



LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Rubanda District

(Vote Code: 616)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	2	40%
No	3	60%

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	Annual Performance contract was submitted on 13/07/2017 which is later than the due date of June 30.	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	• Yes, the Budget presented had a copy of the Consolidated Procurement Plan attached.	Yes
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	• Annual Performance report was submitted on 21/08/2017; SN 4564 which is later than the timeline set period.	No
LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)	xxxxxxx	• LG submitted Quarterly budget performance report under the following receipts: Q1- Serial No.0096;23/11/2017, Q2- Serial No. 0397; 23/02/2017, Q3- Serrial No. 0791; 13 June 2017, Q4- Serial No.4564;21/08/2017.	No
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>Rubanda District Local Government became operational in FY 2016/2017. As such, there were no audit queries arising in FY2015/2016 as the district was not yet formed.</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>From the Auditor General's report for FY 2016/2017, the assessment established that Rubanda District Local Government received an unqualified audit opinion.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Rubanda District

(Vote Code: 616)

Score 50/100 (50%)

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. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2. 	<p>0</p> <hr/> <p>0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No functional Physical Planning Committee in place. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the absence of a Physical/Structural plan, Physical planning committee, approved plans it was difficult to ascertain any consistency of planning with new infrastructure investments.
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. 	<p>2</p>	<p>From the Budget Conference results for the FY 2017/18 held on 12th October 2017 there is proof that priorities in the AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of the budget conference specifically for projects which were broken down into Sub-Countries e.g. Bufundi Sub-county- Construction of a Staff house at Kashasha Health Centre II under the Department of Works & Technical Services; Construction of a 5 Stance VIP latrine at Kashongati P/S in Kishanje parish under Education, Sports & Technology, In Bubare Subcounty for example; Opening of Ruboona- Kyabahinga road; in Ruhija Subcounty- Renovation of Ruhija HC Maternity Ward; in Ikumba Subcounty- Construction of a slaughter slab at Murole Trading Centre, Nyamweru Subcounty- Protection of Water Sources at Kahama, Muko Subcounty- Upgrading Nshanjare Trading Centre to a Town Board, Hamurwa Subcounty- Supply of Tea seedlings.</p>

		<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>From the following sampled investments from the AWP e.g. Construction of a 5 Stance VIP latrine at Kashongati P/S in Kishanje Parish, Kisiizi P/S in Kagunga Parish; Kacerere P/S in Kacerere parish, Construction of staff houses at all primary schools in Bubaare Subcounty, Water Tank in Kitooma, Kiyebe, Bugarama, Mushasha & Bukundine TC; Opening of Nkukuru Kigande-Nyabiha Bitanwa Road, Green House Technology in Ruhija Sub-County; Construction of OPD at Nyaruhanga H/C II in Nyaruhanga parish, Ikumba Sub-County, Construction of Ikore Bridge in Kacenaga parish, Nyamweru Subcounty; Grading Rushayu- Karengyere- Kashasha road 16KMs are all reflected in the approved development plan 2016/17-2022/23.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project profiles have been developed and are listed in the 5-year development plan 2016/17-2022/23 dated June 2015 signed off by the Chairperson to Council. Based on the Budget conference outcomes for FY 2017/18 dated 12th October 2017 together with TPC minutes there is consistence that these profiles have been discussed for all investments.
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>Not in place. DLG being a new district with a thin technical staff most of the activities are just being initiated.</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"> 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>From these sampled projects i.e. Construction of VIP latrines at Kacerere Primary Schools; Construction of VIP latrines at Nyaruhanga Primary School; Construction of VIP Latrines at Kyabahinga Primary School; Construction of VIP Latrines at Iremera Primary School ;Construction of VIP latrines at Kiyebe Primary school; Upgrading Nyamabare- Karondo Community access road to the district status via Kantora; Murubya-Ndego gate road; Construction of classroom block at Kakarisa P/s were derived from the annual work plan & Annual budget performance report given the linkage.</p>
		<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. o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	4	<p>From the Annual Performance report the following infrastructure projects: Construction of Kashasha Market Stalls in Kashasha parish; Construction of a 5 Stance VIP Pit Latrine at Kagunga, Mugyera, & Kagunga HCII, Construction of a 5 Stance VIP Pit latrine at Buhutu TC, Construction of Staff a house at Mugyera HCII, Construction of a staff house at Kashasha HCII in Bufundi Subcounty alone, budgeted at 41,553 but spent 51,766 in 000s were all executed. This gives 80.2%. This is similiary also reflected in the other sub-counties of: Bubaare, Ruhija, Ikumba, Nyamweru, Muko, Hamurwa & Hamurwa TC.</p>
5	<p>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</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<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>The following sampled projects were were completed in the previous FY with supplementary budgets not exceeding 15%: Construction of VIP latrines at Kacerere Primary Schools; Construction of VIP latrines at Nyaruhanga Primary School; Construction of VIP Latrines at Kyabahinga Primary School; Construction of VIP Latrines at Iremera Primary School; Construction of VIP latrines at Kiyebe Primary school</p>

