



## LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Pakwach District

(Vote Code: 618)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	0	0%
No	2	100%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
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.	xxx	Pakwach district LG submitted its first an annual performance contract for FY2017/18 on 1st August, 2017, which is contrary to the standard submission date of 30th June, 2017 as stipulated in the LG budget guidelines.	No
Assessment area: Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).	xxxxx	Pakwach district LG submitted its first annual budget for FY2017/18 without a procurement plan attached as required by LG PPDA Regulations, 2006	No
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			
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)	xxxxx	Pakwach district started operation in July 2017 so this was not relevant	N/A
LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)	xxxxxx	Pakwach district started operations in July 2017 so this was not relevant for FY2016/17	N/A
Assessment area: Audit			

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by April 30 (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action (PFMA Act 2015; Local Governments Financial and Accounting Regulations 2007; The Local Governments Act, Cap 243).</p>	<p>xxxxx</p>	<p>Pakwach DLG began in July 2017 i.e. FY 2017/18. This requirement therefore does not apply.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>xxxxx</p>	<p>Pakwach DLG began in July 2017 i.e. FY 2017/18. This requirement therefore does not apply.</p>	<p>N/A</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Pakwach District

(Vote Code: 618)

Score 10/100 (10%)

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> <p>• All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2.</p>	2	<p>Much as the district is new, there was evidence of a functional physical planning committee in place. It has met once in the 7 months it has been on operation as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes of Pakwach physical planning committee meeting held on 14/12/2017, at the district headquarters Kapita discussed among others roles of the committee, proposal/formulation of payment for building plans and plan approval</li> </ul>
2	<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.</li> <li>• Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If different, justification has to be provided and evidence that it was approved by Council. Score 2.</li> <li>• Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 1.</li> </ul>	0	<p>Not Applicable because the district began operations in FY2017/18. The processes of conducting the budget conference for the current year priorities was not done since the district was not operational.</p> <p>Pakwach district is in the process of developing a 5 years development plan, some of the priorities implemented in FY2017/18 were extracted from Nebbi district 5 years development plan 2 and others were based on the immediate needs of the new district. So it was difficult to make a comparative assessment.</p> <p>There was no evidence that project profiles were development and discussed by the TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG planning guidelines.</p>

3	<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual statistical abstract, with gender disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum 1 point.</li> </ul>	0	<p>Not Applicable because the district began operations in FY2017/18. The statistical abstract with gender disaggregated data was not compiled because the district was not operational</p>
4	<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>Not Applicable because the district began operations in FY2017/18</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100%: score 4</li> <li>o 80-99%: score 2</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	0	<p>Not Applicable because the district began operations in FY2017/18</p>
5	<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects and assets during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>Not Applicable because the district began operations in FY2017/18</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>Not Applicable because the district began operations in FY2017/18</p>

Assessment area: Human Resource Management

6	LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(NOT APPLICABLE)</li> <li>The District only started on the 1st July 2017,( not in the financial year under review 2016- 2017)</li> <li>However; All care taking heads of departments and key sections filled their performance contract agreements for the current financial year.</li> </ul>
	Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3</li> </ul>	0	(NOT APPLICABLE) The District only started on the 1st July 2017,( not in the financial year under review 2016- 2017)
7	The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>( NOT APPLICABLE)</li> <li>The District only started on the 1st July 2017,( not in the financial year under review 2016- 2017).</li> <li>However; The District nominated and submitted proposed members of DSC to the PSC for approval on 24th Jan 2018.</li> <li>The District had also submitted a request for clearance of recruitment to MoPS (CR/115/1 on the 6th October 2017.</li> <li>The District had wage bill short fall, where they could not afford even to pay annual wages to their Skeleton in position staff.</li> </ul>
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(NOT APPLICABLE)</li> <li>The District only started on the 1st July 2017, ( not in the financial year under review 2016- 2017).</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	0	(NOT APPLICABLE) The District only started on the 1st July 2017,( not in the financial year under review 2016- 2017).
8	Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3</li> </ul>	0	(NOT APPLICABLE ) • The District only started on the 1st July 2017,( not in the financial year under review 2016- 2017).
	Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2</li> </ul>	0	(NOT APPLICABLE ) The District only started on the 1st July 2017,( not in the financial year under review 2016- 2017).

