



LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Ngora District

(Vote Code: 603)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	2	33%
No	4	67%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	xxx	<p>Ngora DLG submitted a Draft Performance Contract for FY 2017/2018 on 27th April 2017 and issued with receipt (No. 0581) by MoFPED. As per MoFPED Submission Schedule, the Final Performance Contract for FY 2017/2018 was submitted on 20th July 2017.</p> <p>This submission of the Final Performance Contract for FY 2017/2018 was late - done after the mandatory deadline of 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>Ngora DLG has a Budget for FY 2017/2018 including a Procurement Plan for FY 2017/2018.</p>	Yes
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			
<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	xxxxx	<p>The Annual Budget Performance Report for FY 2016/2017 was submitted on 10th August 2017 (Receipt No. 4541) issued by MoFPED.</p> <p>This was a late submission - made after the deadline of 31st July 2017.</p>	No

<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>All the four Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for FY 2016/2017 were submitted to MoFPED as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Quarter One submitted on 15th November 2016 (Receipt No. 0061) issued by MoFPED. o Quarter Two submitted on 14th February 2017 (Receipt No. 0334) issued by MoFPED. o Quarter Three submitted on 31st May 2017 (Receipt No. 0777) issued by MoFPED. o Quarter Four submitted on 10th August 2017 (Receipt No. 4541) issued by MoFPED. <p>All quarterly reports were submitted late. The requirement is that quarterly reports should be submitted by the end of the following month after the end of the each quarter.</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>Status report on implementation of Auditor General findings for FY 2015/16 was submitted to PS/ST, Directorate of Internal Audit via letter dated 26th June 2017, reference CR/106/13. The assessment result/ score is therefore not compliant since the status report was submitted after 30th April 2017 contrary to Section 11 (2) Public Finance Management Act, 2015.</p> <p>Therefore, not compliant.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>Unqualified audit opinion for the FY 2016/17 as per Auditor General Report of December 2017. Therefore, compliant.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Ngora District

(Vote Code: 603)

Score 46/100 (46%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality; and (ii) all Town Councils in a District are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a municipality/district has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 2. 	0	<p>The Physical Planning Committee is not functional.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2. 	0	<p>Ngora District does not have a Physical Development Plan. Therefore, it was not possible to ascertain the consistency of the plans of all new infrastructure investments with the Physical Development Plans since some investments are outside areas that have Physical Development Plans.</p> <p>It was, however, noted that there are Local Physical Development Plans for the trading centres of Omadito, Atapar, Amapu, Atoot, and Opot.</p>

2	<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2. 	2	<p>The priorities in AWP for FY 2017/2018 are based on the outcomes of budget conference held during the 27th – 28th October 2016. For example, under</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher house construction and rehabilitation – 4 in 1 teachers’ houses in Aciisa PS; Atiira PS; and Morukakise PS (P.47 of Approved Budget for 2017/2018). Health: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of Immunisation shade at Agu HC III (P.18 of Approved Budget for 2017/2018). Water: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Borehole drilling and rehabilitation - 14 boreholes rehabilitated; and 11 drilled (P. 94 of Approved Budget for 2017/2018).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If different, justification has to be provided and evidence that it was approved by Council. Score 2. 	2	<p>The capital investments in the Approved Annual Work Plan for 2017/2018 were derived from the approved Five-Year Development Plan (2015/2016 – 2019/2020). Refer to DDP – Annex One: Annualised Work Plan (Pages 54 - 102)</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 1. 	0	<p>The project profiles have not been developed.</p>
3	<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual statistical abstract, with gender disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum 1 point. 	0	<p>The Annual statistical abstract was not compiled.</p>

4	Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2 	2	<p>All infrastructure projects implemented by Ngora DLG in FY 2016/2017 were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the District Council.</p> <p>For example, under health the project implemented (on Page 44 of the Fourth Quarter Report 2016/2017) was derived from the Annual Work Plan (P.45) and Budget of FY 2016/2017 (P.19)</p>
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100%: score 4 80-99%: score 2 Below 80%: 0 	4	<p>There were twenty-two (22) investment projects implemented (i.e. district-level) during FY 2016/2017; and all were completed as per work plan by end of FY 2016/2017.</p>
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"> Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	2	<p>There were twenty-two (22) investment projects implemented during FY 2016/2017; and all were completed within the approved budget. The budget was UGX 1,044,737,336 while the overall expenditure was UGX 994,115,831. This is 95.2% of the total budget.</p>
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	2	<p>The total budget for O&M (for all departments) for FY 2016/2017 was UGX 118,025,000, while the actual expenditure was UGX 127,170,000.</p> <p>This was 107.7% of the budget for O&M (OBT Fourth Quarter Physical Progressive Report FY 2016/2017 (Cumulative Department Work Plan Performance - Pages 65 - 111).</p>
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				

