from Secretary to the DSC to the CAO dated 5/05/2017, ref. CR/239/1</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>Two submissions were made by CAO to the DSC for consideration but were for staff recruited in FY 2015/16. Staff that were recruited in FY 2016/17 had not yet been appraised for the probationary period and hence could not be confirmed.</p> <p>CAO made a submission on the 14/09/ 2016, ref no. CR/159/2 for confirmation of 112 staff recruited in FY 2015/16. DSC sat on the 19 /10/2016 and considered the submissions and communicated to CAO through Minute extract no. 86/NDSC/2016 ( confirming 16 staff) and minute 71 /NDC/2016 confirming 10 staff. The rest of the staff had not been confirmed by the time of the assessment on the 2/02/2018.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>No submissions were made by CAO to the DSC for disciplinary action during the FY.</p>

8	<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<p>Two ( 2) staff were appointed ( in July 2017) as per appointment and acceptance letters seen on file at the time of the assessment at 2/02/2018</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plant Operator: CR/OP/ 1005</li> <li>• Driver: CR/OP/2018.</li> </ul> <p>None of the two staff had accessed the pay roll, by the time of the assessment.</p> <p>Reasons advanced by the HRO for the delay included: Change of administration (CAO transferred). The new CAO wanted to first establish whether there was a wage bill for the new recruitments. In addition the IGG had an outstanding query with the Plant Operator. The driver had not yet fulfilled the requirements for accessing the pay roll, for instance he had not yet opened a bank account and also had no TIN number.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>No retired staff during the previous FY had accessed the pension pay roll by the time of the assessment. Two staff retired during the previous FY namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CR/PF/1798- Retired in December 2017</li> <li>• CR/NTC/1002- Retired in August 2016.</li> </ul> <p>Generally retired staff in Nakapiripirit district take years before accessing the pension pay roll. HRO reported that since 2013, only 7 out of 24 staff that retired are currently on the Pension Pay roll.</p>
Assessment area: Revenue Mobilization				



12	<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG has no Senior Procurement officer ,only the position of Procurement officer exists (refer min 53(1)NDSC/2008 promotion to procurement officer ,letter of appointment dated 15th August 2008 signed by CAO, Sande Kyomya Christopher.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The TEC produced and submitted reports to the contracts committee for the previous FY e.g.</li> </ul> <p>Construction of Kitchen with store at Namalu mixed primary school signed by contracts committee on 05/4/2017, fencing of lorengedwat sub county HQs signed by evaluation committee on 29/11/2016, renovation of old administration block at Nabilatuk Town Council signed on 05/4/2017, construction of two stance drainable pit latrine in Lorukimo PS signed by evaluation committee on 29/11/2016.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>Evidence of contracts committee considering recommendations of the TEC were not availed at the time of assessment.</p>
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>Procurement and disposal plan for current FY covers all infrastructural projects in approved work plan submitted to Executive Director PPDA dated 31st July 2017(submission of procurement work plan for FY 2017/2018,signed by CAO,Aloysius Aloka and received by PPDA on 7th Sept 2017.</li> <li>The LG made procurements in the previous FY submitted to PPDA Refer to Submission of 4th quarter report to executive Director PPDA July 31st 2017,signed by CAO and received by PPDA on 07 Sept 2017</li> </ul>

14

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

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

2

- For the current FY, The LG prepared 80% of bid documents under open bidding for all investments/infrastructure by August 30th 2017 for prequalification signed by CAO on 31/7/2017 and were advertised on new vision newspaper dated Friday Aug 18th 2017. eg construction of general ward at Nakapiripirit HC III