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	Pakwach DLG began in July 2017 i.e. FY 2017/18. This performance measure therefore does not apply.
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	Pakwach DLG began in July 2017 i.e. FY 2017/18. This performance measure therefore does not apply.
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	Revenue collection mostly happens at the sub county level. Since starting in July 2017, the district has been receiving the 35% local revenue share from S/Cs. Examples include: Receipt of Shs 17,913,583 from Panyamur S/C on 31/01/18, Receipt of Shs 7,951,517 from Panyamur S/C on 11/12/17, Receipt of Shs 297,150 and Shs 930,970 from Alui S/C on 15/11/17. The district's LST deductions from staff are not yet sent to S/Cs because of system issues with the General Fund A/C still to be sorted out by the Accountant General at MoFPED.
		<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>	0	Pakwach DLG began in July 2017 i.e. FY 2017/18. This performance measure therefore does not apply.
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>- There was NO Evidence that Pakwach DLG had the position of a Senior Procurement Officer substantively filled.</li> <li>- There was NO Evidence that Pakwach DLG had the position of Procurement Officer substantively filled.</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>	0	<p>Zero score awarded because LG was non-existent in the previous FY and therefore there was NO Evidence whatsoever to justify any score above zero.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>There WAS Evidence that Pakwach DLG Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provided justifications for any deviations from those recommendations as exemplified by the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construction of One Market Shed with Stalls at Panyimur Modern Market (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00028). DCC Min Date: 20/November/2017.</li> <li>- Construction of 5 x 6 Slaughter Slab at Alwi Auction Market with Proper Drainage Channel and Provision of Hooking and Line Dressing (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00015). DCC Min Date: 20/November/2017.</li> <li>- Construction of 5 Stance Pit Lined VIP Latrine at DEI P/S (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00009). DCC Min Date: 20/November/2017.</li> <li>- Rehabilitation of Borehole (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00004). DCC Min Date: 20/November/2017.</li> <li>- Construction of Improved Drying Racks for Fish Quality Assurance at Wadelai Sub-county (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00006). DCC Min Date: 20/November/2017.</li> <li>- Construction of 5 Stance Pit Lined VIP Latrine at LOBODEGI P/S (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00007). DCC Min Date: 20/November/2017.</li> <li>- Construction of One Market Shed with Stalls</li> </ul>

			<p>at PACEGO Auction Market (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00016). DCC Min Date: 20/November/2017.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construction of 5 Stance Pit Lined VIP Latrine at MARAMA P/S (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00008). DCC Min Date: 20/November/2017.</li> <li>- Rehabilitation of Office Block (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00013). DCC Min Date: 20/November/2017.</li> <li>- Rehabilitation of Anyara Road – Stone Pitching and Grading (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00056). DCC Min Date: 20/November/2017.</li> <li>- Construction of a Two Classroom Block with Office and Store at AVODO P/S in Alwi Sub-county (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00054). DCC Min Date: 20/November/2017.</li> <li>- Deep Borehole Drilling and Construction (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00055). DCC Min Date: 20/November/2017.</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>		<p>(a) There WAS Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year (2017/2018 FY) covered all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget as exemplified by the following procurements that were indicated both in the Procurement Plan and in the approved annual work plan and budget for the current FY (2017/2018 FY):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construction of 5 Stance Pit Lined VIP Latrine at DEI P/S (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00009) (Local Government Budget Estimates for Financial Year 2017/2018, Vote 618: Pakwach District, Output 078181: Latrine Construction and Rehabilitation, 312101 Non Residential Buildings AND was also indicated as #20 on Page 2 of the Procurement Work Plan for FY 2017/18 Dated 06/July/2017 and that was Submitted to PPDA on 13/July/2017).</li> <li>- Rehabilitation of Borehole (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00004) (Local Government Budget Estimates for Financial Year 2017/2018, Vote 618: Pakwach District, Output 098183: Borehole Drilling and Rehabilitation, 312104 Other Structures AND was also indicated as #156 on Page 10 of the</li> </ul>

• 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

Procurement Work Plan for FY 2017/18 Dated 06/July/2017 and that was Submitted to PPDA on 13/July/2017).