6	<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	0	No performance reports were availed
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district has a staff structure ARC 135/306/01. 12TH JUNE 2017 • The DEO, CFO, are the only ones that are substantively appointed heads of department out of the nine. <p>Challenge district undertook training but staff left as soon as possible.</p>
7	<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of the 2nd session meeting of Ngora district service commission held on 24th October 2016 • Minutes of the 3rd session meeting of Ngora district service commission held on 28th November and 2nd December 2016 • Minutes of the 4th session meeting of Ngora district service commission held 19th December 2016. • Minutes of the 5th session meeting of Ngora district service commission held on 27th and 28th march 2017 • Minutes of the 6th session meeting of Ngora district service commission held on 31th may 2017 <p>The staff submitted for recruitment were considered</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of the 2nd session meeting of Ngora district service commission held on 24th October 2016 • Minutes of the 3rd session meeting of Ngora district service commission held on 28th November and 2nd December 2016. • Minutes of the 5th session meeting of Ngora district service commission held on 27th and 28th march 2017 • Minutes of the 6th session meeting of Ngora district service commission held on 31th may 2017 <p>The staff submitted for confirmation were considered</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of DSC 2ND session held on 24th October 2016. Min 15/13/2016. The disciplinary case was considered
8	Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The staff recruited accessed the payroll in the second month as per the pay roll July 2017
	Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2 	0	<p>The pension staff did not access the pay roll by two months. those that retired between 2016/17 are not on the pension payroll. the pension names were cross checked from there files and pension payroll</p>
Assessment area: Revenue Mobilization				

9	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If increase in OSR from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10% : score 4 points • If the increase is from 5 -10% : score 2 point • If the increase is less than 5% : score 0 points. 	0	<p>Own Source Revenue collection in FY 2015/16 was UGX 140,671,221 which decreased to UGX 106,025,384 in FY 2016/17. The decrease was UGX 34,645,837 which is -24.6%, being a decrease in local revenue between the 2 years).</p> <p>Therefore, zero score.</p>
10	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10% : then 2 points. If more than +/- 10% : zero points. 	0	<p>Own Source Revenue was budgeted at UGX 631,075,000 in the FY 2016/17 and the actual collection was UGX 106,025,384. This translates into negative variance or UGX 525,049,616 equivalent to - 83.2%. This is more than -10% hence, therefore, zero score.</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"> • Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	0	<p>There was no evidence that the LG remitted 65% of local revenue (Local Service Tax) for all the four months as received from MoFPED (July to October 2016) to LLGs. Instead, only three out of four remittances were made as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • July 2016 – 15th September 2016 • August 2016 – 6th October 2016 • September 2016 – 26th October 2016 <p>This is contrary to Section 85 (4) of the Local Governments Act, CAP 243, and Regulation 39(2) of the Local Governments (Financial and Accounting Regulations) 2007.</p> <p>Therefore, zero score.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total council expenditure for FY 2016/17 was UGX 38,020,000 20% of local revenue for FY 2015/16 was UGX 28,134,244. Therefore, council expenditure for FY 2016/17 being was more than 20% of the local revenue of FY 2015/16, the score is zero.
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"> Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senior Procurement officer is present but the position of Procurement officer is vacant.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TEC minutes are presented in the works project files of the subsequent project and bids and Contracts committee reports (24 No) are also presented
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes are present no deviation. Technical committee is well represented and they follow evaluation methodology and criteria stated in the invitation.
13	<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AWP 2017/18 is presented but some projects like rehabilitation of rural roads, community road access and maintenance, and urban road access maintenance is planned for in the AWP but not in the procurement plan. Procurement plan for 2017/18 was just printed Projects planned in the previous FY 2016/17 are worked on the current year example it construction of immunisation shade at Agu HCII,

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

0

- Advert newspapers presented for the current year bidding was dated 21st Sept 2017 and issue of bids was slated for 20th Sept 2017 beyond the 30th Aug.

- Not done on time. Out of the 13 infrastructure viewed for the current FY 2017/18, only 3 projects i.e. construction of 4 in 1 teaches houses in Morukakise P/S, Atura P/S and Actisa P/S had bids by 29th June 2017 and 29th August 2017. The other 10 had bids advertised on the 14th of Sept 2017 (which is also beyond 30th August) making a percentage of 23% as per the actual date.

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

0

- The Contracts register is partially filled and still has gaps. Some dates of some projects are still missing; some projects are not yet updated in the register.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	2	<p>LG follows the procurement thresholds see below:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low cost seal 1.35km road at district headquarters NGOR 603/WORKS/2016-2017/00036 contract value 359,347,991 (Open domestic bidding) Construction of a slaughter slab at Atoot and Omaditok trading centre NGOR 603/WORKS/2016-2017/00018 value 11,862, 796 (selective bidding) Completion of mini laboratory and annexes NGOR 603/WORKS/2016-2017/00006 77,713,834 (Open domestic bidding) Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine Kalengo P/S NGOR 603/WORKS/2016-2017/00034 contract value 16,998,985 (selective bidding) Construction of a 5 stance lined VIP latrine at Omuriana P/S. NGOR 603/WORKS/2017-2018/00009 value 16,999,714 (selective bidding).
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"> 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 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interim certificates presented in terms of payment certificate records of projects Completion certificates presented example is the construction of maternity ward at Kobwin HCIII dated 5th March 2017 Fencing of the district administration offices dated 18th Nov 2016 low cost sealing of 1.5KM road at the district headquarters practical completion date 21st June 2017