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

2

- The LG had an updated contracts register showing category/works/goods/services, contract description, method of procurement, contract amount in shs, date of invitation, contract date signed, contractual start date, completion date, and remarks showing ongoing project activities ie construction of two stance drainable latrine in Tokora Health center II, Construction of two classroom block up to window level at Moruita PS, signed by Procurement officer dated 19 Jan 2017.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2.</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG adhered to procurement thresholds eg;</li> </ul> <p>For selective bidding-construction of two stance latrine at Lomikino PS (10,000,000/=), Open bidding-construction of maternity ward in Naiyona angikalio up to roofing(97,150,064/=), open bidding-fencing of Lorengedwat SC HQs(64,298,200/=), selective bidding-renovation of old administration block at Nabilatuk TC(28,035,001/=), Selective bidding-construction of kitchen with store at Namalu mixed PS(21,875,662/=)</p>
15	<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects for previous FY were certified with interim and completion certificates (Provisional certificate of completion ) e.g.</li> </ul> <p>Construction of kitchen at Namalu mixed PS 21/6/2017 signed by district engineer, Construction of 2 stance pit latrine at Lovukumu PS signed on 28/6/2017 by district engineer, renovation of old administration block at Nabilatuk subcounty, fencing of lorengedwat SC HQs, maternity ward at Noyunae angikolio HC II</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>visited projects include; Construction of general ward at Nakapiripirit health center III, Completion of maternity ward at Nabirae HC II, periodic maintenance of Nabulenger road.</p> <p>The above infrastructural projects for current FY visited were not clearly labelled and no site boards seen by the time of assessment</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	<p>There was evidence that the LG made monthly and up to- date bank reconciliations on the following cash books; cash books for UNICEF, YLP, Works department, Accountability A/C, CDD, DDEG A/C, CBG, Education and Health sector were reconciled up to 31/12/2017. The cash book for Administration was reconciled up to 30/12/2017.</p>
17	<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2.</li> </ul>	0	<p>There was no payment register to show overdue bills. However, the payment vouchers sampled show that the LG didn't make timely payment to suppliers during the previous FY. E.g. request for payment of balance for fuel and lubricants supplied on 10/11/2016 dated 17/2/2017, was paid on 20/2/2017. Also request for supply of stationery by Asicco general enterprises dated 23/5/2016 was cleared for payment on 20/3/2017 and paid on 28/3/2017. Furthermore, request for repair of motor cycle by Bugema Garage dated 14/6/2016, was cleared for payment on 14/9/2016 and paid on 28/3/2017 and request from Karinga general Enterprises for supply of fuel and lubricants dated 27/2/2017 was paid on 30/3/2017. The timing of payment was inconsistent i.e. for procurements made towards end of a FY, payment was timely but those made earlier payment was delayed.</p>
18	<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor and produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 3.</li> </ul>	0	<p>The LG has no substantive senior internal auditor. According to the staff structure, the LG is supposed to have a Principal internal auditor and an Internal auditor. However, they are both not in place. The LG had Acting Internal auditor who was interdicted (evidence of a letter of interdiction of internal auditor Mr Anego James dated 9/1/2018 signed by CAO was on file). Only first quarter and second quarter internal audit reports for the previous FY were produced. Therefore, one of the reasons for interdiction was failure to produce 3rd and 4th quarterly internal audit reports.</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>	0	<p>The first and second quarterly audit reports were received by the registry on behalf of CAO, RDC, LCV chairman and LGPAC on 9/12/2016 and 10/7/2017 respectively. However, LGPAC was non functional in FY 2016/2017 because their term of office had expired as explained by the clerk to council and confirmed by LCV chairman. Therefore, there were no LGPAC minutes deliberating on internal audit reports. No evidence of follow up.</p>
		<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	<p>The first and second quarterly audit reports were received by the registry on behalf of CAO, RDC, LCV chairman and LGPAC on 9/12/2016 and 10/7/2017 respectively. However, LGPAC was non functional in FY 2016/2017 because their term of office had expired as explained by the clerk to council and confirmed by LCV chairman. LGPAC has not reviewed the internal audit reports. The current LGPAC was constituted in June 2017 and are yet to start work.</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"> <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 available Asset register was updated up to end of FY 2016/2017. Depreciation was calculated up to 30/6/2017. It was signed by CAO on 17/7/2017. Procurement process for 2017/18 is ongoing so no Assets have been procured in the current FY.</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	<p>From the Annual report of the Auditor General 2017, Nakapiripiriti DLG obtained an unqualified Audit opinion.</p>
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				

21	<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2</p>	2	<p>There was only scanty evidence documented officially that Nakapiripirit District Local Council existed let alone fully functional. The Box File was allegedly submitted to IGG and/or External Auditors for use. As such, at the time of the assessment, there was indicative evidence only that council met 3 out of 6 mandatory times (i.e. on the 5th/9/2016, 15th/3/2017 and 26th/5/2017), and this according to one set of freshly printed-out minutes and hurriedly signed by the Clerk to Council as well as handwritten notes seen in the Clerk to Council's Note Book. All dates of council minutes corresponded with the Schedule of District Council Meetings for FY 2016/2017. It was clear from the contents of these indicative source documents that council met and deliberated on a few relevant service-delivery issues e.g. discussion of departmental budgets, plans and reports as well as committee reports and recommendations (min 23/NDLG/7/2017). It was clear that a few essential issues were altogether missing in the indicative district councils deliberations in the FY 2016/17. These included TPC reports, monitoring reports and performance assessment reports.</p>
22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2.</p>	0	<p>No documented evidence that there is a designated official meant to coordinate lower-level feedback on and responses to grievances /complaints in council.</p>

