



## LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Napak District

(Vote Code: 604)

| Assessment | Compliant | %   |
|------------|-----------|-----|
| Yes        | 3         | 50% |
| No         | 3         | 50% |

| Summary of requirements   | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification   | Compliant? |
|---|--------------------------|--|------------|
| Assessment area: Annual performance contract  |                          |  |            |
| <p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p> | xxx                      | <p>Not Compliant – Napak District APC 2017/18 (Form B) submitted late to MoFPED (see Receipt dated 4th/8/2017 and Receipt No: 4054), hence submitted after the deadline (i.e. not by 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 for proof that the draft Napak District APC/Budget 2017/18 (Form B) was submitted to MoFPED (on the 12th July 2017) was accompanied by a Procurement Plan (one of the appendices that was paged 1-11).</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>Not Compliant - Napak District Draft APR FY 2017/18 was submitted late (4th/8/2017, Receipt No: 4508) to the MoFPED (hence submitted well after the deadline of 31st July 2017). The belated submission was attributed to delayed release of templates by MoFPED culminating into delayed inputs from the sector departments). Napak District is one of the hard-to-reach LGs, thus with persistent weak internet connectivity and power-shortage problems that affect LG operations.</p> | No         |

|   |               |   |            |
|---|---------------|---|------------|
| <p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>   | <p>xxxxxx</p> | <p>Not Compliant – All 4 quarterly reports for the FY 2016/17 were duly submitted but Q4 submitted late (i.e. Q1 - 29th/11/2016 Receipt No: 0128; Q2 – 3rd/3/2017 Receipt No: 0455; Q3 – 7th/6/2017 Receipt No: 0788; and Q4 – 4th/8/2017 Receipt No: 4508).</p>  | <p>No</p>  |
| <p>Assessment area: Audit</p>   |               |   |            |
| <p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by April 30 (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action (PFMA Act 2015; Local Governments Financial and Accounting Regulations 2007; The Local Governments Act, Cap 243).</p> | <p>xxxxxx</p> | <p>The LG provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for the previous Financial year before 30th April. The submission dated 27/2/2017, was submitted/ received on 7th /3/2017. All the 28 internal audit queries were responded to by the LG.</p> | <p>Yes</p> |
| <p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>   | <p>xxxxxx</p> | <p>From the annual report of the Auditor General, financial year 2016/2017, Napak District obtained a qualified Audit opinion.</p>  | <p>Yes</p> |



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Napak District

(Vote Code: 604)

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><br><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>At the time of the assessment, there was no evidence that Napak district had formed a Physical Planning Committee (PPC) – no copy seen of CAO appointment of any PPC members and minutes to help gauge its functionality at the time of the assessment (as at 29th/1/2018) – i.e. with minutes that demonstrate PPC's sitting to help approve/consider new investments within 28 days of receipt of applications. What was seen was a MoLHUD letter to Napak District (ref no: PPD/45/01 dated 24th/4/2017 explaining the role of the PPC. NB: Napak District has 4 Town Councils, only one of which is fully functional in terms having in place systems such a Physical Planning Committee (PPC).</p> <p>Napak District did not have a substantively recruited Physical Planner and funding of this aspect at the time of the assessment (29th-30th/1/2018), hence there were no records to refer to and no documented evidence (minutes) available for proof of the approval of plans consistent with the Physical Plan. While official records got from MoLHUD, (Status of Physical Planning in Uganda 2017, the MoLHUD Physical Planning Department (2015) considered Napak District to have had/available a valid (but undated) Structural Plan (with no valid Detailed Plan as seen on Page 7), there only plan submitted to the assessment team for verification was a Napak Town Council Detailed Plan that was reportedly not yet approved. Indeed there were no records (minutes) of the District Council having approving either a Structural Plan or Detailed Plan referred to by MoLHUD and Napak District official respectively.</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

Based on the contents of the Draft Budget Conference Report (BCR) held on the 2nd November 2017, there was some evidence that the AWP 2017/18 was based on outcomes of the budget conference because the draft contained departmental presentations that specified the priorities that were easy to see in the AWP 2017/18. For education, construction of classrooms was on page 13 of the AWP 2017/18 and on page 19 of the draft BCR. For health, completion of staff houses was seen on page 12 of the AWP 2017/18 and on page 18 of the draft BCR. For water, construction of piped water system was seen on page 15 of the AWP 2017/18 and on page 22 of the draft 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 5-year Development Plan 2015/16-2019/20. For example, the approved AWP (pages 12-13) shows education sector investments e.g. construction of classroom blocks that appear also in the development plan on page 216. The approved AWP (pages 12) shows health sector investments e.g. completion of OPDs that appear also in the development plan on page 215. Also, the approved AWP (pages 15) shows water sector investments e.g. siting, drilling and installation of boreholes that appear also in the development plan on page 220.

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|   |   | <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>While some TPC Minutes offered documented proof that some TPC meetings sat to discuss the developed project profiles with some degree of specificity, there was no TPC minute seen discussing the DDP 2015/16-2019/20. The TPC minutes reflected focus on some specifics about a few projects. A case in point is “prioritization of valley tanks for rehabilitation by MoW&amp;E” – an agenda item (see page 2 of TPC minutes of 28th/2/2017) whose details are minuted on page 7 (minute number min.8/TPC/2/2017). This demonstrates attempts made by Napak District. Indeed, for the FY2016/17, NPA’s (2017) Certificate of Compliance with Planning Guidelines awarded Napak District a score of 75% on the robustness of the planning process but an average score of 27.6% 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>Napak District had no stand-alone document referred to as statistical abstracts that captured gender-related dis-aggregated data. Rather, it captured such statistical information in a document it referred to as “Napak District Strategic Plan for Statistics 2017/18-2019/20”. The plan doubled as its district statistical abstracts document and indeed captured gender disaggregating data (e.g. page v on demographics). Even so, still there was no documented evidence in the TPC minutes that TPC meetings enjoyed using such data to inform allocations and decision making (see FY 2016/17 TPC minutes on the 28th/10/2017, 31st/8/2017, 28th/2/2017, 31st/1/2017, 19th/12/2016, 16th/12/2016 and 30th/8/2016). On the whole, there was weak proof of evidence utilisation of the statistical data captured in the plan and other official sources. The plan had been circulated to the departments for their input but the inputs reportedly were not forthcoming.</p> |

|   |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 4 | Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.  | <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 | 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 that was approved by council.  |
|   | Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.  | <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>     | 0 | According to the Q4 Monitoring and Evaluation Report FY 2016/17, only a few projects (71%) implemented in FY 2016/17 were completed as per work plan. For uncompleted projects, see pages 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the report e.g. the Farmers Hall.   |
| 5 | The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects and assets during the previous FY | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2</li> </ul>                      | 0 | The sampled projects namely, the Farmers Hall and DWO Office, confirmed that some projects were not implemented on budget. This was attributed to them being roll overs from previous financial years (the problem arising from underfunding – the DDEG Guidelines suggest rather stringent formulae, causing disorganization). The other challenge concerns contract awards that often exceeded the budget amounts. According to the Q4 Consolidated Report FY 2016/17 and the Q4 Monitoring and Evaluation Report FY 2016/17, there were a few projects in FY 2016/17 completed within approved budget. |
|   | Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.  | <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 | The district budget for O&M and spent on O&M but the expenditure exceeding the budget (by about 130% beyond the planned expenditure) as seen in AFA and Q4 Monitoring and Evaluation Report for FY 2016/17 (page 9 of the latter cites rehabilitation of classroom blocks and page 10 indicates routine maintenance of dams and wages of a dam care taker as on budget actual expenditures).  |