- Construction of Improved Drying Racks for Fish Quality Assurance at Wadelai Sub-county (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00006) (Local Government Budget Estimates for Financial Year 2017/2018, Vote 618: Pakwach District, Output 018205: Fisheries Regulation, 228001 Maintenance - Civil AND was also indicated as #4 on Page 1 of the Procurement Work Plan for FY 2017/18 Dated 06/July/2017 and that was Submitted to PPDA on 13/July/2017).

- Construction of 5 Stance Pit Lined VIP Latrine at LOBODEGI P/S (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00007) (Local Government Budget Estimates for Financial Year 2017/2018, Vote 618: Pakwach District, Output 078181: Latrine Construction and Rehabilitation, 312101 Non Residential Buildings AND was also indicated as #16 on Page 2 of the Procurement Work Plan for FY 2017/18 Dated 06/July/2017 and that was Submitted to PPDA on 13/July/2017).

- Construction of 5 Stance Pit Lined VIP Latrine at MARAMA P/S (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00008) (Local Government Budget Estimates for Financial Year 2017/2018, Vote 618: Pakwach District, Output 078181: Latrine Construction and Rehabilitation, 312101 Non Residential Buildings AND was also indicated as #17 on Page 2 of the Procurement Work Plan for FY 2017/18 Dated 06/July/2017 and that was Submitted to PPDA on 13/July/2017).

- Rehabilitation of Office Block (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00013) (Local Government Budget Estimates for Financial Year 2017/2018, Vote 618: Pakwach District, Output 138172: Administrative Capital, 312101 Non Residential Buildings AND was also indicated as #4 on Page 1 of the Supplementary and Revised Procurement Work Plan for FY 2017/18 Dated 08/January/2018 and that was Submitted to PPDA on 10/January/2018).

- Construction of a Two Classroom Block with Office and Store at AVODO P/S in Alwi Sub-county (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00054). (Local Government Budget Estimates for Financial Year 2017/2018, Vote 618: Pakwach District, Output 078180: Classroom Construction and Rehabilitation, 312101 Non Residential

				<p>Buildings AND was also indicated as #154 on Page 10 of the Procurement Work Plan for FY 2017/18 Dated 06/July/2017 and that was Submitted to PPDA on 13/July/2017).</p> <p>- Deep Borehole Drilling and Construction (PKCH/618/Wrks/17-18/00055) (Local Government Budget Estimates for Financial Year 2017/2018, Vote 618: Pakwach District, Output 098183: Borehole Drilling and Rehabilitation, 312104 Other Structures AND was also indicated as #155 on Page 10 of the Procurement Work Plan for FY 2017/18 Dated 06/July/2017 and that was Submitted to PPDA on 13/July/2017).</p> <p>(b) Zero score awarded because LG was non-existent in the previous FY and therefore there was NO Evidence whatsoever to justify any score above zero.</p>
14	<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>For current FY (2017/2018), there was NO Evidence that the LG prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30. ACTUAL Bid Preparation Dates were NOT available.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>Zero score awarded because LG was non-existent in the previous FY and therefore there was NO Evidence whatsoever to justify any score above zero.</p>
		<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>	0	<p>Zero score awarded because LG was non-existent in the previous FY and therefore there was NO Evidence whatsoever to justify any score above zero.</p>