23	The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)	Evidence that the LG has published: • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2	2	Documented evidence seen of publishing payroll register on CAO main block's board albeit it was undated, unsigned and unstamped. There was no documented evidence of posting of the pension schedule.
	Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1	1	Documented evidence seen of publishing of procurement register CAO main block's board.
		• Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications, are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1.	0	Not Applicable (N/A) – There was no LGPA in the FY under review.
24	The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens	• Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1	0	No documented evidence that information relayed through central government agencies' (MoFPED, MoLG, OPM, etc) e.g. circulars, guidelines, policies and procedures (on DDEG, NAADS, NUSAF, etc) are disseminated or remitted to Lower level Local Governments (LLG).
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	• Evidence that LG during previous FY has conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc..) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1.	0	No documented evidence existed to prove use of radio talk shows and to prove the case for supporting downward accountability e.g. through barazas, etc.
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"> <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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG Gender Focal Person provided support through the following activities;</li> </ul> <p>Monitoring and support supervision of women projects dated 16/5/2017.report on monitoring women groups, women council meetings, report on gender mainstreaming in communities on 23/5/2017 signed by Gender officer, Awas Deborah.</p> <p>However there was no evidence of gender mainstreaming to sector departments</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that gender focal point has planned activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and that more than 90% of previous year's budget for gender activities has been implemented: score 2.</li> </ul>	0	<p>The planned activities for current FY in the annual work plan signed by Gender officer and CAO on 5th July 2017 include;</p> <p>Mandatory women council meetings, monitoring of women's livelihood programme, workshops and seminars.</p> <p>However, The previous year's budget was not availed at the time of assessment</p>
26	<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental screening where appropriate for the following projects;</li> </ul> <p>Construction of maternity ward in Nativae HC II at Lolodat sub county signed by environmental officer on 2nd Nov 2016, construction of kitchen at Namalu mixed PS signed by environment officer on 3 Nov 2016, Fencing of Kaiku PS on 3 Nov 2016 by environment officer, screening of proposed market site at Moruita Sub county signed by environment officer on 2 June 2016, construction of maternity at Tokom HC IV in Kamongole sub county signed by environment officer on 2 Nov 2016.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>The LG integrated environmental and social safeguards in BOQs in the following contracts;</p> <p>Construction of teachers Kitchen in Namalu-environmental restoration for tree planting was 100,000/=, 2 stance pit latrine at Lovokumo,renovation of administration block at Nabilatuk sub county-environmental mitigation was 200,000/=, Fencing of Lorengedwat sub county HQs-environmental mitigation was 300,000/=</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were no land issues where projects were implemented since most are institutional projects. However, land consent forms for NUSAF include;</li> </ul> <p>Block farm at Loreng parish, Lorengae sub county signed by land owner and LC I of Loreng on 12/3/2017, Nursery bed establishment in Lokwamor village in Navisae parish, Lorengedwat sub county signed by land owners and LC III chairman Lorengedwat on 31 Jan 2017, tree planting in Naupala, Nabilatuk sub county signed by land owners and chairperson LC III Nabilatuk signed on 20 march 2017</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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG had temporal environmental certification forms for the following projects;</li> </ul> <p>Construction of 2 stance latrine in Lomorimor PS in Namalu sub county signed by environment officer on 28/2/2017, Fencing of Kaiku PS in Namalu sub county signed by environment officer on 28/2/2017, construction of OPD in Komaret HC III, Moruita sub county signed by environment officer on 28/2/2017 and construction of production store at Nakapiripirit Town council signed by environment officer on 28/2/2017.</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Educational Performance Measures

Nakapiripirit District

(Vote Code: 543)

Score 34/100 (34%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				
1	<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</p> <p>• Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4</p>	<p>0</p> <p>4</p>	<p>• Did not find any 2017/18 plans or budget for the education department despite all the efforts the assessor made with the Ag. DEO.</p> <p>Nakapiripirit DLG deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for t the 2017/18 FY. Verified the evidence from the staff list signed by the Inspector of Schools on 11/08/17</p>
2	<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision o If 100% score 6 o If 80 - 99% score 3 o If below 80% score 0</p>	0	<p>No documentation regarding the approved structure for primary school teachers or the wage bill provision for the DEO's office could be found.</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>No documentation regarding the structure for inspectors or the wage bill provision for the positions could be found</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence on recruitment was available although the Ag. DEO claimed he had requested the CAO for filling up of existing gaps in his department</li> </ul>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of School Inspectors: score 2</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence on recruitment was available although the Ag. DEO claimed he had requested the CAO for filling up of existing gaps of inspectors in his department</li> </ul>

5	<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY • 100% school inspectors: score 3</p>	0	<p>There was no verifiable evidence to confirm that the two School Inspectors had been appraised by the time of the review.</p> <p>1. Inspector of Schools: Personal File Ref No- CR/NPT/166/1787. Appointed on 31/07/2017 as per minute extract 19/ NDSC/2017.</p> <p>No performance appraisal records for FY 2016/17 were seen on file at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>2. Inspector of School: Personal File Ref No. CR/ACRO/1406. Appointed on 1/09/2005 as per minute extract 58 (3) NDSC/2005.</p> <p>No performance appraisal records for FY 2016/17 were seen on file at the time of the assessment.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised head teachers during the previous FY. • 90% - 100%: score 3 • 70% - 89%: score 2 • Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<p>Appraisal forms for Head Teachers seen in the DEO's office had been signed by the SMC chair persons and were yet to be signed by the Sub County Chiefs and the DEO.</p>

Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection

6	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>Nakapiripiriti ommunicated several guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the 2016/17 FY to schools . Verified evidence by the following communications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report on the conduct of 2017 PLE by Executive Secretary Uganda National Examinations Board to the CAO on 7/11/17 forwarded to the Head Teachers on 4/12/17.</li> <li>Teachers support supervision in schools by P/S MOES on 30/01/17 to all Head Teachers through the DEO</li> <li>School Feeding Program in Education Institutions by HE the President on 15/05/17</li> <li>Mass Registration of learners in all primary, secondary and post primary institutions in Uganda by P/S MOES to all Head teachers on 25/04/17 received at Nakapiripirit Primary School on 29/05/17</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level, including on school feeding: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Nakapiripiriti District Education department held one meeting with primary school head teachers to discuss the National Integrated Early Childhood Development ( NIECD) policy as evidenced by the report by the DIS on the dissemination of the National Integrated Early Childhood Development ( NIECD) policy workshop at parish/community level that took place from 7-11 April 2017</p>
7	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all private and public primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>Could not find documented evidence of the extent of inspection during 2016/2017 mainly because both the DEO and DIS were not in office for the days of the assessment</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>Could not find any documented evidence of discussions of recommendations from the inspection reports.</p>
		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could not find any documented evidence of regarding submission of the inspection reports .</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>Could not find any documented evidence of follow up of recommendation from the inspection reports.</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: 0 List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5</li> </ul>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Nakapiripiriti District primary schools data is consistent in both the EMIS and OBT reports as evidenced by data from the same sources:</li> </ul> <p>EMIS 43 Schools</p> <p>OBT 43 schools</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5</p>	0	<p>Nakapiripiriti District primary schools'enrollment data is not consistent in the EMIS and OBT reports as evidenced by data from the same sources:</p> <p>EMIS 15740</p> <p>OBT 18066</p>
<p>Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>				

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>Works and Technical Services Committee is one of the standing committees and it is responsible education. Indeed, some minutes availed during the assessment (e.g. 7th/11/2016) indicated that some relevant education issues keep popping up in the committees' deliberations – confirming that it met and discussed education service delivery issues, including departmental quarterly updates on priorities budgets, plans (scrutinizing the AWP 2017/18) and reports; as well as assorted sector challenges and recommendations. Even so, there was no evidence in minutes of discussion of results from performance assessments, inspection and monitoring reports.</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>Some minutes of council's deliberations indicated that representatives of the Works and Technical Services Committee presented education sector reports with issues presented to council that required its approval. Examples of some specific issues can be gleaned from the draft council minutes of 15th/3/2017 (min. 23/NDLC/2017) and 26th/5/2017.</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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did not find any recent documentation about the SMCs in the DEOs office mainly because the DEO was out office during the two days of the assessment'</li> </ul>
12	<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<p>No evidence of any publications was seen at the district not even at the notice boards of the individual schools visited during the 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>	4	<p>Verified from the following procurement requests for FY 2017/18 in form 4 of the District AWP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completion of classroom blocks at Namaonot P/S started in 2013/4</li> <li>Completion of renovation of classroom block that was begun in 2015/6 at Nakaale P/S</li> <li>Completion of classroom block at Namorolt P/S. Project started in 2016/17</li> <li>Construction of a two stance pit latrine with a urinal at Kosiko P/S</li> <li>Construction a 3 stance pit latrine with a urinal at Lolele P/S</li> </ul>
14	<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	3	<p>The LG education department certified and initiated payment for suppliers on time as seen from the sampled payment vouchers below;</p> <p>Request from Karinga general traders for payment of fuel and lubricants dated 3/11/2016 was forwarded by DEO on 4/11/2016 and paid on 24/11/2016.</p> <p>Request for repair of motor cycle by Muzamiru dated 7/8/2016 was forwarded on 7/8/2016 and paid on 28/9/2016.</p> <p>Request for payment by Lokosowa and sons for construction of 2 classroom block at Nangorotot P/S dated 29/6/2017 was forwarded on 30/6/2017 and paid on 30/6/2017.</p> <p>Request for payment by Justosan constructors for construction of staff house at Kaiku P/S dated 2/3/2017 was forwarded on 17/3/2017 and paid on 22/3/2017.</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>	4	<p>According to the LG Planner's records and evidence from the Q4 Consolidated APR for the FY 2016/17, the education department attempted to submit in time inputs to the planning unit for all 4 quarters for FY 2016/17 (i.e. Q1 - 25th/11/2016 with no Receipt No but OPM and MoLG stamps seen dated 25th/11/2016; Q2 – 1st/2/2017 Receipt No: 0266; Q3 – 5th/5/2017 Receipt No: 0682; and Q4 – 28th/7/2017 Receipt No: 0835), hence success of the submission of the Q4 APR before the deadline (meant to be submitted before 31st/7/2017).</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"> <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>There was no evidence that the education sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year. The sector had audit queries in first quarter internal audit report of pit latrines completely full, borehole broken down and dilapidated structures at Namalu P/S but no evidence of response to audit queries.</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>	2	<p>Nakapiripiriti DEO disseminated guidelines on violence against children in schools as evidenced by the Invitation letter to all teachers and all L3 chairpersons by the CAO on 06/12/17 for the workshop on orientation of teachers on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Violence against children in schools (VACIS),</li> <li>ii) Related gender based violence (SRGBV)</li> <li>iii) Safe school alternative to corporal punishment and retention</li> </ul>
----	--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Verified the evidence from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invitation by the CAO to the training of District Technical team and teachers on elimination of violence against children in schools that took place 16-18h August 2017.</li> <li>• Invitation for WFP partners to attend a protection, Gender and accountability to affected population ( AAP) workshop by the Head of Karamoja Area office</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did not find any recent documentation r regarding SMCs in the DEO's office.</li> </ul>
18	<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 3:</li> </ul>	3	<p>Verified evidence by the invitation by the DEO to all Head Teachers to participate in a stake holders meeting on environment conservation and climate change on 31/10 /17</p>