Assessment area: Human Resource Management

|   |   |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 6 | LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments |  |  | While the HRO reported that all HoDs were appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPs during the previous FY, verified evidence on the personal files revealed that appraisal documents for the District Health Officer were missing on file at the time of the assessment |
|---|---|--|--|---|



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

(DHO had not yet submitted his forms for filing). The HoDs were assessed about the following key areas:

- Strategic Inputs& Outcomes
- Finance & Human Resource Management
- Cross cutting initiatives/Innovations

Action Plans were drawn for each individual to address the identified areas of improvement.

The HoDs were appraised as indicated below:

- District Education Officer: Appraised on 28/06/2017, Performance Agreement dated 19/08/2016 and Performance Report signed on 19/08/2017 available on file.
- District Comm.Dev. Officer: Appraised on 30/06/2017, Performance Agreement dated 1/07.2016 and Appraisal Report signed on 30/06/17 available on file.
- District Planner: Appraised in Ag. Capacity on 30/06/2017, Completed Appraisal for PS Form 5.
- District Production Officer: Appraised on 26/06/2017(Performance Agreement missing on file). Performance Report signed on 26/07/2017 and available on file.
- Chief Finance Officer: Appraised in care-taker capacity and completed PS Form 5 on 30/06/2017.
- District Engineer: Appraised on 29/06/2017 and Performance Agreement dated 20/07/2016and Performance Report signed on 29/06/17 available on file.
- District Natural Res. Officer: Appraised on 10/06/17. Performance Agreement dated 10/08/16 and Performance Report dated 28/06/17 are available on file.
- District Health Officer: No appraisal documents were available in the personal file of the DHO at the registry.

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

0

Only 3 out of the 9 Heads of Departments positions (as provide by MoPs) were filled substantively by the time of the review. Moreover, the 6 remaining positions were being held by staff appointed by CAO, not in acting capacity, but on Appointment by Duty Assignment (as care takers).

The substantially filled positions are :

- District Education Officer- Ref No: CR/D/10404, appointed on 1/12/2012 as per Min extract:93/DSC/2016
- District Comm. Dev, Off- Ref No: CR/D/10448, appointed on 1/06/2012, as per Min extract: 110/DSC/2012
- District Planner (Ref No: CR/D/10043, appointed on 19/06/14 as per Min extract: 201/DSC/2014, following approval from MoPS as per letter dated 14/09/17, Ref: ARC 135/306/01.

The following positions are held by staff appointed by CAO on Duty Assignment at different times during the FY:

- District Prodn& Mktg Officer- Ref No: CR/D/10444
- District Natural Res.Officer- Ref No: CR/D/156/6
- District Health Officer- Ref No: CR/D/10401
- Chief Finance Officer- Ref No: CR/D/10318
- District Engineer-Ref No: CR/D/10044

|   |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 7 | <p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2</li> </ul>   | 2 | <p>No (0%) recruitment was done during the FY and therefore no submissions were made by CAO to the DSC for consideration. The Ministry of Public Service did not provide a wage bill for the planned recruitment for the year 2016/17.</p>  |
|   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>  | 1 | <p>All (100%) of the submissions made by CAO to DSC for confirmation were considered. Although there were no “New Recruitments” done in FY 2016/17, the submissions by CAO included a back log of 69 confirmations across all sectors. DSC sat from the 19th to 21st of April 2017, and among other matters, considered the confirmation of the 69 staff as evidenced by a letter from the Secretary DSC to CAO dated 15/05/2017 ref. DSC/156/6 Minute extract No.1/2017.</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>There were no disciplinary cases submitted by CAO to DSC for consideration during the previous 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> | 3 | <p>Since no recruitment was done during FY 2016/17, there was no verifiable evidence relevant to this indicator and hence the district earned full scores.</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 staff (0%) accessed pension Payroll, not later than 2 months tired after retirement. 6 staff retired during the previous FY but none of them appear on the Pension Payroll as at Dec 31st 2017. Over the past 7 years, ONLY 1 staff has managed to access the Pension Payroll. The 6 Staff that retired in FY 2016/17 can be identified by the IPPS numbers indicated below:</p> <p>IPPS No. Retirement date</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>621258 - 11/04/2016</li> <li>867802 - 12/12/2016</li> <li>621166 - 25/07/2016</li> <li>621316 - 12/06/2016</li> <li>621264 - 09/09/2016</li> <li>461833 - 21/08/2016</li> </ol> |
|--|--|---|---|---|

Assessment area: Revenue Mobilization

|   |  |   |   |  |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| 9 | <p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If increase in OSR from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10% : score 4 points</li> <li>If the increase is from 5 -10% : score 2 point</li> <li>If the increase is less than 5% : score 0 points.</li> </ul> | 0 | <p>The LG collected own source revenue in FY 2015/16 worth Ugx 198,396,133 and Ugx 132,835,988 in FY 2016/17. Therefore, there was a decline of 49% in actual local revenue collected in FY 2016/17 compared to what was collected in FY 2015/16. The reasons for the decline as explained by CFO were; quarantine which blocked sale of animals in Karamoja region in FY 2016/17, the Auditor General stopped the District from selling their land and collection of 2% as development fees from contractors.</p> |
|---|--|---|---|--|

|    |   |  |   |   |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 10 | <p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10% : then 2 points. If more than +/- 10% : zero points.</li> </ul> | 0 | <p>The LG budget in FY 2016/2017 was Ugx 200,000,000 and the actual local revenue collected in FY 2016/2017 was Ugx 132,835,988. This gives a shortfall of Ugx 67,164,012 which is 34%. (Source of information is the budget 2016/17 and final accounts 2016/17).</p>   |
| 11 | <p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2</li> </ul>  | 2 | <p>There was evidence in the financial statements 2016/17 that the District remitted 30,182,780 Ugx (65%) to Lower local governments in FY 2016/17. The LLGs also remitted 35% to the District. This was in respect to section 85(4) of the LG Act CAP 243, which requires 65% remitted to LLGs.</p>  |
|    |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2</li> </ul>  | 2 | <p>Total local revenue collected in FY 2015/16 was Ugx 198,396,133. From the payment vouchers assessed, the LG spent Ugx 36,889,800 (19%) of total local revenue collected in FY 2015/16 on council activities. This was below the 20% authorized by law. (First schedule of the LG ACT CAP 243). Part of the figure under statutory bodies in the final accounts was unconditional grants so it was not possible to get the exact amount of Local revenue spent on council activities from the financial statements.</p> |