15	<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</li> </ul>	0	Zero score awarded because LG was non-existent in the previous FY and therefore there was NO Evidence whatsoever to justify any score above zero.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2</li> </ul>	0	There was NO Evidence that all works projects for the current FY (2017/2018 FY) were clearly labeled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration as confirmed during a field visit conducted by the Assessor on 10/February/2018.
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	Pakwach district has 6 bank accounts including the TSA. The district is operating on a hybrid system where the TSA account is still fully operated from BOU. As of the day of assessment on 09/02/18, the General Fund a/c and Operations a/c were reconciled up to date. Two of the accounts; Youth Livelihood and NUSAF Sub Projects have just been opened and no transaction has yet taken place on them. NUSAF Operations a/c had just got its first funds in January 2018.
17	<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2.</li> </ul>	0	Pakwach DLG began in July 2017 i.e. FY 2017/18. This performance measure therefore does not apply.

18	The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor and produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 3.</li> </ul>	0	The Internal Audit department is headed by Jakweyo Emmy in caretaker capacity, per his posting instruction by Nebbi CAO dated 30/06/17. Jakweyo is an Examiner of Accounts (Ref. CR/161/3).
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries: score 2.</li> </ul>	0	Pakwach DLG began in July 2017 i.e. FY 2017/18. This performance measure therefore does not apply.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1</li> </ul>	0	Pakwach DLG began in July 2017 i.e. FY 2017/18. This performance measure therefore does not apply.
19	The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.	<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>	0	The district has a book assets register formatted as recommended in the Accounting Manual, containing information on vehicles, computers and furniture. However, the book does not have any information on district lands and buildings.
20	The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion  Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY: <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>	0	Pakwach DLG began in July 2017 i.e. FY 2017/18. This performance measure therefore does not apply.
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				

21	<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2</p>	0	<p>Not Applicable because the district began operations in FY2017/18</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>There was no evidence that Pakwach district LG designated a person to coordinate and respond to grievances/complains provided by citizens</p>
23	<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published: • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</p>	0	<p>No evidence of LG payroll and pensioner schedules published on public notice boards and other places.</p>
	<p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>There was evidence of the procurement information such as Bid notice under selective bidding dated 7/2/2018, Release of funds for YLP projects worth 56,664,000 dated 11/12/2017 and Release of funds for YLP projects worth 94,531,000 dated 19th/12/2017 published</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications, are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1.</li> </ul>	0	<p>Not Applicable because the district began operations in FY2017/18.</p>

24	The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	0	Not Applicable because the district began operations in FY2017/18
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that LG during previous FY has conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc..) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1.</li> </ul>	0	Not Applicable because the district began operations in FY2017/18

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

25	The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG gender focal person has provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities score 2.</li> </ul>	0	Zero score awarded because LG was non-existent in the previous FY and therefore there was NO Evidence whatsoever to justify any score above zero.
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that gender focal point has planned activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and that more than 90% of previous year's budget for gender activities has been implemented: score 2.</li> </ul>	0	<p>- There WAS Evidence that gender focal point had planned activities for current FY (2017/2018 FY) to strengthen women's roles. The Assessor saw Gender and Women Activities Annual Work Plan and Budget for 2017/2018 FY that indicated: Quarterly Supervision of Women Activities budgeted at 1,088,000 UGX; Refresher Training on Use of Gender Tools in Programme Planning and Audit budgeted at 700,000 UGX; Visits to LLGs and Schools to Conduct Needs Assessments for Women and Girls and Disseminate Government Programmes budgeted at 800,000 UGX; Celebration of Women Day budgeted at 1,500,000 UGX.</p> <p>- Zero score awarded because LG was non-existent in the previous FY and therefore there was NO Evidence whatsoever to justify any score above zero.</p>

26	<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</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>	0	<p>There was NO Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, was carried out for activities, projects and plans. Also, there was NO Evidence that mitigation measures were planned and budgeted for.</p>
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>There was NO Evidence that the LG integrated environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>There was NO Evidence that all projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of ownership by way of a land title or agreement with land owners.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>There was NO Evidence that all completed projects had Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer. None of the projects sampled had a copy of an Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer on their Procurement Files that were appropriately and adequately referenced.</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Educational Performance Measures