## **LGPA 2017/18**

Health Performance Measures

Nakapiripirit District

(Vote Code: 543)

Score 52/100 (52%)

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>	0	<p>The approved staffing structure could not be accessed at the Office of the DHO. While the the approved staffing structure was reported to be at the HR's office it was not possible to access this as the HR was not station. It was also reported that no recruitment has been planned since the wage to support addition of more staff in health facilities was not provided.</p>
2	<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 4</p>	0	<p>No recruitment of staff at health facilities has been planned for the FY 2017/2018 to necessitate preparation of this request. Although staffing gaps were reported, there was no wage bill to support any more staff if recruitment was done.</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>	8	<p>There are 2 health facility In-Charges for the HCs IV in Nakapiripiriti district ( Nabilatuk HC IV and Tokora HC IV) and they were appraised by the DHO. The In-Charges were appointed by Assignment of Duty by the CAO ( in care taking capacity).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In-Charge Nabilatuk HC IV- CR/OP/2113: Appointed by Assignment of duty on 18/05/2017 ref- CR/2113: Appraised on 10/09/2016. Appraisal form PS Form 5 duly signed by the DHO.</li> <li>2. In-Charge Tokora HC IV- CR/OP/18952. Appointed on assignment of duty on 2/01./ 2017 ref-CR/103/9 : Appraised on 10/09/2016. Appraisal form PS Form 5 duly signed by the DHO.</li> </ol> <p>The appraisal files for both In-Charges were available at the registry for verification.</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>	0	<p>At the time of the assessment, a deployment list could not be accessed at the DHO or HR's office. Both the HR officer and the DHO were off station and delegated staff could not access the list showing deployment of staff in the different health facilities.</p>
Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision				

5	The DHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities	<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	The Only guidelines received by the DHOs office during 2016/2017 FY were the Uganda clinical guidelines 2016. These were reportedly distributed to the 18 health facilities in the district. No communication by way of letters to the recipients, minutes of DHT or quarterly review meetings was provided to confirm dissemination of these guidelines.
	Maximum 6 for this performance measure	<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	Although meetings were held, review of minutes of DHT, quarterly other meetings does not reflect having explained the UCG guidelines from national level to the in-charges.
6	The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services	Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3	3	The DHT supervised Tokora and Nabilatuk HC-IVs, the only health units at this level in the district. Support supervision reports at the accounts office show these as part of supervised health facilities during the previous FY.
	Maximum 6 points for this performance measure	Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% supervised: score 3 points</li> <li>80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2</li> <li>60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 1</li> <li>Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</li> </ul>	2	13/18 (72%)health facilities in the district were supervised during the previous FY. Three support supervision reports for quarters 1,2&3 were found in the files at the accounts office (not the DHOs office) as supporting documents for accountability of support supervision funds.
7	The Health Sub-district(s) have effectively provided support supervision to lower level health units	Evidence that health facilities have been supervised by HSD and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% supervised score 6 points</li> <li>80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 4</li> <li>60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 2</li> <li>Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</li> </ul>	0	There was no support supervision report or minutes of DHT meetings showing that the HSD supervised lower level health facilities. The only detailed support supervision report accessed at Tokora HC IV was dated 22-25/1/2007 (not 2017). Since the in-charge was off station it was not clear if this was an error but in one of the minutes, the year 2006 was referred to as the previous year meaning that this was not a report for 2016/2017 FY. Further to this support supervision to Nakapiripiriti HC III by the HSD was not reflected in the support supervision book. The only support supervision that was not partner supported was from the medicines supervisor from the district.