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

|    |   |   |   |  |
|----|---|---|---|--|
| 12 | <p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 the position of Procurement officer (appointed on 1st June 2012 signed by CAO, Omongin Joseph. Currently there's no position of senior procurement officer. However the position of senior procurement officer was advertised in the New vision of 11th November 2017 and interviews were carried out on 28/12/2017</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 Contracts committee for previous FY for the following projects; ie completion of farmers Hall at District HQs on 19/10/16, for cattle crush in Iriri parish on 20/12/17, completion of water office block at district HQs on 26/7/17, completion of farmers Hall at Matany Sub county on 20/12/2016, construction of market shade at Namendera in Iriri Subcounty on 20/12/2016 all signed by TEC Members.</li> </ul> |
|    |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1</li> </ul>  | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The contracts committee considered recommendations of the TEC for: water office block at district HQs meeting held on 26/5/2017 vide min 54/I/CC/2016-2017, cattle crush in Iriri. market shade held on 20/12/2017 min 29/S/2016-2017, completion of farmers hall held on 11/11/2016 min 22/d/2016-2017 signed by contract committee members</li> </ul>   |
| 13 | <p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul> | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procurement and Disposal plan for current year covers all infrastructural projects and approved workplan submitted to Executive Director PPDA dated 3 Oct 2017 signed by CAO, Oloya Stephen.</li> <li>Evidence of procurements in previous year as per procurement plan was submitted to Executive Director PPDA in a fourth quarter report for FY 16/17 signed by CAO on 10th July 2017 and received by PPDA on 13th July 2017.</li> </ul>                     |

|    |   |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | <p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30: score 2</li> </ul>  | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG prepared bid documents for current FY By Aug 30th Prequalification and short listing of firms was done on 17 Aug 2017 as viewed on the notice board prepared by procurement officer and chairperson contracts committee Talamini Florence. Therefore the target 80% was met</li> </ul>  |
|    |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2</li> </ul>  | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The contracts register was viewed and is updated signed by CAO and Procurement officer on 19th Dec 2017.The contracts register shows procurement ref no, contract name, method of procurement, service provider, Date of award, contract value in Ug shs,procurement status(agreement signing)</li> </ul>  |
|    |   | <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 for previous FY 16/2017 Following PPDA Guidelines .below 50m selective, above 50m open domestic national bidding, below 1m micro procurements. Completion of farmers' hall at DHQ open bidding, 199,626,52 shs, water office block open bidding 131,650,420 shs. Construction of market shade at 33,185,00 shs, payment of office stationary at 245,000 shs</li> </ul>  |
| 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>Works for previous FY were appropriately certified and completion certificates issued these include;</li> </ul> <p>Staff house at Loikodiokodio primary school signed by CAO, District Engineer and contractor on 20 sept 2016 ,handing over on 16/8/2016</p> <p>Market shade at Lopeei sub county, signed by CAO district Engineer and contractor on 22 Aug 2017,construction of livestock fence market at Irimi subcounty signed by CAO, District Engineer and contractor on 22 Aug 2017</p> |

|                                       |   |  |   |  |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
|                                       |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2</li> </ul> | 2 | Infrastructural projects for current FY had not yet started by the time of assessment  |
| 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>From the following cashbooks, there was evidence that the LG makes monthly and up to date bank reconciliations. Cash books for Administration, technical services and works, education, Accountability, production and marketing, natural resources, UWEP Recovery and Global fund were reconciled up to 31/12/2017. Also Accounts for council and statutory bodies, social development, UNICEF, YLP Operations, NUSAF, YLP recovery and YLP projects were 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>  | 2 | <p>The LG made timely payments to suppliers as evidenced from sampled payment vouchers;</p> <p>Niabai stationers request for supply of Laptop computers dated 19/6/2017, approved and paid on 26/6/2017.</p> <p>Also request dated 15/12/2016 for Muryagaz service station for fuel, was approved and paid on 16/12/2016.</p> <p>Payment to Buwala motors and civil engineering company LTD for repair and service of MV – UG0656Z request dated 12/4/17, approved on 19/5/17 and paid on 22/5/2017.</p> <p>All contract documents were attached. Furthermore, all sampled payments in the Accountability file FY 2016/17 had timely payments.</p> |



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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.

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

0

The District has only a caretaker in the capacity of District Internal Auditor appointment letter dated 18/10/2017 signed by CAO, ref CR/D/10165. The District internal auditor produced all the four quarterly audit reports dated 31/10/2016, 27/1/2017, 28/4/2017 and 11/10/2017 respectively.

According to the approved and adopted staff structure for Napak District dated 14th/9/2017 and signed by PS, the Internal Audit department is supposed to have a District internal Auditor and the Internal Auditor.

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

0

There is evidence of provision of information on implementation of internal Audit findings for the previous FY and evidence that the audit queries were followed up and responded to in the 'report on status of implementation of internal audit recommendations raised in internal audit reports for FY 2016/2017' document signed and stamped by District internal Auditor on 9/1/2018. However, this information has not been provided to Council and LG PAC. Also evidence of follow up letters on audit queries were available e.g. to Acting District engineer- unrealized value for money on Lokiteded-Matany and Iriiri-Napak District roads dated 15/10/2017, signed by CAO on 15/10/17.

- Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1

0

There was evidence that the quarterly internal audit reports were submitted to the LG Accounting Officer as follows; 1st quarter on 31/10/2016, 2nd quarter on 27/1/2017, 3rd quarter on 28/4/2017 and 4th quarter on 11/10/2017. All the reports were signed and stamped by CAO. LGPAC didn't review the Quarterly internal audit reports because they lacked quorum. The newly constituted LGPAC committee was inducted in October 2017 as evidenced from the induction report of DPAC dated 3/10/2017 signed by clerk to council and facilitated by ACAO and District internal auditor.