		<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 	0	<p>From the Annual Performance report the following infrastructure projects: Rehabilitation of Kyenyi-Murole-Kanyungu-Ndeego road; Rehabilitation of Habushoro-Kinyungu-Mukikagata road & be upgraded to to District road status, Rehabilitation of Nyamiyanga-Bwegyerere-Kashara road, Maintenance of Ntaraga-Kyanamira-Mukashেকে road, Upgrading Nyamabare-Karondo Community access road to District status via Kantora, Upgrading Nfasha-Karambo road in Ikamiro parish, Upgrading Nshanjare Trading Centre to a town board. The LG budgeted 135,158 but spent 81,094.8 which is below the target of 80%. This can be attributed to a limited technical staff and equipment in the LG which is in its infancy stage.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

Assessment area: Human Resource Management

6	<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	0	<p>From the personnel files reviewed by this assessment it was established that all Heads of Departments were not appraised during the financial year 2016/2017.</p>
	<p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3 	0	<p>From the personnel files and staff structure it was established that all Heads of Departments are not substantively appointed.</p> <p>They were assigned duties by Chief Administrative Officer</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	<p>From Secretary DSC it was established that 100% of all staff submitted for recruitment were considered as evidenced by</p> <p>The CAO Declaration of vacancies to DSC in a letter dated 11/5/2017</p> <p>All the submissions from CAO were considered by DSC in the meeting of 24th and 4th August 2017 in Financial year 2017/2018</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	1	<p>From the Secretary DSC this assessment established that there were no submission from CAO for staff to be considered for confirmation during the financial year 2016/2017</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	1	<p>From the Secretary DSC this assessment established that there were no disciplinary cases submitted by CAO for consideration during the financial year 2016/2017</p>
8	<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	0	<p>There was no evidence that staff recruited during the financial year 2016/2017 accessed Salary payroll as the payroll was not availed for verification.</p>
		<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>From the Human Resource office this assessment could not establish staff retired during the Financial year 2016/2017 because the retired staff list was not availed for verification</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. 	4	<p>From the final accounts of FY 2016/2017 the assessment established that Rubanda District Local Government collected local revenue amounting to UGX 108,984,391. Considering that Rubanda District Local Government became operational in FY 2016/2017, no local revenue was collected in FY 2015/2016 as an entity. Therefore, the increase between FY 2016/2017 and 2015/2016 is assessed as UGX 108,984,391 (i.e. 100%).</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>From the final accounts for FY 2016/2017 this assessment established that Rubanda District Local Government collected local revenue amounting to UGX 108, 984,391 against a budget of UGX 457,328,000 implying that actual collection is below budget by 76%.</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 	2	<p>From the final accounts for FY 2016/2017 and books of account, this assessment established that Rubanda District Local Government received local service tax amounting to UGX 81,468,529 of which UGX 53,200,581 (65.3%) was shared with sub-counties based on the data of contributing persons resident in the recipient Sub-counties.</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	<p>From the final accounts for FY 2016/2017 it was established by this assessment that Rubanda District Local Government collected local revenue amounting to UGX 108,984,231 of which UGX 23,541,231 (21.6%) was spent on Councillors' emoluments.</p> <p>The amount of OSR expenditure on councillors' emoluments is computed as below;</p> <p>Description</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 80%;"></th> <th style="text-align: right;">Amount (UGX)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total expenditure on Councillors emoluments as per final accounts</td> <td style="text-align: right;">34,500,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less amount contributed by Central Government</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(10,958,769)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount spent from OSR</td> <td style="text-align: right;">23,541,231</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Amount (UGX)	Total expenditure on Councillors emoluments as per final accounts	34,500,000	Less amount contributed by Central Government	(10,958,769)	Amount spent from OSR	23,541,231
	Amount (UGX)											
Total expenditure on Councillors emoluments as per final accounts	34,500,000											
Less amount contributed by Central Government	(10,958,769)											
Amount spent from OSR	23,541,231											