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sites boards visited lacked an indication of the contract value and expected duration. Some of the site boards were of previous years of 2013/14
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"> Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence of up to date monthly bank reconciliations as at the time of assessment; that is 30th January 2018 therefore, reconciliation for the month of December 2017. The evidence available was for the period up to 30th June and not 31st December 2017. <p>Therefore, zero score.</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"> If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2. 	2	<p>The LG makes timely payments therefore, no overdue bills. The only supplier who has not been paid for about 2 months is M/s Fahaab Energy (U) Limited who supplied fuel and is owed UGX 14 million due to differences in account titles as submitted to Accountant General and the bank. This is purely beyond the LG and, correspondences between CAO and Accountant General indicate that the problem is being addressed.</p> <p>Therefore, a score of 2.</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.

3

There is a Substantive Principal Internal Auditor from 18th June 2012 under DSC Minute No. 34/2012. All the 4 quarterly reports for FY 2016/17 were produced although some were submitted late to the PS/ST as follows;

i. 4th Quarter – date 13th July 2017, submitted on 18th January 2018 2017.

ii. 3rd Quarter – dated 12th May 2017, no evidence of submission.

iii. 2nd Quarter – dated 8th February 2017, submitted on 12th April 2017.

iv. 1st Quarter – dated 10th November 2016, submitted on 20th March 2017.

Therefore, a score of 3.

- 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

No evidence of information to Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the FY 2016/17. The minutes of Finance, Planning and Administration Committee of Council and their recommendations do not address matters of internal audit.

Therefore, zero score.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1 	<p>1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence that internal audit reports for FY 2016/17 were submitted to CAO and LG PAC, and that LG PAC has reviewed them and, queries are being followed up as follows; i. 4th Quarter – date 13th July 2017, copy delivered to CAO and LG PAC on 17th January 2018. ii. 3rd Quarter – dated 12th May 2017, copy delivered to CAO and LG PAC on 15th May 2017. iii. 2nd Quarter – dated 8th February 2017, copy delivered to CAO and LG PAC on 10th February 2017. iv. 1st Quarter – dated 10th November 2016, delivered to CAO and LG PAC on 9th January 2017. • However, (ii), (iii), and (iv) above contravene Regulation 12 (e) of the LGFARs 2007 which requires internal audit to prepare internal audit quarterly reports for submission to the council within one month at the end of each quarter. <p>Therefore, a score of 1.</p>
19	<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	<p>4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an up to date assets register as per LGAM 2007 formats - land and buildings, motor vehicles and heavy plants, and General. • The last transaction in the register was Voltage Regulator and Power Cable from OPM entered on 18th October 2017. • Although the LG still maintains a manual register, the Accountant General provided a template for a more detailed register and the LG is in the process of migrating to the new format. <p>Therefore, a score of 4.</p>

20	<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY: • unqualified audit opinion: score 4 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</p>	4	<p>Unqualified audit opinion for FY 2016/17 as per Auditor General Report of December 2017. Therefore, a score of 4.</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>Ngora District Council met and discussed service delivery related issues. Refer to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MIN. 66/NDC/05/2017; 67/NDC/05/2017; and 68/NDC/05/2017 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 25th May 2017). • MIN. 55/NDC/05/2017 and MIN. 55/NDC/05/2017 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 3rd May 2017) • MIN. 48/NDCM/12/2016 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 21st December 2016) • MIN. 38/NDCM/10/2016 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 31st October 2016) • MIN. 26/NDCM/08/2016 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 25th August 2016).
22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2. 	0	<p>There is no designated person in place.</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	The district had not published the LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public 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	Information on the awarded contracts has not been published.
		• 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. The Central Government did not conduct the Annual Performance Assessment for LGs in 2016/2017. Also information obtained was that the District Website (www.ngoradlg.go.ug) is not updated.
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	A file (CR/218/1: COMMUNICATION) was presented. However, there was no evidence the district had communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during FY 2016/2017.
	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	There was a Baraza organised by the Council for African Policy (CAP) in close collaboration with Ngora DLG on 18th August 2017. The HoDs of Ngora made presentations on the implemented projects for the FY 2016/2017. Refer to CR/210/39: BARAZAS – PUBLIC FORA. Notable was that the Baraza was organised in FY 2017/2018 and NOT FY 2016/2017.
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				

25	<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG gender focal person has provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities score 2. 	2	<p>Guidance is present in the Gender sector including among others the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of women councils and reports dated 28th Oct 2016, report on 30th Dec 2016 and report on monitoring of women projects on 15th Dec 2016 • Minutes and reports of PWD dated 7th Nov 2016 and 18th Dec 2016 • Minutes and reports of YLP dated 18th Nov 2016, Youth appraisal report on 4th Nov 2016, technical planning committee for YLP dated 21st Nov 2016, sub county minutes 30th Nov 2016, 1st Dec 2016 and 25th Oct 2016
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that gender focal point has planned activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and that more than 90% of previous year's budget for gender activities has been implemented: score 2. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current year budget was not presented. • CDO claims that they don't change their budgets, they use the same previous FY. • Planned budgets given were in soft copy and taken from the UWEP and YLP grants
26	<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No screening reports presented • No EIA reports presented • No EMP reports presented
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presented works and infrastructure projects all integrated ESMP involving tree planting, and environmental restoration present in the BOQs of bids.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No land agreements were presented