|    |  |  |   |  |
|----|--|--|---|--|
| 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 LG maintains detailed assets registers covering details on buildings, heavy plants, vehicles etc and in the format of the accounting manual. It was updated up to end of FY 2016/2017. For FY 2017/2018, procurement is underway so no asset has been procured by the LG.</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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>unqualified audit opinion: score 4</li> <li>Qualified: score 2</li> <li>Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</li> </ul> | 2 | <p>The LG obtained a qualified Audit opinion as evidence from the Annual report of the Auditor General 2016/2017.</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 documented evidence in the Napak District Council Minutes that it was functional – it met 5 out of 6 mandatory times (i.e. on the 30th/5/2017, 22nd/3/2017, 23rd/12/2016, 30th/11/2016 and 30th/9/2016). The council sometimes deliberated on relevant service-delivery issues (e.g. review and approval of plans, budgets, committee reports and recommendations, etc). However, what appeared to be missing in its discussions in the FY 2016/17 were deliberations on 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> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2.</li> </ul> | 0 | <p>No documented evidence of 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   | 0 | No evidence seen of posting/publishing of payroll and pension schedule on LG notice boards.  |
|  | Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure  | • Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1  | 0 | No evidence that the procurement plan and awards of contracts and amounts were posted on the notice boards.  |
|  |   | • 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 for proof that the circulars, guidelines, policies and procedures from central government agencies' (MoFPED, MoLG, OPM, DDEG, NAADS, NUSAF, etc) are disseminated to lower level LGs. |
|  | 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 for proof of the practice of downward accountability through barazas, radio events, 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>   | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG provided guidance and support to sectors through Gender mainstreaming through the following;</li> </ul> <p>Planning ,implementation and monitoring of Gender response budgeting report Aug 2017,Activity reports on Gender equality and women empowerment July-Dec 2016,TOTs training on the use of National Gender Based Violence Database(NGBOD)18-16th October 2016 signed by CAO, GBV adolescent youth friendly services implementation plan supported by UNFPA on 29 Sep 2016 signed by CAO, in education go back to school campaigns, monitoring early child development centers, minutes of child protection quarterly coordination meeting held on 13/9/2017,report on 10 day training for FAL institutions and parish development committees on 2nd sept 2016.</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> | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current work plan for current FY 2017/2018 in place activities include;</li> </ul> <p>Mapping relevant partners and acting them on the national GBV database, Training duty bears and political leaders on relevant laws and policies on GBV, Quaterly joint monitoring of GBV activities.</p> <p>More than 90% of the previous years budget was utilised keenly for activities with development partners coming on board.</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 forms for emptying 10(5 Stance VIP) pit latrines in schools signed by Senior environment officer on 20/04/16,renovation of 2 classroom block at Pilas primary school signed on 19/01/2017,construction of livestock market fence at Nabwal parish signed on 19/01/2017,construction of cattle crush at Iririri subcounty signed by Senior environment officer on 19/01/2017,supply of female goats and male boer goats at Lokope sub county signed by Senior environment officer on 19 Jan 17</li> </ul>   |

|  |  |   |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|---|
|  |  | <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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents eg; Construction of market shade at Kanyapus in Lokopo sub county ref no NAPA GOU/WRKS/2016-17 environmental management for tree planting 10 seedlings at 500,000 shs, construction of 2 stance VIP Pit Latrine for girls in Lopeli primary school lopei sub county,BOQ for environmental management 10 seedlings(Neem ) at 60,000 Shs</li> </ul>  |
|  |  | <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>• No land issues for projects under conditional grant were got. However for Pastoral Livelihoods Reselience projects consent forms for voluntary land contribution were seen eg;</li> <li>• Valley dam in Lotome sub county signed by owner and chairman land committee,LCI III on 23/01/2018,slaughter slab at lovenchora TC Kokopira village signed by LCI,III, Construction of quarantine station signed by area land committee chairman ,LCI and III at Iriri subcounty on 10th Jan 2018.</li> </ul> |
|  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2</li> </ul> | 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No environmental and social mitigation certification forms were availed during assessment</li> </ul>   |



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Educational Performance Measures

Napak District

(Vote Code: 604)

Score 79/100 (79%)

| No.  | Performance Measure   | Scoring Guide  | Score | Justification  |
|--|---|--|-------|--|
| Assessment area: Human Resource Management |   |  |       |  |
| 1  | <p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</li> <li>Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul> | 4     | <p>Verified the evidence for budgeting for teachers and head teachers from the Local Government Performance Contract FY 2017/18 where Napak has budgeted to pay 303 teachers in 32 schools giving an average of 8 teachers per school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Form the FY 2017/18 staff list it can be seen that some schools have less than 7 teachers and one head teacher.</li> <li>According to the DEO, the current school enrolment requires more teachers than what the wage bill provides for so the few teachers are shared in all schools</li> </ul> |
| 2  | <p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision o If 100% score 6 o If 80 - 99% score 3 o If below 80% score 0</li> </ul>   | 6     | <p>Verified evidence from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Government Performance Contract FY 2017/18 where the Wage bill provides for 303 teachers</li> <li>FY 2017/18 staff list of 400 teachers</li> </ul>   |

|   |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 3 | <p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6</li> </ul> | 6 | <p>Napak District has substantively filled the positions of the three school inspectors.</p> <p>Verified information from appointment letters of the inspectors and the Department's approved structure of 14/07/2017 by the Ministry of Public service as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 District Inspector of schools</li> <li>• 2 Inspector of Schools</li> </ul> |
| 4 | <p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p> | <p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of Primary Teachers: score 2</p>   | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no recruitment plan for teachers. According to the DEO the low wage bill provision does not allow for recruitment for teachers. She therefore wrote to the CAO on 8/01/18 seeking an increase in the wage bill</li> </ul>   |
|   |  | <p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of School Inspectors: score 2</p>  | 2 | <p>All the 3 positions of inspectors are substantively filled as evidenced by their appraisal forms duly signed by the CAO on 30/06/17</p>  |



5

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.

Maximum 6 for this performance measure

Evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY • 100% school inspectors: score 3

3

There are 3 School Inspectors in Napak district. 1 District Inspector of Schools and 2 Inspectors of Schools. All inspectors were appraised during the previous FY as indicated below:

1. District Inspector Schools: File Ref-CR/D/10202. Appraised on 30/06/17 (for calendar year 2017). The Performance Appraisal Report (PS Form 5) dated 25/07/17 is available on file.

2. Inspector of Schools: File Ref-CR/D/10330. Appraised on 30/06/17) (for calendar year 2017) (The Performance Appraisal Report (PS Form 5) dated 30/06/17 is on file.

3. Inspector of Schools: File Ref-CR/D/10202. Appraised on 30/06/17 for Calendar year 2017. Performance Appraisal Report (PS Form 5) dated 30/06/17 is one file.

The inspectors were assessed about the following areas:

- Level of achievement against key outputs
- Core competencies; leadership, decision making, team work human resource management, finance management etc...

Action plans were developed to address the areas of improvement identified

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

3

Napak district with 32 Head Teachers. All (100%) of the Head Teachers were appraised for the calendar Year 2017 by the Sub-county chiefs witnessed by the chairpersons School management committees of their respective schools.

Appraisal files were retrieved (brought to DEO's Office by S/C Chiefs on day 2 of the assessment) and a random sample of 5 files (as shown below) confirmed that the appraisals were conducted. PS Form 5 Appraisal forms were dully completed and endorsed by the S/C Chiefs and SMC chairpersons.