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	<p>Rubanda DLG did not have a substantive senior procurement officer and procurement officer substantively recruited at time of assessment. This District was recently created and the process of recruiting officers is ongoing.</p>
----	---	---	---	---

<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	<p>The Technical Evaluation Committee prepared and submitted an evaluation report to the Contracts Committee for works based on technical compliance selection dated 1/2/2017. The report was signed and dated by members of the evaluation committee.</p> <p>The TEC committee evaluated and submitted a report No: RUBA 616/WRKS/2016-17/00018 to the Contracts Committee: for partial construction of Rubanda District Headquarters Office Block at contract price of UGX, 419,719,923.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	1	<p>LG presented detailed Contracts Committed meeting held on 18th November 2016 in the DLG Procurement office with Agenda a contract members who attended.</p> <p>Rubanda District Contracts Committee Meeting held on 13th and 14th December 2016 under Minutes CC/37/2016-2017 signed by members included reading and confirmation of TEC minutes of 18th November 2016.</p> <p>Contracts Committee approved ITB submitted by TEC on 13th December 2016. ITB was for Proc ref RUBA 616/WRKS/2016-17/00018: Partial Construction of Rubanda District Headquarters Office Block.</p>

13	<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	2	<p>DLG presented the the Procurement and Disposal Plan for FY 2017/18 which includes all investments and infrastructure projects which are also reflected in the budget for FY 2017/18:</p> <p>Sample infrastructure projects Projects in FY 2017/18 include: RUBA616/WRKS/2016-17/00018: Completion of Rubanda District Administration Block at UGX: 77,049,317;</p> <p>Rubanda DLG made procurement in FY 2016/17 as per Annual Work Plan FY 2016/17:</p> <p>Partial Construction of Rubanda DLG Headquarters Office Block Contract Number RUBA616/WRKS/2016-17/00018 by Real Engineering Contractors Co Ltd at UGX: 419,719,923.</p> <p>Construction of 5 Stance VIP latrine at Kacerere Primary School, Bufundi Sub County at UGX: 21,901,980</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"> • For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30: score 2 	0	<p>Rubanda DLG did not present information to suggest that bid documents for all investment/infrastructure reports in FY 2017/18 were prepared by August 30th.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2 	0	<p>LG did not present an updated contracts register for FY 2016/17. The Principal Assistant Secretary and CAO indicated that the Contracts register was kept by the Procurement officer who was not present during this assessment</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	0	<p>LG did not present evidence that to suggest that DLG adhered to procurement thresholds in FY 2016/17..</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"> 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	<p>Rubanda DLG prepared interim certificates in FY 2016/17:</p> <p>FY 2016/17: Only 2 partial interim certificate were presented by DLG Certificate No: 01 dated 7/12/2016: Construction of a 5-Stance VIP Lined Latrine at Kacerere Primary School, Bufundi Sub-county. Amount: UGX: 21,901,980.</p> <p>Certificate No. 01: Construction of 5 stance Pit Latrine at Irerwera Primary School by Mporex Co. Ltd dated 13/4/2017. Contract Value: 16,749,634.</p>
		<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	<p>Rubanda DLG did not have project (s) with site board indicating name of project, funder, name of contractor, source of funding and contract value at the time of this assessment.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management				
16	<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4 	4	<p>During FY 2016/2017 Rubanda District Local Government operated 11 bank accounts which were reconciled on a monthly basis and up to date by the time of this assessment.</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. 	0	<p>From the CFO, this assessment established that Rubanda District Local Government did not maintain a claims and payment register during FY 2016/2017. As such, the timeliness of payments to suppliers could not be readily ascertained.</p>

18	<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor and produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 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. 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>3</p> <p>0</p> <p>1</p>	<p>From the CAO and personnel office, this assessment confirmed that Rubanda District Local Government has substantive Principal Internal Auditor appointed on 20/11/2017. From the internal audit department, it was established that all the four quarterly Internal Audit reports for FY 2016/2017 were produced.</p> <p>From the Clerk to Council, Chief Administrative Officer and the Internal Audit Department, it was established that by the time of this assessment, Rubanda District Local Government had not yet provided information to Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit recommendations raised during FY 2016/2017.</p> <p>From the Clerk to Council, it was confirmed that the internal audit reports for FY 2016/2017 were submitted to LG PAC and deliberated on accordingly as evidenced by LG PAC minutes reviewed by this assessment.</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>0</p>	<p>Rubanda District Local Government maintained an updated assets register though in a format different from that prescribed by the Local Government Finance Manual. Some of the exceptions noted include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The format used by Rubanda District lacks key details like cost of asset and date of acquisition All assets are recorded in one table and not in their respective classes such as land and buildings; motor vehicle and heavy plants; General assets as recommended by the Local Government Finance Manual.