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No completed Environmental Certificate form were presented• Only 1 Environmental inspection certificate was presented dated 12th Dec 2017
--	---	---	--



LGPA 2017/18

Educational Performance Measures

Ngora District

(Vote Code: 603)

Score 12/100 (12%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				
1	<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 	0	<p>According to the LG Performance Contract 2017/2018, the district has a wage provision of 4,127,131,000 for Primary teachers at all levels.</p> <p>The LG, which has 58 schools, has not been given a go-ahead to recruit and yet it has a school (Ajeluk) which has only 6 teachers and 6 schools with no substantive Head Teachers</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4 	0	<p>According to the LG Performance Contract 2017/2018/ OBT 2017/2018, all Primary Schools except Ajeluk P/S have the minimum of 7 teachers. Ajeluk P/S has only 6 teachers and 1 Head Teacher</p> <p>Six schools (Atapur, Kokong, Kobuin, Agolitoum, Agu and Ngora) do not have a substantive Head Teacher</p>
2	<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision o If 100% score 6 o If 80 - 99% score 3 o If below 80% score 0 	0	<p>According to HRM, The LG has a ceiling of 849 teachers and has 674 teachers on the payroll. This translates into 79%</p>

3	<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	0	<p>The approved structure of the LG (dated 12th June 2017) has 2 positions of school inspector. There is a position for 1 senior inspector of schools that is filled and a position of inspector of schools that is not filled</p>
4	<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of Primary Teachers: score 2</p>	0	<p>According to the Performance Contract/ OBT 2017/2018, the Department submitted an input to the recruitment plan that indicates the intention to recruit 180 teachers</p> <p>Meanwhile, the LG, which has just advertised posts for recruitment did not advertise any position for teachers because MOPS had not given a go-ahead to recruit.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of School Inspectors: score 2</p>	0	<p>According to the Performance Contract/ OBT 2017/2018, the Department submitted an input to the recruitment plan that indicates the intention to recruit 2 school inspectors (However, the approved structure provides for 2 school inspectors with 1 position already filled)</p> <p>Meanwhile, the LG, which has just advertised posts for recruitment, did not advertise the position of inspector.</p>

5	<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY • 100% school inspectors: score 3</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Okurut George inspector of schools was appraised 23/10/17 • Ms Acham betty inspector of schools was appraised 23/10/17 • The senior inspector of schools was not appraised
	<p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised head teachers during the previous FY. • 90% - 100%: score 3 • 70% - 89%: score 2 • Below 70%: score 0</p>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Six out the 42 head teacher were not appraised that is 14% so 86% of the head teachers were appraised

Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection

6	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>			<p>The LG received several circulars from the national level in the FY 2016/2017. Evidence of communication of all circulars to schools was not seen.</p> <p>Some of the schools that were visited such as Akeit P/S and Akisim did not produce any of the circulars that were found at the district while Oteteen P/S had only one circular and St. Aloysius Demonstration School had only 2 circulars.</p> <p>Furthermore some of circulars found in Akisim and St. Aloysius were not listed by the district. These are; Teacher Support Supervision in schools dated 30/6/2017 from Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES) and Guidelines for taking Disciplinary action on Education Service Personnel from the Education Service Commission.</p>
---	--	--	--	--

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

0

The circulars and Guidelines presented by the district at the time of assessment are as follows;

- Schools and other Institutions Calendar 2017, dated 18th November 2016 from MOES;
- Guidelines for implementing Performance Agreements for Heads and Deputy Heads of Tertiary Institutions, Secondary and Primary Schools dated January 2017 from Ministry of Public Service;
- Ensuring Teacher Presence in Schools through enforcing Sanctions and Rewards dated 26th June 2017 from Ministry of Local Government;
- School Feeding Programme in Education Institutions dated 15th May, 2017 from MOES;
- Uganda National Primary Schools Performing Arts Festival Syllabus for 2017 dated 17th February 2017;
- Managing Instruction materials in Schools/ (with manual) dated 24th July 2016;
- Salary entitlement/underpayment to Science Teachers/ Tutors/ Instructors dated 19th September 2016 from MOES;
- Secondary School Teachers teaching in Primary Schools dated 25th July 2016 from MOES;
- Guidelines on School Feeding and Nutrition Programmes for UPE and Universal Post Primary

			Education and Training from MOES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level, including on school feeding: score 2 	<p>2</p> <p>In the FY 2016/2017, the LG Education Department met with Head Teachers on 28/9/2016, 20/10/2016, 22/2/2017, 7/4/2017, 23/1/2017 and 27/4/2017</p> <p>At the meeting on 23/1/2017, the DEO made a presentation on school feeding and in the meeting on 27/4/2017, Head Teachers were oriented on Performance Agreements</p>
7	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all private and public primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all private and public primary schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59% score 1 o Below 50% score 0. 	<p>0</p> <p>In the FY 2016/2017, the LG held only two school inspections and produced the two reports,</p> <p>In Term 1 (Quarter 3), 37 Government schools were inspected</p> <p>In Term 2 (Quarter 4), 65 Government schools were inspected</p> <p>(The LG has 58 Government Schools, 6 Community Schools and 33 Private Schools)</p>