1.CR/D?10403: Appraised on 15/12/17. PS Form 5 signed by S/County chief, SMC Chairperson and endorsed by DEO

2.CR/D/10226: Appraised on 30/0617. PS Form 5 signed by S/county Chief, SMC Chairperson and endorsed by DEO

3.CR/D/10351: Appraised on 30/12/17. PS Form 5 signed by S/county Chief, SMC Chairperson and endorsed by DEO

4.CR/D/10465: Appraised on 14/12/17. PS Form 5 signed by S/county Chief, SMC Chairpeson and endorsed by DEO

5.CR/D/10492: Appraised on 20/12/17. PS Form 5 signed by S/County Chief, SMC Chairperson and endorsed by DEO

Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection

The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools

Maximum 3 for this performance measure

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

1

Verified evidence from the following communications:

- Letter of invitation for the school feeding program in education institutions to the Head teacher forwarded by the DEO on 27/06/17
- Focus on school Inspection of 19th July 2017 from DES forwarded to the Head Teachers by the DEO on 19/06/17
- Circular of dressing code for non-teaching staff from the P/S Ministry of Public Service of 29/05/17
- Circular for the teachers on Early Grade Reading (EGR) to HT by DIS.
- Financial Management Training for School Managers to the H/T by the DEO on 15/05/17
- Submission of detailed documentation regarding staff who are currently out for studies either with or without pay by CAO to the H/T on 6/09/17
- Circular of 24/01/17 by the P/S MOES regarding Menstrual Hygiene Management in Schools forwarded by the DEO to all Head Teachers on 25/01/17

• Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level, including on school feeding: score 2

2

Verified evidence from the following communications:

- Letter of invitation to the Head Teachers for the program for dissemination of National Integrated early childhood Development (NIECD) policy to Districts signed the DEO on 9th May 2017.
- Concept Note and program to all head teachers for the regional engagement of Cultural and Religious Leaders on the Gender and Equity issues in the Karamoja Region received from P/S MOES by the DEO 19th July 2017 and forwarded to all Head Teachers on 20th July 2017

|   |  |  |    |  |
|---|--|--|----|--|
| 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100% - score 12</li> <li>o 90 to 99% - score 10</li> <li>o 80 to 89% - score 8</li> <li>o 70 to 79% - score 6</li> <li>o 60 to 69% - score 3</li> <li>o 50 to 59% score 1</li> <li>o Below 50% score 0.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | 12 | <p>Verified the evidence from the following District inspection summary reports by the DIS to the DEO which showed 100% inspection coverage during the year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2016/17 1st quarter 06/03/17</li> <li>2016/7 2nd quarter 04/05/17</li> <li>2016/17 3rd quarter 31/07/17</li> </ul>   |
| 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>   | 4  | <p>Verified evidence from Minutes of the Naitakwae P/S SMC meeting of 7/12/17 which discussed among other things:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>? Increased need for involving parents in school activities</li> <li>? Causes of increased school drop-out rate</li> </ul>  |
|   |  | <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>  | 2  | <p>Verified the evidence from the following acknowledgement notes from the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) signed by the Senior Inspector of Schools on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11/07/16 for receipt of the Napak Report of 2nd quarter 2016/17</li> <li>14/07/16 for receipt of 3rd quarter of 2106/17</li> <li>14/07/17 for receipt of inspection report of 4th quarter 2016/17.</li> <li>10//07/17 for receipt of inspection report of Jan to Dec. 2016</li> </ul> |

|  |  |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|
|  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4</li> </ul>   | 4 | <p>Verified evidence from warning letters by the DEO to the following teachers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loukong Pauline Chaam of Chorichol P/S for absenteeism of 31/10/17</li> <li>• Lonuen Paul of Longalom P/S of 9/01/18 for skipping the scheme of work and lesson plan</li> <li>• Enrol Palpin of Longalom P/S of 9/01/18 for skipping scheme of work and lesson plan.</li> <li>• Adokot Emmanuel of Longalom P/S for unprofessional conduct during the school inspection exercise on 9/01/18</li> <li>• Ogato Nicholas of Longalom P/S for unprofessional behaviour during school inspection of 20137</li> </ul> |
| 9  | <p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5</li> </ul> | 5 | <p>The Napak data of list of government aided primary schools is consistent with EMIS and PBS with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 32 schools in the EMIS</li> <li>• 32 schools in the PBS</li> </ul>  |
|  | <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>   | <p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5</p>                                      | 0 | <p>The Napak FY 2016/17 Government aided Primary schools' enrolment data is not consistent as can be seen from the data below obtained from EMIS and OBT:</p> <p>EMIS_-----15225 Students</p> <p>OBT -----14305 Students</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>The General Purposes Committee (GPC) is responsible for education on top of other social sectors. Evidence from both the council and GPC minutes were available to confirm that it met and discussed education service delivery issues including departmental quarterly updates on priorities and reports; as well as challenges and recommendations. Even so, there was no evidence in minutes of discussion of results from performance assessments, inspection and monitoring (see FY 2016/17 GPC minutes on the 18th/5/2017, 20th/12/2016, 24th/12/2016 and 14th/3/2017).</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 GPC presented education sector issues to council, issues that required council's approval e.g. see council minutes of the 30th/5/2017 (page10) and 30th/11/2016 (page13). However, available evidence revealed that the GPC met only 2 out of 6 mandatory times (i.e. only on the 20th/12/2016 and 18th/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>               | 5 | <p>Verified evidence from the minutes of the SMC meetings that are signed by the H/T and were conducted on the following dates at Longalom Primary school visited during the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11/11/17</li> <li>• 02/10/17</li> <li>• 07/07/17</li> <li>• 21/04/17.</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 although there were publications of UPE funds received at the notice boards of each 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> | 0 | <p>The procurement requests seen were submitted after April 30. i.e</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 2 classroom block submitted on 22/09/17</li> <li>• Rehabilitation two classroom block at Kokipurati P/school submitted on 24/10/17</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 DEO certified and initiated payment for suppliers on time. Evidence from the sampled vouchers confirm timeliness. For example;</p> <p>Request for retention for construction of Lokodiokodio P/S dated 16/12/16 from Clabos Uganda LTD cleared by DEO on 10/1/17 and paid on 12/1/2017.</p> <p>Request for retention by Oba and Sons enterprises for construction of the two classroom block at Lokopo P/S dated 5/1/2017, forwarded by DEO on 7/1/2017 and paid on 11/1/2017.</p> <p>Request from Saimo general services for payment for 5 tyres dated 30/6/2017, cleared on 30/6/2017 and paid on 30/6/2017 Most of the documents on file conform to timely certification and initiation of payment.</p> <p>Those that don't conform have other issues attached.</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>While, the Q4 consolidated report for the FY 2016/17 covered education inputs for all four quarters, it was reported by the LG Planner with records and evidence that the education department often times was slow and uncooperative to remit timely quarterly inputs to allow for timely synthesis of quarter reports into a district consolidated report and submission forwards. The department cited that recourse to OBT made it unnecessary to solicit inputs through other means. The partly explains the late submission of the Q4 APR (i.e. Q1 - 29th/11/2016 Receipt No: 0128; Q2 - 3rd/3/2017 Receipt No: 0455; Q3 - 7th/6/2017 Receipt No: 0788; and Q4 - 4th/8/2017 Receipt No: 4508).</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> | 2 | <p>From the Quarterly internal audit reports FY 2016/17, the Education department had audit queries which were responded to according to evidence in 'report on status of implementation of internal audit recommendations raised in internal audit reports for FY 2016/2017' document signed and stamped by District internal Auditor on 9/1/2018. E.g. audit query in education voucher number 4/8 N.T.R Treasury.</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>Verified the evidence from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report of training of senior man/ woman on gender issues and menstrual hygiene management which took palce from 10th – 12th August 2017.2017 at Matany Parish Hall Hall compiled and signed by DIS on 4/09/17</li> <li>• Initiation letter for the H/T for the improvement of HPV workshop that took place 8/10/17</li> <li>• Report on teacher and student workshop on building a +ve attitude and support school environment, elimination of against the children in schools on 18h July 2107 signed by the DIS and PEO on 8/07/17.</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 the following sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report of training of senior man/ woman on gender issues and menstrual hygiene management which took place from 10th – 12th August 2017.2017 at Matany Parish Hall Hall compiled and signed by DIS on 4/09/17</li> <li>• Initiation letter for the H/T for the improvement of HPV workshop that took place 8/10/17</li> </ul> <p>Report on teacher and student workshop on building a +ve attitude and support school environment, elimination of against the children in schools on 18h July 2107 signed by the DIS and PEO on 8/07/17</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invitation letter by CAO to H/T for training of senior women &amp; men teachers on 07/08/17</li> <li>• Invitation letter by the CAO to the SMC chairpersons for joint planning meeting of 27/07/17 forwarded by the H/T on 25/07/17.</li> </ul> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>   | 1 | <p>Verified the evidence from the sample of the two schools visited namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Langalop P/ 2/6 member the Founding body (Catholic Church ) are female</li> <li>• Kalotom P/S 3/6 members from Founding body (COU) are female</li> </ul>  |