20	<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY: • unqualified audit opinion: score 4 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</p>	4	<p>From the Auditor General's report for FY 2016/2017, the assessment established that Rubanda District Local Government received an unqualified audit opinion.</p>
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				
21	<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2</p>	2	<p>Council Minutes availed and dated as follows: 16/09/2016; 28/10/2016; 20/12/2016; 30/03/2017; 30/05/2017 by Clerk to Council confirm discussions of service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results & LG PAC. It was however revealed that details of the standing Committee reports & results are never accessed by Council.</p>
22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2.</p>	2	<p>Planner is the designated person to coordinate response to feed-back & this is part of the job description.</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>Not displayed.</p>
	<p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1</p>	0	<p>• Not published. DLG hasn't filled the positions in the Procurement Unit yet.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG PA exercise wasnt carried out at National level.
24	The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An unreferenced flimsy correspondence file with Budget call papers, MoLG Circulars & Guidelines availed indicates that communications are made to LLGs. This also includes invitations for meetings for LLGs.
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .Voucher number 21/02 dated 21.12.16 being payment for radio talk shows in the amount of two million eight hundred twenty thousand was availed as proof that that the activity took place.

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"> Evidence that the LG gender focal person has provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities score 2. 	0	The District Community Development Officer (currently in Charge of Gender issues) did not provide official documents/minutes to suggest that Gender was mainstreamed in other departments during this assessment.
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.			

		<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. 	2	<p>The DLG Budget for FY 2017/18 includes gender mainstreaming activities which are costed.</p> <p>The DLG submitted YLP and UWEP Work Plans FY 2017/18</p> <p>Planned activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Conducting sensitization meetings on gender mainstreaming and women empowerment; ii) Implementation of UWEP and YLP activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DLG received and spent UGX. 105,390,131 for implementing YLP in April 2017 and some activities are on-going. 100% of the YLP budget has been spent.
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 	2	<p>The District Environmental Officer prepared screening/inspection reports for infrastructure projects e.g. schools.</p> <p>i) IEIA review reports for Sunrise Nursery and Primary School dated 12/2017 and Batuma Memorial Airstrip dated 05/11/2017</p> <p>Screening reports include: Vision Preparatory School in Bubare Sub-county; Memorial; EIA Screening of Batuma Memorial Airstrip; God's Mercy Primary School and Muko Junior School in Muko Sub-county.</p> <p>ii) District Development Plan for FY 2017/18, Budget for FY 2017/18 and Quarterly work plan for FY 2017/18 indicate environmental management activities and are budgeted for.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	0	<p>The approved Budget for FY 2017/18 indicate that the DLG has integrated social management and environmental mitigation in DLG planning but not in bid documents;</p> <p>Planned activities for FY 2017/18 include: Riverbank and wetland restoration;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder environmental training and sensitisation • Monitoring and evaluation to environmental compliance (EIA).
		<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	<p>LG could not provide evidence that all projects are implemented are on land owned by LG.</p>
		<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	<p>The District Environmental Officer did not present signed Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification forms for completed projects.</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Educational Performance Measures

Rubanda District

(Vote Code: 616)

Score 37/100 (37%)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance contract and Approved Budget estimates (Vote 616) reviewed and shows that only 1278 teachers have been provided for in the wage bill with a vacancy of 10 teachers to be recruited in 2017/18 although department requires a total of 1379 teachers according to the manpower needs of the department
		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of Teachers list reviewed and found 8 schools(Rwakagurusi, Igomanda, Ruhonwa11, Buzaniro, Kaburara, Kiriba, Ruhiga and Kiyebe primary Schools) without the requisite number of teachers and a head teacher as per threshold in the current FY 2017/18 Sampled schools Kabirizi P/S, Nyakatugunda P/S, Rubanda Mixed P/S found deployment of One head teacher and 7 teachers as required. Recruitment request/dated 18/05/2017 from DEO to CAO shows recruitment of 164 teachers and 45 Head teachers required

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 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance contract for FY 2017/18 page 17 shows approved structure and wage bill is for 1278 teachers There is a gap of 10 teachers as per wage bill provision for 1278 teacher to be filled in FY 2017/18 and not yet filled.
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 	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance contract shows two positions of inspectors and both in place with one just recruited and yet to report to duty Approved structure vide ARC/306/01 Dated 31st May 2017 for Rubanda provides for two inspectors(Senior inspector of schools and Inspector of schools)- 8 total for whole education department and one position already filled and the second inspector also interviewed and awaiting Advert for position seen Reference external advert 02/2017 under RBD/DSC/015/2017