8	<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4 	<p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>There were no minutes to show that the Department had held meetings to discuss school inspection reports</p> <p>The Directorate of Education Standards (DES) requires each LG to submit 4 Quarterly inspection reports each FY.</p> <p>Ngora district made only one submission to DES in the FY 2016/2017. This was the 1st Term /Quarter 3 report. DES acknowledged receipt of the report on 3rd June 2017</p> <p>There was no evidence of follow up of inspection recommendations</p>
9	<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5 	<p>0</p>	<p>There are inconsistencies in the lists of schools from the Education Department vis a vis those of EMIS and OBT.</p> <p>The LG Education Department presents a list of 63 Government Schools (Document dated 27th April, 2017 and titled Activity Report on the Comprehensive Education and Sports Sector Data Collection Exercise 2017) while EMIS and OBT presents 58 schools</p> <p>Then, under EMIS there are 47 Private Schools while the LG Education Department lists 41 Private Schools</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

0

The enrolment data in the Department has minimal discrepancies with EMIS and OBT enrolment data.

For instance, the list from the Department lists 923 pupils for Agirigiroi P/S while OBT lists 921 pupils for the same school. EMIS lists 918 for the same school

On the list from the Department, Mukura P/S has 879 pupils. OBT lists 853 for the same school while EMIS lists 800 pupils

Opot P/S has 985 pupils on the list from the Department. OBT lists 972 from the same school while EMIS presents 846 for the same school

Kopege has 716 pupils on the list from the Department. OBT lists 715 pupils from the same school while EMIS presents 756 for the same school

Gawa P/S has 694 pupils on the list from the Department. OBT lists 683 pupils for the same school while EMIS presents 619 pupils for this school

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10

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

Maximum 4 for this performance measure

• 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

2

The Standing Committee of Finance, Planning, Administration, and Social Services (Health, Education, and Community Based Services) met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2016/2017 as indicated below:

- Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 9th May 2017 (under 27/NDC/05/2017).
- Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 15th and 17th February 2017 (under 21/NDSC/02/2017).
- Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 16th and 19th December 2016 (under 15/NDSC/12/2016).
- Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 14th and 17th October 2016 (under 12/NDSC/10/2016).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2 	0	<p>The Office of Clerk to Council presented just two copies of 'The Recommendations of the Committee of Finance, Planning, Administration, and Social Services to Council'. These copies had not been signed by the members of the committee.</p> <p>The titles of the documents were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'The Recommendations of the Standing Committee of Finance, Planning, Administration, and Social services in a meeting held on 16th – 17th January 2018'. • 'The Recommendations of the Committee of Finance, Administration, and Social Services to Council'.
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)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80% schools: score 0 	0	<p>There are no files in DEO's office containing minutes from School Management Committees (SMCs); and so the functionality of SMCs in the district could not be ascertained</p>

12	<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	0	<p>At the time of assessment, the LG had not posted the non-wage recurrent grants on the district notice board. Also, the LG does not have a functional website.</p> <p>In three of the schools that were visited, i.e. Akisim P/S, Oteteen P/S and St. Aloysius Demonstration School, the non-wage recurrent grants were posted in the Head Teachers Officer. Akeit P/S was an exception. The Head Teacher has not posted the grant for 2017</p>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				
13	<p>The LG Education department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	0	<p>The Education Department made late submissions to PDU as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of 4 in 1 Teachers house at Atiira P/S, Moru Kakis and Aciisa P/S at 90,500,000/= each. Submissions of requests to PDU made on 26/6/2017 Construction of a 5 stance VIP Latrine at Okoboi P/S and Ngora Township P/S at 19,000,000/= each. Submissions of requests to PDU made on 5/9/2017 Supply of 3, 36 Seater desks to Akeit P/S at 5,400,000/=. Submission of requests to PDU made on 26/6/2017 Supply of filing cabinets at 1,500,000/=. Submission of requests to PDU made on 1/11/2017

14	<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<p>There are no delays in certification, recommendation, and payment of contractors in the education sector as seen in the contract executed (the only major contract) in FY 2016/17 as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Name of Contractor – Simpio Tech (U) Ltd b. Nature of Contract – Construction of a 4 in 1 Teachers’ House at Omuriana Primary School, Ngora District c. Award – 11th July 2016 d. Contract signed – 20th September 2016 e. Contract amount – UGX 19,406,460 f. Request for payment – 16th December 2016 g. Certificate – 27th November 2016 h. Approval – 20th January 2017 i. Payment date – 10th March 2017 <p>Therefore, a score of 3.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting			

15	<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	0	<p>The Education Department submitted all the four quarterly reports electronically (mainly on flash disks) to DPU.</p> <p>However, the dates of submission could not be ascertained.</p>
----	--	--	---	---

16

LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)

Maximum 4 for this performance measure

• 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

2

• 1st Quarter 2016/17 internal audit report had queries in the following schools;

i. Light College Secondary School;

? Non remittance of NSSF, and

? Invalid receipts issued.

ii. Ngora Peas High School;

? No cash book for 2015

? No vote book for 2015

? No bank statements for March – May 2015

? Purchases made by the Head Teacher

? Inventory missing

• 2nd Quarter had queries of unaccounted for funds totaling UGX 12,735, 212 in the education sector as follows;

? Vehicle maintenance – no assessment certificate from the District Engineer, plus no after repair report.