Pakwach District

(Vote Code: 618)

Score 36/100 (36%)

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>Vote 545 Pakwach district OBT FY17/18 has a wage bill of UGX 3,045,225,810 for 585 Teachers and Head teachers at the 63 government-aided schools.</p> <p>The DEO has a school staff list deployment schedule for 585 Teachers and Head teachers as per "Teachers' Information File 2017 Pakwach District Local Government Education and Sports, FY17/18" on file in the DEO' Office.</p>
2	<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision o If 100% score 6 o If 80 - 99% score 3 o If below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	6	<p>The UGX 3,045,225,810 OBT budget provision for the entire 585 Teachers and their Head teachers in FY17/18 (i.e. 100%) has catered for the minimum staffing level in the structure of a Head teacher and minimum 7 Teachers.</p>

3	<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6</li> </ul>	0	<p>The district approved structure has 3 positions and only 1 has been duly filled as per individual file at Central Registry.</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>	2	<p>There was a department recruitment plan 2017/2018/2019 that covers both the Primary Teachers and School Inspectors on file and sent to HRM department from the Education dated 24th September 2017.</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>	2	<p>There was a department recruitment plan 2017/2018/2019 that covers both the Primary Teachers and School Inspectors on file and sent to HRM department from the Education dated 24th September 2017.</p>

5	<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY • 100% school inspectors: score 3</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Applicable.</li> <li>• The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</li> </ul>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised head teachers during the previous FY. • 90% - 100%: score 3 • 70% - 89%: score 2 • Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Applicable.</li> <li>• The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection				
6	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Applicable.</li> <li>• The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level, including on school feeding: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Applicable.</li> <li>• The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</li> </ul>
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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Applicable.</li> <li>• The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not Applicable.</li> <li>The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not Applicable.</li> <li>The district was established in the FY 2017/18.16/17</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not Applicable.</li> <li>The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</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> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5</li> </ul>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EMIS (2017) list of schools data stood at 74 government-aided and private primary schools</li> <li>OBT list of schools data stood at 63 government aided primary schools in FY2017/18</li> </ul>
		<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>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EMIS enrolment data stood at 47,880 pupils FY2017/18</li> <li>OBT enrolment data stood at 47,655 pupils in FY2017/18 due to the additional private schools who do not receive capitation grants but report on enrolment for EMIS.</li> </ul>

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc...during the previous FY: score 2</li> <li>Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not Applicable.</li> <li>The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</li> <li>Not Applicable.</li> <li>The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</li> </ul>
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>There was evidence that all the 65 schools (63 government aided, 2 private) have established SMCs as per regulation as evidenced by “List of SMCs of approved 2017 calendar year and confirmed at facility levels as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Dei PS-2 females out of 12 members</li> <li>-Panyimur PS-3 females out of 12 members</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not Applicable.</li> <li>The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</li> </ul>

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>There was evidence that the Education department prepared and submitted all investment items in the approved request dated 10 September 2017 contrary to April 30th</p>
14	<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Applicable.</li> <li>• The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				
15	<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Applicable.</li> <li>• The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</li> </ul>

16	<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 4 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points o If all queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	0	<p>PDLG was not operational in FY16/17. The performance measure does not apply</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>There was evidence from the Education Department on dissemination of guidelines for use by senior women/men teachers as per FAWE, UNICEF, and Trailblazers support to the Senior Women Teachers.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>There was no evidence from the Education Department on dissemination of sanitation guidelines with the Inspector of Schools files for use on sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools</p>

		<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>There was evidence that all the 65 schools (63 government aided, 2 private) have established SMCs as per regulation as evidenced by “List of SMCs of approved 2017 calendar year and confirmed at facility levels as follows:</p> <p>-Dei PS-2 females out of 12 members</p> <p>-Panyimur PS-3 females out of 12 members</p>
18	<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 from the Education Department on collaboration with the Environment department on issuance of guidelines on environmental management</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Health Performance Measures