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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>Support supervision reports from the DHT were discussed and recommendations made in the support supervision books provided at the health facilities. For example, in a DHT meeting held on 7/06/2017 it was recommended that due to closure of <i>Concern Worldwide</i>, integrated support supervision by the DHT should be enhanced.</p>
	<p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</li> </ul>	6	<p>Recommendations from support supervision reports were followed . For example in the DHT meeting held on 14/06/2017, the DHO reported poor management of malaria in the district not following MOH guidelines in most health facilities. One of the Medical officers was assigned to be the Malaria focal person in the district as stop gap measure</p>
9	<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for health facility lists as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: o List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10</li> </ul>	0	<p>The annual work plan was not accessed and the list of the reporting health facilities was not provided by the biostatistician at the time of the assessment.</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	<p>Nakapiripirit District's Council meetings that sat on the 5th/9/2016, 15th/3/2017 and 26th/5/2017 passed some recommendations of the Social Services Council Committee that covers issues on health.</p>
----	---	---	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Social Services Council Committee is one of the standing committees and it is responsible health. Indeed, some minutes availed during the assessment (e.g. 7th/3/2017) indicated that some relevant health issues keep popping up in the committees' deliberations – confirming that it met and discussed health service delivery issues, including departmental quarterly updates on priorities budgets, plans (scrutinizing the AWP 2017/18) and reports; as well as assorted sector challenges and recommendations. Even so, there was no evidence in minutes of discussion of results from performance assessments, supervision and monitoring.</p>
11	<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 5 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5</li> <li>• If 80-99% : score 3</li> <li>• If 70-79%: : score 1</li> <li>• If less than 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	5	<p>HUMCs at Tokola HC IV and Nakaparipiriti HCIII were functional. Both health facilities held HUMC meetings. For Nakaparipiriti HCIII, Minutes were available for HUMC meetings held on 11/08/2016, 01/10/2016 and 25/03/2017. Among issues discussed were arrival pf medicines and lack of solar lighting at the OPD. For Tokola HC IV, issues of functionality of the maternity ward and inadequate supplies of medicines leading to stock outs were discussed.</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>	0	<p>Display of PHC funds released at the previous quarter was confirmed at only one of the visited facilities (Nakaparipiriti HC III). There was no display at Tokora HC IV for the PHC funds at the facility notes board.</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> <p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	2	<p>No procurement request to cover investments in the district was developed since no such procurement was planned for the current FY.</p> <p>No procurement request form to the PDU in the district was developed since no such procurement was planned for the current FY.</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:</li> <li>• 100% - score 8</li> <li>• 70-99% – score 4</li> <li>• Below 70% - score 0</li> </ul>	8	<p>The office of the DHO developed and submitted a a procurement plan for medical supplies to NMS for 2017/2018 signed by the DHO on 30/01/2018. This consolidated plan covers all the facilities. The office of the DHO through the store keeper endorses on all the delivery notes of the medicines supplied to the district from the NMS.</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>The LG Health department certified and recommended suppliers for timely payment as evidenced from the payments below;</p> <p>Request from Kadam construction company Ltd for rehabilitation of OPD at Lomorunyangae H/C II dated 14/12/2016, forwarded by DHO on 14/12/2016 and paid on 20/12/2016.</p> <p>Request by Nakaterot investments Ltd for payment for renovation of staff houses and construction of a placenta pit in Namalu H/C III dated 7/12/2016 was forwarded by DHO on 8/2/2017 and paid on 10/2/2017.</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>	4	<p>According to the LG Planner's records and evidence from the Q4 Consolidated APR for the FY 2016/17, the health department attempted to submit in time inputs to the planning unit for all 4 quarters for FY 2016/17 (i.e. Q1 - 25th/11/2016 with no Receipt No but OPM and MoLG stamps seen dated 25th/11/2016; Q2 – 1st/2/2017 Receipt No: 0266; Q3 – 5th/5/2017 Receipt No: 0682; and Q4 – 28th/7/2017 Receipt No: 0835), hence success of the submission of the Q4 APR before the deadline (meant to be submitted before 31st/7/2017).</p>
17	<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If sector has no audit query score 4</li> <li>If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points</li> <li>If all queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	0	<p>There was no evidence that the Health department has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year. The sector had audit queries in first quarter internal audit report where a spot check of Nabulenger H/C III indicted that procurement procedures for drugs and other medical supplies were not being adhered to by the Health centre staff. But no evidence of response to audit queries.</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>	<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>Gender composition of HUMCs at both Tokora (3/8 female) and Nakapiripiriti HC III (2/6 female)met requirements as per the HUMC guidelines.</p>
	<p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>The LG had not received these guidelines from the MOH for issuing to the health facilities.</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>	0	<p>The LG had not received these guidelines from the MOH to issue to health facilities.</p>
----	---	---	---	---