4	<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of Primary Teachers: score 2</p>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment plan 2017/18 submitted by the department and also found in Performance contract 2017/18 shows 10 Teachers and one inspector required to be recruited this financial year 2017/18
		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment plan 2017/18 submitted by the department and also found in Performance contract 2017/18 shows 10 Teachers and one inspector required to be recruited this financial year 2017/18 Advert for recruitment of inspector seen under external advert 02/2017 under RBD/DSC/015/2017 and one inspector already in place and the other awaiting appointment
5	<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY • 100% school inspectors: score 3</p>	0	<p>From the Human Resource office this assessment could not establish whether the inspector of school was appraised during the Financial year 2016/2017 because the personnel file were not availed for verification</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised head teachers during the previous FY. • 90% - 100%: score 3 • 70% - 89%: score 2 • Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<p>From the Human Resource office this assessment could not establish whether the Head teachers of primary schools were appraised during the Financial year 2016/2017 because the personnel files were not availed for verification</p>
Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection				

6

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

Maximum 3 for this performance measure

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

0

• Circulars written by DEO to schools in the FY 2016/17 includes Circulars seen on Environment, Installation of Lightning resistors dated 3th October 2017

• Communication seen on official opening of terms calendar under circular 01/2017 dated 12/01/17

• Circular seen on Provisional list of students to benefit from District Quota Admission scheme ADM/137/174/01

• No circulars seen on School support inspection and school feeding and so not ALL circulars shared as required.

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

2

• Minutes of meeting between DEO and Head teachers seen dated 11/11/2016 although no evidence seen on discussion on national policy issues

• Minutes dated 5/08/2016 shows discussion on guidelines under Min 13/Aug /2016

• Minutes dated 13th July 2016 reviewed and shows discussion on issues of policy among others

• No evidence of issues of school feeding discussed

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. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inspection reports of schools reviewed and the following summary of schools were inspected in FY 2016/17 QTR 1: 91 government and 80 private schools QTR 2: 100 Private schools and no government schools inspected QTR 3: 158 private schools and no government schools inspected QTR 4: 73 government schools inspected <p>Average inspection per quarter 106 Schools inspected out of 263 schools in the District giving 43% coverage</p> <p>Total government schools 110 and private schools 153</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sampled schools shows that inspection was done only once
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 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes dated 14/10/2016 under Min 3/2016 and Min 4/2016 shows discussions on inspection and follow up of issues that include teacher absenteeism Minutes 14 February 2017 under Min 4/2017 shows discussion of inspection issues and follow up (teacher absenteeism, schemes of work etc) Minutes of 8th December 2017 under MIN 4/2017 also discusses inspections

		<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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of Districts that submitted Inspection reports from DES reviewed and shows that Rubanda District did not submit reports No written proof of submission of inspection reports to DES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4 	0	Three Sampled schools(Kabirizi P/S, Nyakatugunda P/S, Rubanda Mized P/S) no minutes available or documents to show follow up of inspection report recommendations
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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of schools reviewed and found 110 government primary schools,, 154 private schools though others closed after supervision EMIS lists obtained from MoES shows a total of 139 schools in the district
		<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of schools and enrollment UPE shows 54,856 pupils(25,843 female and 29014 males) Performance contract under OBT shows enrollment at 56,000 pupils EMIS data obtained from MoES indicates total UPE enrollment as 70,565 pupils
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"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Services Standing Committee Minutes where the Education sector is duly represented dated 20/10/2016; 13/12/2016; 14/03/2017; 09/05/2017 when reviewed there is proof that the committee responsible for education meets to deliberate on service issues, performance assessment results etc.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Services Standing Committee where the Education committee is represented, the minutes presented and dated 20/10/2016; 13/12/2016; 14/03/2017; 09/05/2017 clearly indicate that the education sector committee presented issues that required approval of Council which included recommendations, education sector implementation plans, inspection reports etc
11	<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO) • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80% schools: score 0</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No minutes of SMCs at DEO level • Only 81 schools have SMCs according to the list of schools with requests for SMC approved showing 74% of schools with SMCs

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No publication of schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants as per guidelines at the time of assessment. DEO claims no notice board as reason
----	--	---	---	---

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 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procurement requisitions by the department to procurement seen dated 27/7/2016 with requests as per work plan Rubanda DLG consolidated Procurement plan for FY 2016/17 prepared and education department procurements evident under serial numbers 1-9
----	---	--	---	---