? No invitation for the regional workshop in Mbale.

? No evidence of payment for mobilization of primary schools for licensing.

• All the above queries were responded to and accountability provided by the DEO. The response and accountabilities were dated 18th May 2017.

Therefore, score 2.

17

LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines

Maximum 5 points for this performance measure

- 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

0

There was no evidence of dissemination of guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills

- Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2

0

There is no evidence of issue and explanation of guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools.

- Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1

1

The requirement of the gender composition as per the 2nd Schedule of the Education Act 2008 is at least 2 women on the Foundation Body which has a total of 6 people.

Akisim P/S and St. Aloysius Demonstration P/S have 2 women and 4 men each on the SMC Foundation Body and Oteteen has 3 women and 3 men. These 3 schools meet the guideline on gender composition of the SMC .Meanwhile Akeit P/S has only 5 members on the Foundation Body with 2 women and 3 men.

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



LGPA 2017/18

Health Performance Measures

Ngora District

(Vote Code: 603)

Score 47/100 (47%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human resource planning and management				
1	<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY • More than 80% filled: score 6 points, • 60 – 80% - score 3 • Less than 60% filled: score 0</p>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DHO office produced a list of health workers per faculty with filled and vacant post per facility and based on the list presented 73% of the staff have been recruited as per 15th September 2017. The list shows the gaps of staff required and yet to be recruited.
2	<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 4</p>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A recruitment plan for FY 2017/18 was presented as evidence. this plan was submitted to HRM and received on 30th September 2016
3	<p>The LG Health department has ensured that performance appraisal for health facility in charge is conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the health facility in-charge have been appraised during the previous FY: o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Ocimwa Simon was the in charge of health centre iv dismissed on disciplinary grounds (not appraised) the district has one health centre iv.

4	<p>The Local Government Health department has equitably deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers equitably, in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY: score 4 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A list of staff deployed to respective health facilities was presented as an evidence dated up to December 2017. In addition, the AG. DHOs presented a list showing further internal transfers of some staff to various facilities which indicates original place of work and facility been transferred to and reasons of transfer. The transfer is to be effective from 1st February 2018.
---	--	--	---	---

Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision

5	<p>The DHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 	0	<p>No clear justification that the DHO communicated to health facilities as in particular regarding guidelines , circulars and policies</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence presented for any meeting that took place to discuss about guidelines
6	<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence presented to justify that the DHT supervise the HSD

		<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY: • If 100% supervised: score 3 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • Support supervision report dated 12 April 2017 visited Kobwin HCIII and Opot HCII • 25 October 2017 Another support supervision report where visits were made to Mukura HCIII, Ngora Hospital Atoot HCII • 19th Dec 2016 field monitoring report was presented and the purpose was to conduct integrated monitoring and support supervision for family planning. This included Atoot HCII, district maternity unit, Ajeluk HCIII Kapir HC III Kobwin HCIII Ngora HCIV Agu HCIII and Mukura HCIII
7	<p>The Health Sub-district(s) have effectively provided support supervision to lower level health units</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities have been supervised by HSD and reports produced: • If 100% supervised score 6 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 4 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 2 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This assessment visited Ngora HSD but did not find any evidence that the HSD carry out support supervision to health facilities
8	<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A file of action plans was presented by Ag DHO as evidence, developed on date of 19th December 2016 the action plans include the following areas o Quality improvement, action to be taken and by whom and when o Most of actions to be implemented in January.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DHO presented a report to improve fourth antenatal quality improvement approach. To improve pregnant mothers attending ANC4. DHO presented this quality improvement report which is used to follow-up gaps identified particularly in ANC services and data qualities and as per some of the action plans in all 12 facilities but this evidence was a one time activity not a routine for other recommendations
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"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DHO office presented all quarterly Out Budgeting Tool extracts for 2016/17. Also presented are the HMS reports showing outputs per indicator. The quarterly OBT report show cumulative achievements directly extracted from DHIS2 (HMIS platform for electronic reporting) and both OBT and HMIS reports were found to be accurate and consistent after sampling and validating some performance immunisation indicators. Andrew Akol the biostatistician walked the assessment through the process.
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				

<p>10</p>	<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"> • 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 	<p>2</p>	<p>The Standing Committee of Finance, Planning, Administration, and Social Services (Health, Education, and Community Based Services) met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2016/2017 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 9th May 2017 (under 27/NDC/05/2017). • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 15th and 17th February 2017 (under 21/NDSC/02/2017). • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 16th and 19th December 2016 (under 15/NDSC/12/2016). • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 14th and 17th October 2016 (under 12/NDSC/10/2016).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>0</p>	<p>The Office of Clerk to Council presented just two copies of 'The Recommendations of the Committee of Finance, Planning, Administration, and Social Services to Council'. These copies had not been signed by the members of the committee.</p> <p>The titles of the documents were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'The Recommendations of the Standing Committee of Finance, Planning, Administration, and Social services in a meeting held on 16th – 17th January 2018'. • 'The Recommendations of the Committee of Finance, Administration, and Social Services to Council'.