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Nakapiripirit District

(Vote Code: 543)

Score 56/100 (56%)

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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The safe water coverage data showed that Nakapiripirit DLG had safe water access coverage of 66.4% while 3 sub counties had safe water access coverage below the district average i.e</li> <li>Lolachat S/C-38%</li> <li>Kakomongole S/C-51%</li> <li>Nakapiripirit Town Council-53%</li> <li>However, Nakapiripirit DLG targetted more of the S/C above the district coverage and only S/C below the district Coverage (Lolachat S/C) as per the Annual Work Plan and Budget of FY 2017/18.</li> </ul>
2	<p>The LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY: score 15</li> </ul>	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the annual progress report for quarter four of FY2016/17 submitted to MoWE on 04th August 2017, Nakapiripirit DLG implemented Lolachat piped water system phase 1 as budgeted in the AWP FY2016/17.</li> </ul>
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>	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 2nd Quarter annual progress report for FY2017/18 submitted and received by MoWE on 22/01/2018 has an appendix of monitoring report by Nakapiripirit DWO for Lolachat piped water supply system conducted on 14/01/2018.</li> <li>• A report on borehole rehabilitation by the Hand Pump Mechanics Association prepared on 14/01/2018 was seen by the assessor.</li> <li>• A report and instructions to be executed on ongoing 5-stance drainable pit latrine at Kakamongole RGC, also annexed in the 1st quarter progress report for FY2017/18.</li> <li>• There was also a monitoring report of water projects in the district by the DWO submitted to the CAO on 20th April 2017.</li> <li>• From the assessor's analysis, 99% of the WSS facilities were monitored annually by the DWO.</li> </ul>
4	<p>The LG Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• 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</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The safe water coverage data showed that Nakapiripirit DLG had safe water access coverage of 66.4%, Lorengedwat S/C-95%, Nabilatuk S/C-99%, Lolachat S/C-38%, Namalu S/C-76%, Kakamongole S/C-51%, Moruita S/C-45%, Nakapiripirit Town Council-53% &amp; Loregae S/C-73%.</li> <li>• This was contrary to the MIS report that shows that NNakapiripirit DLG had safe water access coverage of 64%, Lorengedwat S/C-82%, Nabilatuk S/C-79%, Lolachat S/C-43%, Namalu S/C-76%, Kakamongole S/C-63%, Moruita S/C-50%, Nakapiripirit Town Council-95% &amp; Loregae S/C-56%.</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				

5	<p>The LG Water department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement requests from DWO for FY 2017/18 were submitted late after April 30th 2017 for instance;</li> <li>• Phase 2 of Lolachat piped water costing costing Ugshs 380,587,686.</li> <li>• Completion of Tokora 5-stance pit latrine at Kakomongole Rural Growth Centre costing Ugshs 8,596,000.</li> <li>• Minor rehabilitation of 6 boreholes by the Hand Pump Mechanics Association costing Ugshs 20,880,000.</li> <li>• All the 3 procurement requests were initiated by the ADWO on 20th July 2017 and were received by the Procurement Officer on 01st August 2017.</li> </ul>
6	<p>The DWO has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the DWO prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DWO prepared a contract management Plan for FY2016/17 and this is shown in the 2nd quarter Annual progress report submitted to MoWE on 20th April 2017.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through field visits on 03rd February 2018 at Lolachat piped water and Tokora 5-stance pit latrine at Kakomongole Rural Growth Centre, the designs were found similar to what is mentioned in their Bills of Quantities.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No hand over reports of completed projects were found on file.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No completion reports for WSS projects were found on file in the DWO.</li> </ul>

7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	3	<p>There is evidence that the LG timely certified and recommended suppliers for payment from the payment requests and vouchers available. E.g.</p> <p>Request from Karinga General Traders Ltd for supply of fuel and lubricants to water office dated 2/2/2017 was forwarded on 15/2/2017 and paid on 17/2/2017.</p> <p>Payment request from Karinga for supply of fuel and lubricants to water office dated 3/4/2017 was forwarded by DWO on 5/4/2017 and paid on 16/5/2017.</p> <p>request from Techno industries Ltd for payment for construction of Lola chat water supply system dated 12/6/2017 was forwarded by DWO on 12/6/2017 and paid on 13/6/2017.</p> <p>Request for payment by Fauza Agencies for construction of a 5 stance pit latrine in Kakomongole rural growth centre dated 26/6/2017 was forwarded by DWO on 28/6/2017 and paid on 29/6/2017.</p>
---	---	---	---	---