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



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Health Performance Measures

Napak District

(Vote Code: 604)

Score 77/100 (77%)

| No.   | Performance Measure  | Scoring Guide  | Score | Justification  |
|---|--|--|-------|--|
| Assessment area: Human resource planning and management |  |  |       |  |
| 1   | <p>LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>             | <p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY • More than 80% filled: score 6 points, • 60 – 80% - score 3 • Less than 60% filled: score 0</p> | 3     | <p>155/251 (60.5%) approved positions are filled with a wage bill available. No advertisement to improve staffing levels this FY is planned due to the deficit in the wage bill estimated at Ugx 60,000,000/= for the health department according to the Ministry of Public Service. Cadres where more gaps are experienced are reported to be enrolled nurses and midwives.</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 for the current FY was planned. This is because the wage bill is not sufficient to support the recruitment of new staff.</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 was no health staff that had to be appraised by the DHO as Napak District did not have a government hospital and HCs IV. The district is served by Matany Hospital which is a Private Not- for- Profit Hospital. There is an on-going process at MoH to upgrade Iriiri HC III to HC IV level.</p>   |

|   |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 4 | <p>The Local Government Health department has equitably deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers equitably, in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul> | 4 | <p>Staff are equitably deployed in the 15 health care facilities in the district according to the deployment lists and budgeted funds in the PBS per health facility.</p> |
|---|--|--|---|---|

Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision

|   |  |  |   |  |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| 5 | <p>The DHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3</li> </ul>                     | 3 | <p>The LG received guidelines on PHC management, service delivery standards for the health sector (2016) quality improvement (2016), integrated management of acute malnutrition 2016 and integrated management of malaria (2015) from the MOH. communication of these guidelines was done through dissemination meetings with in charges and staff at lower level health facilities. One of such dissemination meeting was held on 18-22 July 2016 with support from UNICEF</p> |
|   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3</li> </ul> | 3 | <p>The DHO with support from partners explained guidelines through dissemination meetings to health facility in charges and staff from the health facilities for example, a dissemination meeting for integrated management of acute malnutrition held on 18 -22 July 2016..</p>   |
| 6 | <p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>  | <p>Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3</p>   | 3 | <p>The district has no HC IV. The health sub district activities are implemented through Matany hospital which is an NGO/Mission founded facility. This HSD was supervised by the DHT during the previous FY as per support supervision record at the HSD office of Matany.</p>  |

|   |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|
|   |   | Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY: • If 100% supervised: score 3 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0 | 1 | The DHT supervised 71% (10/15) of all the health facilities in the previous FY. Q1-Q4 support supervision reports are available at the office of the DHO.  |
| 7 | The Health Sub-district(s) have effectively provided support supervision to lower level health units<br><br>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure   | Evidence that health facilities have been supervised by HSD and reports produced: • If 100% supervised score 6 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 4 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 2 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0       | 6 | Matany HSD supervised all the lower level health facilities during the previous FY. These activities happened monthly and reports on this activity for example on 29/05/2017 to Kangole dispensary and Naoriet, 29/05.2017 to Morulinga, 18/07/2017 to Namendera and Nakicumat, were sampled as evidence proving that the HSD carried out this task effectively.   |
| 8 | 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<br><br>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure | <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 | Support supervision reports were discussed to follow up recommendations. Minute 4 of the DHT meeting held on 27/01/2017 shows Matany hospital and Apeitolim HC III were performing well regarding MCH indicators while Moluringa, Nabwala, Lopeei and Madeke performed poorly in this area. All facilities performed poorly in HCT. Also Minute 5, bullet 9 of this discussion provided further recommendations to improve performance.  |
|   |   | <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 | Minute 5, bullet 9 of the DHT meeting held on 27/07/2017 provided further recommendations to improve performance in the poorly performing health units according to the support supervision reports. A board meeting for Matany hospital on 23/09/2017 min 4/09/2017 discussed outcomes of the drug prescription survey, performance of supervised health facilities and proposed rewarding those which were performing well. Min6/09/2017 also deliberated on health unit performance in more detail. |