Pakwach District

(Vote Code: 618)

Score 29/100 (29%)

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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than 80% filled: score 6 points,</li> <li>• 60 – 80% - score 3</li> <li>• Less than 60% filled: score 0</li> </ul>	3	<p>Approved structure FY2017/18 had a total of 254 health staffs while the current staffs on payroll are 160 giving 62.9%.</p> <p>There was no PHC wage bill for recruitment in the FY 2017/18.</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>There was no recruitment plan for the FY 2017/18. However, a copy of recruitment plan and a request for funds to recruit workers including health for the FY 2018/19 from CAO to Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Public Service and Ministry of Local Government was seen at the HRs office.</p>
3	<p>The LG Health department has ensured that performance appraisal for health facility in charge is conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the health facility in-charge have been appraised during the previous FY: o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Applicable.</li> <li>• The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</li> </ul>

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>A copy of the updated staff lists (November 2017) deployment matched with that of the budget framework FY 17/18 (OBT) as seen at the DHOs office.</p>
---	--	--	---	--

Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision

5	<p>The DHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable.</li> <li>• The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<p>Not applicable.</p> <p>The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</p>
6	<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3</p>	0	<p>Not applicable.</p> <p>The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</p>
		<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% supervised: score 3 points</li> <li>• 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2</li> <li>• 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 1</li> <li>• Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</li> </ul>	0	<p>Not applicable.</p> <p>The district was established in the FY 2017/18</p>

7	<p>The Health Sub-district(s) have effectively provided support supervision to lower level health units</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities have been supervised by HSD and reports produced: • If 100% supervised score 6 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 4 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 2 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	0	<p>Not applicable.</p> <p>The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</p>
8	<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p>	<p>• Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</p>	0	<p>Not applicable.</p> <p>The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</p>
	<p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</p>	0	<p>Not applicable.</p> <p>The district was established in the FY 2017/18.</p>
9	<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for health facility lists as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: o List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10</p>	10	<p>• A copy of the list of Health facilities at the DHOs office that were consistently submitting HMIS to the DHO/MOH were the same as those on the list of health facilities in the OBT.</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</p>	<p>• 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>	0	<p>Not Applicable because the district began operations in FY2017/18</p>

	<p>require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</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>	0	<p>Not Applicable</p> <p>The council since the establishment of Pakwach district LG has only sat once, and currently has only 2 committees; business committee and general purpose committees. The sectoral committees are yet to be formed including that one of social services sector.</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>Pakwach District has no hospital.</p> <p>Copies of HUMC meeting minutes were availed at the selected health facilities (100%) These facilities included; Panyamur HC III, Pakwach HC IV, Panyingoro HC III, Boro HC II and Dei HC II.</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>Copy of PHC fund distribution list of health facilities was properly displayed on noticeboard of DHO.</p>

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management



16	<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>Not Applicable because the district began operations in FY2017/18</p>
17	<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year • If sector has no audit query score 4 • If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points • If all queries are not responded to score 0</p>	0	<p>Not Applicable; Pakwach DLG began in July 2017 i.e. FY 2017/18. This performance measure therefore does not apply.</p>

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

18	<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Copies of attendance lists of HUMC members during their meetings in selected health facilities composed of both females and males</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Copies of sanitation management guidelines were seen at any of these selected health units</li> <li>• VIP latrines though showed separate sides for men and women</li> </ul>

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No Copies of guidelines on medical waste management were seen in all the selected health facilities</li></ul>
----	---	---	---	---



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Pakwach District

(Vote Code: 618)

Score 25/100 (25%)