11	<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 5 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5 • If 80-99% : score 3 • If 70-79%: : score 1 • If less than 70%: score 0 	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report of HUMC meeting held on 28th November 2017 • Discussed integration of general ward and maternal work to be part District budgets attended by 9 members out of 10 members. • A Second meeting took place on 19th Dec 2017 and purpose was follow-up and budget review.
12	<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No publication of PHC funds on the notice board both at DHO and CAO notice boards

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

13	<p>The LG Health department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2 	2	<p>AG DHO Presented a procurement plan for the health department submitted on 9th March 2017</p>
		<p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	0	<p>Nothing was presented as evidence</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"> • Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time: • 100% - score 8 • 70-99% – score 4 • Below 70% - score 0 	4	<p>A list of participants on a meeting held to facilitate review of basic kit requirements for health facilities was presented as evidence. The Presented list indicates that the NMS and DHT participated but not convincing that fully supported health facility in charges to come up with procurement plan. The meeting was held on 10th January 2017</p>
----	--	--	---	---

15

The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time

Maximum 2 for this performance measure

• Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points

2

There are no delays in certification, recommendation, and payment of suppliers/contractors in the health sector as confirmed in 2 contracts executed in FY 2016/17 as follows;

- i. Name of Contractor – U Best (U) Ltd
 - a. Nature of Contract – Completion of a Paediatric Ward at Ngora Health Centre IV
 - b. Contract signed – 18th August 2016
 - c. Contract amount – UGX 11,365,756
 - d. Request for payment – 13rd April 2017
 - e. Certificate – 24th April 2017
 - f. Approval – 27th April 2017
 - g. Payment date – 5th May 2017
 - ii. Name of Contractor – U Best (U) Limited
 - a. Nature of Contract – Completion of a Paediatric Ward at Ngora Health Centre IV
 - b. Award dated – 11th July 2016
 - c. Contract signed – 18th August 2016
 - d. Contract amount – UGX 24,571,227
 - e. Request for payment – 11th November 2016
 - f. Certificate – 6th February 2017
 - g. Approval – 8th February 2017
 - h. Payment – 8th February 2017
- Therefore, a score of 2.

Assessment area: Financial management and reporting

16	<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	0	<p>The Health Department submitted all the four quarterly reports electronically (mainly on flash disks) to DPU.</p> <p>However, the dates of submission could not be ascertained.</p>
17	<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year • If sector has no audit query score 4 • If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points • If all queries are not responded to score 0</p>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd Quarter internal audit report queried unaccounted for funds totaling UGX 2,229,150 as follows; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Fuel – no consumption fuel statement. ii. Servicing and repair of vehicle No. UG 4623M – no assessment report from the District Engineer. • Fuel Consumption Statement No. 505 totaling UGX 1 million against voucher No. 7/11 dated 16th November 2016 and other accountability documents were provided in response to the above queries. <p>Therefore, a score of 2.</p>
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				
18	<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2 • Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2 	2	<p>10 members substantive members composed of chair and vice, treasurer, mobiliser secretary in-charge, staff representative and other members composed of 5 women and 5</p> <p>No evidence presented</p>

19	<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that the LGs has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal : score 2 points.	0	No evidence presented
----	---	---	---	-----------------------



LGPA 2017/18

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Ngora District

(Vote Code: 603)

Score 14/100 (14%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: score 10 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No safe water coverage data was obtained at DWO to determine sub counties with safe water coverage below the district average. The annual work plan and Budget for water and sanitation for the financial 2017/2018 was obtained but it was wrongly dated 28th/8/2015. This was not an authentic document to be relied on to inform the local government performance assessment report

2

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)

Maximum 15 points for this performance measure

• Evidence that the LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY: score 15

0

• The annual progress reports obtained at DWO did not show water projects per Sub County. Besides the water coverage data of the district was not obtained to establish if sub counties below district coverage were budgeted for water projects in the previous financial year 2016/2017.

In fact, page 6 only shows drilling of 7 deep boreholes and 2 shallow wells were budgeted under PAF in four communities irrespective of whether sub counties below district average were being targeted.

• The budget document obtained at the district water office was not authentic since it lacked official stamp and wasn't duly signed and dated to be relied upon to inform the local government performance assessment.

Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision

3	<p>The LG Water department carries out monthly monitoring and supervision of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually. • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15 • 80 - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10 • 70 - 79%: score 7 • 60 - 69% monitored: score 5 • 50 - 59%: score 3 • Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored -score 0</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No supervision and monitoring plan was obtained at DWO to show the number of projects to be monitored. • Annual progress reports obtained were not authentic since they didn't bear official stamp, date, and signature of respective offices as such it couldn't be relied on to inform the LPA. • There was no supervision and monitoring reports of each project obtained at DWO
4	<p>The LG Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No sector mis reports were obtained at the DWO as was the case for performance contract and OBT. This made it impossible to verify data obtained from MoWE as similar and consistent.

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"> No submission reports on procurement were obtained at DWO to verify with what exists at DPU office. Sector annual work plan and budget for the current financial year 2017/2018 was not authentic to be relied upon since it was dated 28/8/2015.
6	<p>The DWO has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the DWO prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no substantive contract manger appointed to effectively manage wss projects/ contracts. No contract management records were obtained to establish if WSS projects were being constructed as per the BOQs/ specifications No site minutes were obtained to establish if the agreed actions between DWO and the contractor / consultant were being implemented by the contractor. Therefore, there was hardly a sample of five WSS projects taken to validate the findings from the files/ records.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No contract management records were obtained to ascertain if they were constructed as per the design specifications

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No hand over reports were obtained at DWO
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No completion reports filed to show all WSS projects certified at DWO by the district engineer
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	3	<p>There are no delays in certification, recommendation, and payment of contractors in the water sector as confirmed in the only major contract executed in FY 2016/17 as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name of Contractor – Galaxy Agro Tech (U) Ltd • Nature of Contract – Drilling of 5 boreholes, Ngora District • Award – 11th July 2016 • Contract amount – UGX 95,845,500 • Request for payment – 29th November 2016 • Certificate – 16th January 2017 • Approval – 23rd January 2017 • Payment date – 17rd March 2017 <p>Therefore, a score of 3.</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"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	0	<p>The Water Department submitted all the four quarterly reports electronically (mainly on flash disks) to DPU.</p> <p>However, the dates of submission could not be ascertained.</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"> • 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 	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No audit queries for water sector for FY 2016/17. Therefore, a maximum score of 5.
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				

10

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

Maximum 6 for this performance measure

• 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

3

The Standing Committee of Works and Technical Services, Production and Marketing, and Natural Resources met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2016/2017 as indicated below:

• Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 11th – 12th May 2017 (under MIN. 30/NDC/05/2017 & 31/NDC/05/2017).

• Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 13th – 14th February 2017 (under MIN. 25/NDSC/02/2017).

• Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 12th October 2016 (under MIN. 11/NDSC/10/2016).

• Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 28th – 29th July 2016 (under MIN. 6/NDSC/07/2016).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	0	<p>The Office of Clerk to Council presented just two copies of 'The Recommendations of the Committee of Works and Technical Services and Technical Services, Production and Marketing, and Natural Resources to Council'. These copies had not been signed by the members of the committee.</p> <p>The titles of the recommendations presented were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'The Recommendations of the Committee of Works and Technical Services and Technical Services, Production and Marketing, and Natural Resources to Council'. • 'The Recommendations of the Standing Committee of Works and Technical Services and Technical Services, Production and Marketing, and Natural Resources in a meeting held on 18th and 19th January 2018'
11	<p>The LG Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No information on AWP, Budget and water development releases and expenditures was obtained on the district notice boards. • The district website was not functional to show any information on contracts.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From a sample of five WSS projects taken, water projects were inadequately clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction and contractor as seen here under: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Okomoin village 4/10/2016 DWD56146 Funded by PAF - Okunguro p/s borehole 13/8/2016 Depth 64 m - Obur village DWD48184 - 11/06/2015 - Mukura s/c bore hole - - Mukura village borehole 24/06/2015 DWD48220
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name/contract and contract sum was obtained on district notice boards or website

12	Participation of communities in WSS programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No community applications for water and public sanitation facilities as per sector critical requirements was obtained at DWO
	Maximum 3 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O&M funds and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, for the current FY: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No community meeting minutes to show collection o and m funds for preventive maintenance and minor repair were obtained at DWO for the current financial year. No sector mis showing number of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O and M funds was obtained at DWO

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

13	The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No screening templates were obtained from ENR office for all projects as a critical requirement to safe guard the environment. No EIAs reports were obtained from ENR office
	Maximum 4 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No copy of completed environmental screening template was obtained at ENR office. Therefore obtaining a sample of 3 contracts to check if they had a clause on environmental protection wasn't possible

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mitigation plan was obtained at ENR office to be verified in the field to assess compliance with good environmental and social protection practices
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"> If at least 50% WSCs are women as per the sector critical requirements: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to annual progress report for the previous financial year 2016/2017, gender equity is enlisted as at least a women per WSC but not at 50% of WSCs as women as per the sector critical requirement No list of WSCs with composition of gender per facility was obtained at the DWO
15	<p>Gender- and special-needs sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/RGCs.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A sample of five public sanitation facilities and constructions show they have ramps and separate stances for men, women and PWDs for equity and inclusion. - Ngora GC IV staff VIP under construction - Akubui p/s - Mukura p/s - Mukura trading centre public sanitation VIP - Okunguro p/s