|   |  |  |    |  |
|---|--|--|----|--|
| 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> | 10 | <p>The List of health facilities provided in the PBS is consistent with health facilities in Napak that report monthly through the DHIS2. The PBS and HMIS reports are available at the DHO's office for verification.</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>The General Purposes Committee (GPC) is responsible for health on top of other social sectors. Evidence from both the council and GPC minutes were available to confirm that it met and discussed health service delivery issues including departmental quarterly updates on priorities and reports; as well as challenges and recommendations. Even so, there was no evidence in minutes of discussion of results from performance assessments, inspection and monitoring (see FY 2016/17 GPC minutes on the 18th/5/2017, 20th/12/2016, 24th/12/2016 and 14th/3/2017).</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>Some minutes of council's deliberations indicated that representatives of the GPC presented health sector issues to council, issues that required council's approval e.g. see council minutes of the 22nd/3/2017, min. 8/DLC/3.2017 (page14 on need for health centers). However, available evidence revealed that the GPC met only 2 out of 6 mandatory times (i.e. only on the 20th/12/2016 and 18th/5/2017).</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 existed in all the sampled health facilities. e.g. Lokopo HC III held quarterly HUMC meetings on 5/08/2016, 28/10/2016, 15/12/2016 and 21/04/2017. For Lopeei HC IIIHUMC held meetings on 22/10/2016, 25/02/2017, 25/05/2017, and 15/07/2017. In these meetings. In these meetings budgets and resources issues were discussed. E.g in the meeting on 25/02/2017, according to the health unit financial committee, release PHC funds (Ugx. 1, 909,308/=) were allocated as follows. 5% sanitation, 50% administration, 30% operations and 35% EPI. In a meeting held on 15/07/2017, the facility budget and PHC non wage were discussed in Min.6.</p> |
| 12   | <p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</li> </ul>  | 3 | <p>There was evidence of display of PHC releases on the notice boards of the Matany Hospital Lokopo HC III and Lopeei HC III and the notes boards of the district health office.</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> | 0 | <p>The only procurement, (rehabilitation of a dilapidated maternity ward) at Apitolim HC II planned was submitted. This had however been approved by CAO by July 2017 and can be confirmed at the PDU of the district.</p> <p>The only procurement request for rehabilitation of a dilapidated maternity ward at Apitolim HC II was submitted to the PDU late (16/11/2017)</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 DHO supported development of the procurement plan for medicines and supplies endorsed on 16/01/2016 by both the DHO and the representative from NMS. The DHO's office coordinated bimonthly deliveries of essential medicines from NMS to the district. The procurement plan for medicines and supplies along with copies of receipts for the 6 cycles of drug deliveries from NMS on 8/08/2016, 8/11/2017, 19/01/2017, 23/03/2017, 5/06/2017 were available at the DHOs office.</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 DHO certified and initiated payment for suppliers on time. Evidence from the sampled vouchers confirm timeliness. For example;</p> <p>Request for funds for fuel for St. Kizito Hospital dated 6/3/2017, forwarded by DHO on 8/3/2017 and paid on 8/3/2017.</p> <p>Claim by Mango Elgon motors for repair of MV number LG0014090 dated 22/5/2017, forwarded by DHO on 6/6/2017 and paid on 6/6/2017.</p> <p>Request by Buwala motors dated 10/10/2016 for repair of Land cruiser forwarded by DHO on 1/11/2016.</p> <p>Most documents had all the relevant documents attached e.g. certificates, inspection reports, receipts, invoices etc.</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>While, the Q4 consolidated report for the FY 2016/17 covered health inputs for all four quarters, it was reported by the LG Planner and records and evidence availed to confirm that the health department often times was slow and uncooperative to remit timely quarterly inputs to allow for the synthesis of quarter reports into a district consolidated report. The department cited that recourse to OBT made it unnecessary to solicit inputs through other means. The partly explains the late submission of Q4 APR (i.e. Q1 - 29th/11/2016 Receipt No: 0128; Q2 – 3rd/3/2017 Receipt No: 0455; Q3 – 7th/6/2017 Receipt No: 0788; and Q4 – 4th/8/2017 Receipt No: 4508).</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>From the Quarterly internal audit reports FY 2016/17, the Health department had audit queries and some were responded to according to evidence in 'report on status of implementation of internal audit recommendations raised in internal audit reports for FY 2016/2017' document signed and stamped by District internal Auditor on 9/1/2018. E.g. response on audit query from St.Kizito Hospital dated 24/2/2017 of an accounted for funds.</p>  |
| Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards |   |  |   |  |
| 18   | <p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>                              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2</li> <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>Out of the 3 sampled health facilities, Only Lopeei HCIII had at 2/7 HUMC members as females. The rest pf the facilities did not meet this gender composition.</p> <p>These guidelines were not found at the health facility. It was reported by the DHO that they have not been provided by the MOH.</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>No guidelines for medical waste management have been provided to this LG. Also sampled health facilities only had SOPs for waste segregation displayed in the laboratories</p> |
|----|---|---|---|---|



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Napak District

(Vote Code: 604)

Score 55/100 (55%)