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>	10	<p>Annual work plan approved by the permanent secretary on 2/08/2017 planned to implement drilling of 11 deep boreholes (hand pumps) and design the piped water system at Boro Parish Panyimur sub county. The deep borehole (hand pump) procurement process is in progress with an evidence of proposed location targeting all the 5 sub counties of Pakwach, Alwi, Panyimur, Panyango and Wadelai</p>
2	<p>The LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	0	<p>This is not applicable, the district started its operation with effect from the beginning of financial year 2017/2018</p>
Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision				

3	<p>The LG Water department carries out monthly monitoring and supervision of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually. • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15 • 80 - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10 • 70 - 79%: score 7 • 60 - 69% monitored: score 5 • 50 - 59%: score 3 • Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored -score 0</p>	0	<p>There was no evidence of monitoring and supervision report on file including the first and second quarter reports since the district started its operation at the beginning of the financial year</p>
4	<p>The LG Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: o List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10</p>	10	<p>There is evidence of consistent data submitted for the planned activities in the annual work plans of the financial year 2017/2018 stamped on 02/8/2017 by the permanent secretary</p>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				
5	<p>The LG Water department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	0	<p>Not applicable, the local government started its operation in financial year 2017/2018, The procurement requests were submitted on 16/6/2016 after the approval of the district, covering all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p>

6	The DWO has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts  Maximum 8 points for this performance measure	<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	There was no evidence of appointing contract manager and prepared contract management plans
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2</li> </ul>	0	There was no evidence of water source surface designs for the deep borehole projects
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2</li> </ul>	0	Construction of WSS have not been completed
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2</li> </ul>	0	Water and sanitation projects have not been completed
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>	0	No certifiable works have been implemented in the water sector
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				
8	The LG Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit  Maximum 5 for this performance measure	<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	Not applicable, Pakwach district LG was not operational in FY2016/17

9	<p>LG Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 5 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 If queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	0	<p>Pakwach DLG began in July 2017 i.e. FY 2017/18. This performance measure therefore does not apply.</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>	0	<p>Not Applicable because the district began operations in FY2017/18</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>	0	<p>Not applicable, Pakwach district was not operational in FY2016/17. The council since the establishment of Pakwach only has 2 committees of business committee and general purpose committees. The sectoral committees are yet to be constituted</p>
11	<p>The LG Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>There was evidence of approved water development grants releases and expenditures for the 1 st quarter 2017/2018 dated 29/8/2017, second quarter release dated 28/10/2017 and 3rd quarter release dated 11/1/2018, however, no evidence of displayed detailed annual work plans on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>Not Applicable, the district began operations in FY2017/18 and no project have been completed</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2</li> </ul>	2	There was evidence of displayed Information on tenders and contract awards under selective bidding with procurement references number (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) on the District notice boards dated on 7/2/2018 signed by Ogwang Godfrey Okello.
12	Participation of communities in WSS programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1</li> </ul>	0	There was evidence of 3 memorandum of understanding submitted by the sub county chiefs indicating the villages of Padengo dated 11/12/2017, Tienmandir dated 12/12/2017 and Amonjo dated 11/12/2017. However, there was no evidence of community participation and applying for water and sanitation evidenced by the meeting minutes and attendance list
	Maximum 3 points for this performance measure	<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	There was no evidence of list of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O&M funds and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs since the start of the district.
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				
13	The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2</li> </ul>	0	The process of procurement processes is in final stages, the sites have been identified. However, there was no evidence of environment and social screening for the planned projects during the assessment period.
	Maximum 4 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1</li> </ul>	0	The was no evidence of environment plans and follow up support
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1</li> </ul>	0	There was no evidence that awarded construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection

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	<p>5 sampled water and sanitation committees of Amonjo 7(4females, 3 males), Tienmandir 7( 3 females, 4 males), Padengo 7 (3 female, 4 males), Mulima Village 7 (4 female, 3 male) and Nyakira South 7 (2 female, 5 male). The evidence shows at least 50% WSCs are women as per the sector critical requirements.</p>
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>	0	<p>Not Applicable, the district began operations in FY2017/18 and no construction facility have been completed</p>