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 	3	<p>From the list of 10 payment requests raised in the Education Department in FY 2016/2017, seven of them were recommended within one week while the three took slightly more than two weeks. On average, the Head of Department recommended suppliers' requests within 8.2 days from the date of receipt of the request.</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>Performance report from Education department availed and dated 15/08/2017 which is later than the set timeline.</p>
16	<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	0	<p>From the quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2016/2017, it was established that the Education Department had five audit queries which were not yet responded to by the time of this assessment.</p>

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

17	<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correspondence dated 11th October 2016 by DEO to head teachers seen circular 15/2017 and reviewed and indicates guidelines on how the senior man and woman should handle issues of hygiene and sanitation,
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correspondence dated 11th October 2016 by DEO to head teachers circular 15/2017 seen and reviewed and indicates gender mainstreaming and how to deal with those with special needs

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of Schools SMC on file reviewed show that some schools do meet the threshold of 2 females on the SMC as per schedule 2 of the Education Act 2008 but some didnt have • Sampled three schools(Rubanda Mixed, Nyakatugunda, Kabirizi) for visit shows that SMCs not fully constituted in schools such as Nyakatugunda Primary school.
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: 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correspondence dated 11th October 2016 by DEO to head teachers circular 15/2017 seen and reviewed and indicates need to plant trees , establishment of environment clubs, and development of minutes for the environment clubs in accordance with National policy guidelines on environment all in collaboration with environment department



LGPA 2017/18

Health Performance Measures

Rubanda District

(Vote Code: 616)

Score 34/100 (34%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human resource planning and management				
1	<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY • More than 80% filled: score 6 points, • 60 – 80% - score 3 • Less than 60% filled: score 0</p>	3	<p>The current filled staff structure in the district is 238/342 (69.5%) The Local government is in the process of recruiting 63 HCW out of 84 vacant posts (75%).</p>
2	<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 4</p>	4	<p>The recruitment plan was submitted and the 63 approved posts were already in the process of being advertised. The advert was submitted on 20th of January 2018.</p>
3	<p>The LG Health department has ensured that performance appraisal for health facility in charge is conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the health facility in-charge have been appraised during the previous FY: o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<p>From the Human Resource office this assessment could not establish whether the Health Unit incharges for Hamurwa and Muko HCIVs were appraised during the Financial year 2016/2017 because the personnel files were not availed for verification</p>

4	<p>The Local Government Health department has equitably deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<p>The health department currently has deployed a total of 237 workers in its government facilities and all these workers were budgeted for in the current FY 17/18. A sample of attendances from facilities; Bubaale HCIII, Muko HCIV, and Hamurwa HCIV was in line with the deployment list in the DHO's 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"> • 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>There was no evidence that the DHO had communicated guidelines issued by the MoH in the previous FY16/17. There were copies of guidelines at the DHO and a file for distribution of guidelines these to facilities was opened in July 2017. DHO indicated that guideline dissemination is usually done through the RHITES-SW partner and a file has been opened up to track which facilities have received guidelines.</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	<p>There was no evidence in form of meeting minutes that the DHO had held meetings with HF in-charges to explain the guidelines. This was attributed to inadequate funds to hold central meetings with health facility staff. DHO depended on partner support to disseminate these guidelines and a file was opened up to track all district/partner meetings held with facilities</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>The district has 2 HCIV; Hamurwa HCIV and Muko HCIV. The DHT had held 3 quarterly support supervisions (Q2,Q3,Q4) in the FY16/17. Q1 support supervision was not done due to delay in release of funds as the district had just started</p>
		<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY: • If 100% supervised: score 3 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	0	<p>The DHT had not conducted all the 4 quarterly support supervisions to lower health facilities in the FY16/17. The ambulance which they were using got an accident and the entire district has only one vehicle that is used by all staff including the CAO to perform district related activities and so it was not possible to visit all facilities in the district. E.g. Hamurwa HCIV was supervised on 3.10.16; Bubaale HCIII 20.09.16 by the DHT</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>Rubanda district has two Health Sub districts; Rubanda East and West; HSD supervision reports were available for Rubanda West Q4 (e.g. Bubaale HCIII was supervised on 28th June 2017 by the HSD) and other reports were not seen. Lack of supervision was attributed to delay in release of HSD funds and lack of transport to facilities.</p>