| 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 for Napak District LG show that the district has safe water access of 82%. Hence, only two sub counties were below district safe water access coverage; Iriiri-58% and Lokopo-79%.</li> <li>From the Napak AWP for FY 2017/18 submitted and received by MoWE on 18th July 2017, Napak DLG allocated drilling of boreholes in both Iriiri S/C (Kapadakook village).</li> <li>Lokopo S/C submitted the list of Water facility sites late hence were not included in the AWP for 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>In the annual progress report for 2016/17 submitted to MoWE on 31st August 2017, Napak DLG allocated drilling of boreholes inn both Iriiri and Lokopo sub counties.</li> <li>Namendera health centre in Iriiri S/C and Lokwasinyon village in Lokopo S/C.</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> | 10 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two monitoring reports of WSS projects by Napak DWO were seen by the assessor for the FY 2016/17.</li> <li>• One was monitoring report for the completion of Napak DWO block phase I and II.</li> <li>• Another was the monitoring report of Lopeei piped water system prepared on 27th December 2017 by the DWO.</li> <li>• From the assessors analysis, 86% 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> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>  | 0  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Safe Water Coverage data for Napak District LG also presented in the 2nd quarter annual progress report show that the district has safe water access of 82%, Iriiri S/C-58% and Lokopo S/C-79%.</li> <li>• This was contrary to the MIS report that showed that Napak DLG had safe water coverage of 82% and that 2 Sub-Counties figures below the district average included Iriiri S/c-61% &amp; Napak Town Council-65%.</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 were seen by the assessor for instance</li> <li>• Siting, drilling and installation of 07 boreholes in Napak district for 2nd quarter of FY2017/18 was initiated by the DWO on 29th September 2017. The total cost was Ugshs 147,623,000.</li> <li>• The procurement request was however initiated and submitted late on 29th September 2017 which was after 30th April 2017 as per the manual guideline.</li> <li>• Another procurement request for siting, drilling and installation of 2 production wells were initiated late on 29th September 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> | 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no contract management plan by the DWO seen during the assessment.</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 4 sampled boreholes, the designs were found similar with what is mentioned in the 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. The DWO indicated that the handover of DWO block was to be held in March 2018.</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>  | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payment certificate on completion of DWO block was issued for CAB Uganda Limited on 29th June 2017 and endorsed by the Napak CAO. Contract No. Napa604/Wrks/16-17/DWSCG/00001</li> <li>• A payment certificate on siting, drilling and installation of 10 hand pumps for Icon Projects Ltd was issued on 12th June 2017. Contract no. Napa604/Wrks/16-17/DWSCG-DDEG/00002</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>The DWO certified and initiated payment for suppliers on time. Evidence from the sampled vouchers confirm timeliness. Request from Kutonak 2015 quick supplies for spares supplied dated 12/6/2017 was forwarded by DWO on 12/6/2017 and paid on 13/6/2017.</p> <p>Request for drilling, installation and casting of boreholes by Icon projects LTD dated 30/6/2017, was forwarded by DWO on 30/6/2017 and paid on 30/6/2017.</p> <p>Request for funds by power products (U) Ltd for supply and installation of rain water harvesting pump dated 19/6/2017 was forwarded by DWO on 19/6/2017 and paid on 29/6/2017.</p> <p>There was timely initiation and recommendation of payment by DWO for all the documents reviewed.</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> | 0 | <p>While, the Q4 consolidated report for the FY 2016/17 covered water inputs for all four quarters, it was reported by the LG Planner with records and evidence availed to the effect that the water department often times was slow and uncooperative to remit timely quarterly inputs to allow for the synthesis of quarter reports into a district consolidated report. The department cited that recourse to OBT made unnecessary to solicit inputs through other means. The partly explains the late submission of the Q4 APR (i.e. Q1 - 29th/11/2016 Receipt No: 0128; Q2 - 3rd/3/2017 Receipt No: 0455; Q3 - 7th/6/2017 Receipt No: 0788; and Q4 - 4th/8/2017 Receipt No: 4508).</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> | 3 | <p>From the Quarterly internal audit reports FY 2016/17, the Water department had audit queries which were responded to according to evidence in 'report on status of implementation of internal audit recommendations raised in internal audit reports for FY 2016/2017' document signed and stamped by District internal Auditor on 9/1/2018. E.g. audit query dated 21/11/2016 voucher number 10/11 for drilling boreholes by Omara P. Otim. Audit query dated 8/6/2017 voucher number 4/6 for inspection of new boreholes by Omara and query dated 15/2/2017 voucher number 10/2 for repair of boreholes in Turtuko-Lokopo S/C by Omara. Most of these audit queries were for un accounted for funds.</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>The General Purposes Committee (GPC) is responsible for water on top of other social sectors. Evidence from both the council and GPC minutes were available to confirm that it met and discussed water service delivery issues including departmental quarterly updates on priorities and reports; as well as challenges and recommendations. Even so, there was no evidence in minutes of discussion of results from performance assessments, inspection and monitoring (see FY 2016/17 GPC minutes on the 18th/5/2017, 20th/12/2016, 24th/12/2016 and 14th/3/2017).</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>Some minutes of council's deliberations indicated that representatives of the GPC presented water sector issues to council, issues that required council's approval e.g. see council minutes of the 23rd/12/2016, min. 16/DLC/2016, (page17 on broken boreholes in schools requiring rehabilitation). However, available evidence revealed that the GPC met only 4 out of 6 mandatory times (i.e. only on the 18th/5/2017, 20th/12/2016, 24th/12/2016 and 14th/3/2017).</p>   |

11

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

Maximum 6 points for this performance measure

- 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

2

- Minutes seen of the 7th district WASH advocacy meeting held at Napak district HQ. Date was 22/09/2017 and was attended by district councillors, partners and district heads of departments.

- Minute 4 on the progress report and work plan 2017/18 by the DWO showed AWP, budget and Water Development grant releases and expenditures e.g

- Water sector development grant annual budget release was Ugshs 363,976,422 and sanitation grant was Ugshs 21,575,985 for FY2017/18.

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

2

- During the field visits on Tuesday 30th January 2018, the assessor visited 4 boreholes and found out that they were well labelled that is;

- Namendera HC of Iriiri S/C, Lomoruchubae village of Lorengecora S/C , Nageret village of Lorengecora S/C and Kouriong village of Matany S/C.

- Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2

2

- Information on tenders and contract awards was seen on Napak LG noticeboard as indicated;

- Project: Siting, drilling and installation of 9 deep boreholes in Napak

- Best Evaluated bidder: Icon Projects Ltd

- Total Contract Sum: Ugshs 181,900,800 with VAT inclusive.

- 2nd best bidder: KLR(U) Ltd

- Date of display: 22nd November 2017

- Date of removal: 4th December 2017

|    |  |  |   |   |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 12 | <p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1</li> </ul>                              | 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application letters for water sources were seen e.g</li> <li>Kalocel L.C.1 village applied for a deep borehole on 11th January 2018 and the letter was endorsed by the L.C.1 chairperson, secretary for women, 2 committee members and 4 community members.</li> <li>Kalocel L.C.1 also paid the community contribution fee of Ugshs 200,000 to Napak district and a general receipt was issued on 16th January 2018. Receipt no.1332.</li> <li>Similarly, Apeduru village also applied for a borehole on 22nd October 2017. Also paid community contribution fee of Ugshs 200,000 on 06th November 2017 under receipt no.863</li> <li>Other water source applications and payment receipts of community contribution fees were seen.</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 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 | <p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p> | <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>The Assessor found out from the office of Environment and Natural resources had done environmental screening for only one water project out of the many projects.</li> <li>A screening template for Kouriong borehole, Matany S/C was available and the screening was conducted on 8th February 2017.</li> </ul> |
|----|--|--|---|---|

|    |  |  |   |  |
|----|--|--|---|--|
|    |  | <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 both FY 2016/17 and FY2017/18.</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 never had a clause on environmental protection for instance;</li> <li>• A contract No.Napa 604/Wrks/16-17/DWSCG-DDEG/00002 for siting, drilling and installation of 10 handpumps in Napak district awarded to Icon Projects Ltd on 16th December 2017 never had the above clause.</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>  | 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assessor looked at 8 lists of Water User Committees (WUCs) that were established and trained the sub-counties of Lokopo, Iriiri, Lorengocora and Matany from 7th-14th December 2016.</li> <li>•</li> <li>• It was found out that 5 out of 8 WUCs ( 62.5%) for boreholes had atleast 50% of their members as women in line with the sector critical requirements. These included;</li> <li>• Napeeto(M=4, F=5), Loburkaikwan (M=4,F=5), Kouriong(M=5,F=4), Timu (M=4,F=5), Namenuain(M=4,F=4), Namendera (M=4,F=4), Nageret(M=5,F=4), and Lomoruchubae (M=6,F=3).</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>• In the previous FY 2016/17 and the current FY 2017/18, no public sanitation facilities have been budgeted and constructed. This is because the MoWE is now supporting Napak district in the sanitation sensitization using Community Led Total Sanitation Strategy (CLTS) approach.</li> </ul>  |