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"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5</li> </ul>	5	<p>According to the LG Planner's records and evidence from the Q4 Consolidated APR for the FY 2016/17, the water department attempted to submit in time inputs to the planning unit for all 4 quarters for FY 2016/17 (i.e. Q1 - 25th/11/2016 with no Receipt No but OPM and MoLG stamps seen dated 25th/11/2016; Q2 – 1st/2/2017 Receipt No: 0266; Q3 – 5th/5/2017 Receipt No: 0682; and Q4 – 28th/7/2017 Receipt No: 0835), hence success of the submission of the Q4 APR before the deadline (meant to be submitted before 31st/7/2017).</p>
---	--	---	---	---

9	<p>LG Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 5 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 If queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	0	<p>There was no evidence that the water sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year. Also there was no evidence that the water department had/ didn't have internal audit queries since third quarter and fourth quarter internal audit reports were not produced.</p>
---	--	--	---	--

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>Finance, Planning and Administration Committee is one of the standing committees and it is responsible water. Indeed, some minutes (e.g. 13th/3//2017) availed during the assessment indicated that some relevant water-related issues keep popping up in the committees' deliberations – confirming that it met and discussed water service delivery issues including departmental quarterly updates on priorities, budgets, plans (scrutinizing the AWP 2017/18) and reports; as well as assorted sector challenges and recommendations. Even so, there was no evidence in minutes highlighting discussion of results from performance assessment, supervision and monitoring in the water sector.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>Finance, Planning and Administration Committee presented some water sector related issues that required council's approval. The specific issues can be gleaned from the draft council minutes of 15th/3/2017 (min. 23/NDLC/2017) and 26th/5/2017.</p>

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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Assessor saw on Nakapiripirit DLG noticeboard, information on Water Development Grant releases.</li> <li>From a copy on noticeboard, it can be seen that DWSCCG released by MoWE for Quarter 1 of FY2017/2018 published by the office of the district CAO was Ugshs 176,733,999. Release date was 30/09/2017.</li> <li>In quarter 2 of FY2017/18, DWSCCG was Ugshs 112,949,636 released on 30/10/2017.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Assessor visited Moruita borehole in Army brigade on 3rd February 2018 and found out that it was clearly labelled.</li> <li>Similarly, 2 latrines visited on 3rd February were clearly labelled;</li> <li>5-stance latrine at Moruita Rural Growth Centre, Moruita S/C.</li> <li>5-stance drainable pit latrine at Kakomongole Rural Growth Centre, Kakomongole S/C.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on tenders and contract awards on Water and Sanitation projects for FY2017/18 was not seen on Nakapiripirit LG noticeboard.</li> </ul>
12	<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One application letter for a deep borehole was seen for Lokitela-Angikoria village, Lolachat S/C and was signed by the L.C.Chairman on 19th January 2018.</li> <li>However, there was no evidence of payment of community contribution fee of Ugshs 200,000 as per the sector critical requirements.</li> </ul>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O&amp;M funds and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, for the current FY: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no physical report seen confirming the functioning of WSCs with evidence of O&amp;M funds being collected in the current FY 2017/18.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---	--

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

13	The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no report or even screening template seen for WSS projects at DWO and ENR offices of Nakapiripirit DLG.</li> </ul>
	Maximum 4 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DWO indicated that there has never been cases of unacceptable environmental concerns in the FY 2016/17.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction contracts were not availed by the DWO particularly for the Lalachat Water Supply system that was constructed in the FY2016/17 by the time of assessment.</li> <li>• Hence, the assessor could not verify a clause on environmental protection in the contract or supervision contract.</li> </ul>

14	<p>The LG Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If at least 50% WSCs are women as per the sector critical requirements: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assessor analyzed a list of 8 WUCs of Moruita S/C and Lorengedwat S/C trained by Nakapiripirit DWO incharge of mobilization on 28th November 2017.</li> <li>• It was observed that only 12.5% of the WUCs (1 out of 8) had atleast 50% of their members as women in accordance with the Rural Water and Sanitation guidelines. The composition is shown below;</li> <li>• Naopong village, Lorengedwat S/C(M=6, F=3)</li> <li>• Looi village, Lorengedwat S/C(M=4, F=5)</li> <li>• Nangamit village, Lorengedwat S/C(M=7, F=2)</li> <li>• Naoi village, Lorengedwat S/C(M=6, F=3)</li> <li>• Moruita P/S, Moruita S/C(M=5, F=4)</li> <li>• Loitalaloi village, Moruita S/C(M=6, F=3)</li> <li>• Moruita Trading Centre, Moruita S/C(M=5, F=4)</li> <li>• Seretu village, Moruita S/C(M=5, F=4)</li> </ul>
15	<p>Gender- and special-needs sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/RGCs.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two public sanitation facilities were visited on Saturday 03rd February 2018 by the Assessor and were found with adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PwDs i.e</li> <li>• 5-stance latrine at Moruita Rural Growth Centre, Moruita S/C.</li> <li>• 5-stance drainable pit latrine at Kakomongole Rural Growth Centre, Kakomongole S/C.</li> </ul>