8	The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up	<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 	0	A review of the DHT minutes indicated no evidence of discussion of the support supervision reports to make recommendations for the corrective action in FY16/17. The DHT has started discussing the recommendations in this FY17/18 as evidenced in the DHT meetings for Q1 and Q2. The template for writing minutes now captures action points
	Maximum 10 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 	0	There was no evidence from the supervision reports that recommendations were discussed in the DHT meetings and as such there was no evidence for follow up of the recommendations for corrective action
9	The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for health facility lists as per formats provided by MoH	<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 	0	The HMIS list obtained from MoH indicated 38 facilities to have submitted their HMIS reports. This was verified and found consistent with hard copies at the DHO. Whereas 34 facilities are required to receive PHC non-wage grants only 28 facilities are listed in OBT and displayed on the notice board. The 6 facilities are still under Kabale district and the DHO is following up with MoFPED and DHO Kabale to ensure these facilities are transferred to Rubanda district since they didn't receive their PHC funds in this FY17/18 and were neither budgeted for under Kabale district.

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council	<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 	2	From Council Minute availed as follows: 20/10/2016; 13/12/2016; 14/03/2017; 09/05/2017 which show proof that the health sector standing committee met & discussed service delivery issues including health supervision reports, implementation plan reports, performance assessment results etc.
	Maximum 4 for this performance measure			

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	2	<p>From the minutes & recommendations of the health standing committee dated 20/10/2016; 13/12/2016; 14/03/2017; 09/05/2017 it is clear that the health sector committee presented issues that required approval to Council. This is clearly spelt out in the recommendations which form the basis of approval by the full council on the following dates:16/09/2016; 28/10/2016; 20/12/2016; 30/03/2017; 30/05/2017.</p>
11	<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 5 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5 • If 80-99% : score 3 • If 70-79%: : score 1 • If less than 70%: score 0 	0	<p>Of the 3 facilities sampled, none of them held the 4 mandatory HUMC meetings in the FY16/17. At Muko HCIV, no funds were available to conduct meetings as they didn't have one of the signatories to the account. The in-charge had since resigned for an NGO job. At Hamurwa HCIV, HUMC meetings were held only twice in the FY16/17; on 07.12.16 and 01.05.17. Q1 and Q2 funds were realised at the same time and meeting was held in December 2016.</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"> • 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 	3	<p>The list of facilities receiving PHC non-wage grants was displayed at the DHO's office stamped and dated 17th July 2017. 28 facilities were on the list with an annual budget of 156,406,763 UGX</p>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				

13	<p>The LG Health department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	2	<p>The DHO submitted the procurement request to PDU on 10th March 2017</p> <p>The Health department has only one procurement this FY17/18 which was submitted on 10th March 2017. This procurement is for construction of VIP toilets at Hamurwa and Muko HCIV and a ceiling in the labour ward at Ruhija HCIII. The procurement is ongoing and at bidding selection stage as displayed in the procurement calendar in PDU</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 	8	<p>All the health facilities submitted procurement plans to NMS before 30th June 2017. The plans were prepared by the district medicine management supervisor with support from National medical stores and submitted electronically.</p>
15	<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 2 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points 	2	<p>From the list of two payment requests raised in the Health Department in FY 2016/2017, one of them was recommended within one day while the other took ten days. On average, the Head of Department recommended suppliers' requests within 5 days from the date of receipt of the request.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				

16	<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report available and was submitted on 14/08/2017 but was presented later than the required timeline of mid-July
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>From the quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2016/2017, it was established that the Health Department had five audit queries which were not yet responded to by the time of this assessment.</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 	2	<p>All the sampled facilities meet the gender composition of at least one third female as per the guidelines. For example, HUMC for Hamurwa HCIV has 4/11 females while Bubaale HCIII has 4/8 members female and Muko HCIV has 3 female members</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2 	0	<p>There was no evidence of issuance of sanitation guidelines at Muko HCIV and Bubaale HCIII. Hamurwa had sanitation guidelines. At all the three facilities, toilets were separated by gender though they were not labelled at Bubaale HCIII.</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	<p>There were no hard copies of guidelines on medical waste management, however, there was a circular from USAID introducing Green Label as the company that would be collecting waste from voluntary male circumcision camps at Hamurwa and Muko HCIV. At the facilities, the In-charge acknowledge receipt of the circular and weekly collection of wastes by Green label. All the three facilities indicated having been mentored on waste disposal by the DHT and Partner RHITES-EC but no guidelines were seen.</p>
----	---	---	---	--



LGPA 2017/18

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Rubanda District

(Vote Code: 616)

Score 55/100 (55%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	10	<p>A Summary of the safe water coverage showing the average safe water coverage of the district (62.5%) and each of the sub county was avaiied.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Sub-counties below the average safe water coverage of the district include Ruhija 46%, Muko 43%, Hamurwa 58% Bubare 45% were established All the 4 sub-counties of Ruhija, Muko, Hamurwa, and Bubare which are below the district safe water coverage were targeted for in the AWP 2017/2018.
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"> 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 	15	<p>From the budget for financial year 2016/2017 and the annual progress reports on quarterly basis submitted to the line ministry, it was established that 8 water Springs, 1 rain water tank and 3 GFS in the sub counties which have safe water coverage below the district average as were implemented planned for in the budget. These included 8 Springs in Hamurwa and Ruhija sub counties, 1 rain water tank in Ruhija, 3GFS in hamurwa, Bubare and Muko sub counties</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>	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From the annual progress report it was established that 9 projects were implemented. - It was established from the field reports file that monthly progress reports for all the 9 implemented projects were supervised and monitored
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: o List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reports of MIS obtained from MoWE, the performance contracts and AWP submitted on 2/8/2017 Shows the same list of projects that are consistent and in the MIS reports and performance contracts. • OBT for the workplan for 2017/2018 was not available

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>From the DWO it was establish that there was no list of procurement request for the projects to be implemented submitted to PDU</p>
---	---	---	---	--

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	<p>From the contract files it was established that the following were missing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No contract management plan in place - No minutes of the site meetings - No appointment letter for contractor manager.
		<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"> - From the water facilities sampled. water tanks and springs are constructed according to designs and specifications - For the Gfs extensions it was established that there no designs, lay out and drawings
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From the contract file it was established that there are no handover reports by the contractors for the facilities constructed and completed
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From the payment certificate file in works, it was established that all the projects implemented were certified by DWO for payment and completion reports attached.
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>From the list of 10 payment requests raised in the Water Department in FY 2016/2017, eight of them were recommended within two weeks the Head of Department recommended suppliers' requests within time from the date of receipt of the request.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report available on file and a copy integrated to the DLG annual performance report and dated 14/08/2017 which was late for the acceptable submission of mid-July.
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 	0	<p>From the quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2016/2017, it was established that the Water Department had two audit queries which were not yet responded to by the time of this assessment.</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"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> After reviewing documents from the Clerk to council, it was established that the the standing committee responsible for water sat on dates of 20/10/2016; 13/12/2016; 14/03/2017; 09/05/2017. There is proof that the Water Sector Standing Committee met & discussed the sector service delivery issues, implementation plan, supervision reports, and performance assessment results.9/5/2017 discussed the water budget and recommended for its approval in the council
----	--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council minutes dated 20/10/2016; 13/12/2016; 14/03/2017; 09/05/2017 with recommendations & resolutions availed. On council sitting of 30/5/2017 the water sector committee presented the recommendation for water budget and were approved.
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	<p>It was established that there are no district notice board, and could be established whether they were displays of releases, procurement plans</p> <p>- from the minutes of advocacy meetings obtained from DWO it was established that expenditures and releases were discussed</p>
		<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	<p>- From the 5 projects sampled which included 3GFSs of ikamiro, banyara, nyakasazi in subcounties of muko, bubare and nyamweru respectively did not have sign boards. Others included RWT 1 at rubanda tech. school in ikumba subcounty and 1 at katoma catholic church Ruhija subcounty</p>
		<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	<p>It was established that there was no notice board and there no display showing tender invitations, notice of the best evaluated bidder, amount of the contract was seen</p>
12	<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<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	<p>- From the software and hard ware file reports, it was established that 7 applications for projects were submitted by the communities forwarded by LC1 and subcounty chief</p> <p>- In the community files there was no acknowledgement to show community contribution towards capital development</p>

		<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"> - From the sampled projects, it was established that there were no receipts for collection of fees for O&M established - No Minutes for community meetings
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				
13	<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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"> - From the Contract file it was established that no environmental reports and screening was done on all the project
		<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"> - From the supervision file it was established that no follow ups on environmental concerns was made
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From the bills of quantities for spring protection it was established that environmental clauses like planting grass, constructing storm water drainage channel, and putting live fences
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"> • From the sample projects 5 sampled water facilities and their soft ware progress reports and MIS form submitted to ministry, it was established that all the 5 water facilities have less than 50% women on the WSCs

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	<p>From the sampled sanitation facility of a two stance lined pit latrine at Muko market it was found out that it has adequate access and separate stances one for women and the other for men and a ramp on one side for PWD</p>
----	--	--	---	---