



## LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Rubirizi District

(Vote Code: 602)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	5	83%
No	1	17%

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG submitted an Annual Performance Contract to MoFEP on July 7th, 2017</li> </ul>	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence obtained from the MoFEP inventory, the procurement plan was received together with the budget on 7/4/2017 receipt no. 0529.</li> </ul>	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	<p>The LG submitted Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on 27/7/2017.</p> <p>Acknowledgment receipt No 0819 from MoFPED is available (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	Yes

<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>• The LG submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters: Receipts from MoFPED seen for all quarters ie</p> <p>Q1 dated 9/11/2016 receipt number. 0029</p> <p>Q2 dated 10/2/2017 receipt number 0316</p> <p>Q3 dated 22/5/2017 receipt number 0740</p> <p>Q4 dated 27th/7/2017 receipt number 0819</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Assessment area: Audit</p>			
<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by April 30 (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action (PFMA Act 2015; Local Governments Financial and Accounting Regulations 2007; The Local Governments Act, Cap 243).</p>	<p>xxxxx</p>	<p>The Local Government submitted the Internal Auditors report status for the year 2015/16 on 26th October 2017 and receipted by the Directorate of Internal Auditor at MOFPED. The CAO response on status of implementation received by MOFPED s on 17th January 2017.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>xxxxx</p>	<p>Unqualified opinion as per Auditor General's report of 2016/17 submitted on 29th December 2017. (Page 227).</p>	<p>Yes</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Rubirizi District

(Vote Code: 602)

Score 71/100 (71%)

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>	0	<p>The LG has committee is in place, newly appointed on 3/1/2018 and includes; DEO, DHO, Physical planer, DWO, DAO, District Surveyor, DCBS officers.</p> <p>However, the committee has not transacted any business</p> <p>The district has no physical plan, thus no infrastructure investments have been approved as required by Physical Planning Law.</p>
2	<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.</li> </ul>	2	<p>There is synchronisation of the two documents Under Works and roads, the AWP 2017/18 pg 75 talks about Maintenance of Feeder roads. This corresponds well with outcomes of the Budget Conference report dated 27/10/2016 pg2-Feeder Roads maintenance and mechanized methods of spot gravelling.</p> <p>Under education, Budget Conference Report highlights construction of Classrooms and latrines page 3-4, the same priorities are reflected in the AWP page 43</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> </ul>	2	<p>The LG derives its capital investment from the Approved 5 year Development Plan eg, Maintenance of Feeder roads page 75 of the approved DDP, the same is prioritised as an investment in AWP page 47</p> <p>Construction of classroom block and VIP latrine page 73 of the DDP, can be traced on page 43 of the AWP 2017/18</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 1.</li> </ul>	1	<p>LG developed project profiles, were presented to TPC and discussed in a meeting held on 9th/ 11/2016 under Min: Rubi//TPC/Min.34/16.</p> <p>The profiles seen are elaborate and follow the format. They include; background, technical description, duration, funding source, work plan, M&amp;E strategy, EIA and mitigation plan , operation and maintenance plan</p>
3	<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual statistical abstract, with gender disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum 1 point.</li> </ul>	1	<p>LG compiled a statistical abstract 2016/17FY. Presented to TPC on January 15th, 2018 under Minute; Rubi/TPC/Min: 122/2018F. It included disaggregated gender data: male and female, rural and urban population.</p>
4	<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>From the Annual Budget Performance Report, the infrastructure projects implemented by the LG were derived from the AWP and budget; examples are captured below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of Kyabakara GFS (phase 2) can be traced in the AWP 2017/18 page 52 of the approved budget</li> <li>Construction of VIP latrine at Katerera Town School in Kyabakara S/C, page 43 AWP FY 2017/18 of the approved budget</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	4	<p>There was evidence that Investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan as shown below :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed of Kyabakara GFS, Total budget = 267,533,000, Total amount paid 259,511,996 i.e. 97%</li> <li>Construction of a classroom block at Kichwamba Budget was: 88,695,000 Total paid = 79,907,131 i.e 90%</li> </ul> <p>The projects in caption were implemented as per work plan( 100% completion)save for the payments on construction of Kyabakara PS which were not fully paid by the time of commissioning</p>
5	<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects and assets during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>From the Annual Budget Performance Report 2016/17 investment projects implemented were completed within approved budget - minus</p> <p>For example;</p> <p>Completion of Kyabakara GFS. Total budget = 267,533,000. Total amount paid 259,511,996 i.e. 97% it was about 100% ( contract not fully paid)</p> <p>Construction of classroom block at Kichwamba Budget was: 88,695,000 Total paid = 79,907,131 i.e. 90%</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Expenditure on O&amp;M for infrastructure presented as below;</p> <p>Repair &amp; building budget 2,073,000</p> <p>Actual expenditure 680,000</p> <p>Civil Works budget 5,400,000</p> <p>Actual expenditure 5,400,000</p> <p>Translating into 81.4%</p>
--	--	---	---	--

Assessment area: Human Resource Management

6	<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>All the 09 HODs had performance agreements completed and signed by CAO and only 1 out of the 9 had a complete performance report. The guidelines require a complete appraisal process to have both a performance agreement and a report.</p>
---	---	---	---	---



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

0

07 HODs were substantively appointed and 04 on assignment.

- Chief Finance Officer appointed under Min No 24/2017 of the DSC( Letter dated 31st March 2014)
- The District Production and Marketing Officer appointed under Min No 54/2014 of the DSC( Letter dated 3rd April 2017)
- The District Natural Resources Officer confirmed under Min No. 38/2017(9 ) of DSC (letter dated 2th Oct 2017)
- The District Community Development Officer appointed under Min. No. 22/2015(q) (i) of DSC( Letter dated 28th May 2015)
- The Principal Assistant Secretary appointed under Min. No. 22/205(m)(i) of DSC
- The District Health Officer appointed under Min No. 22/2015(P)(I) of the DSC(Letter dated 28th May 2015)
- Clerk to Council appointed under Min No. 180/2011 of the DSC(Letter dated 20th June 2011)

7	<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>All positions that were declared to the DSC in the FY 2016/2017 were considered.</p> <p>The district had planned to fill in 60 positions as per the recruitment plan 2016/17. A request for clearance was submitted to Ministry of Public Service by CAO on June 23, 2016. Clearance was provided by the MoPS in a letter dated August 19, 2016 for Agricultural Extension Workers. The district was also advised to identify critical positions that could be filled within the available wage and submit for clearance.</p> <p>Declaration of 12 vacancies was made to the DSC on 20 Sept 2016(Declaration Forms). The 12 positions were advertised in the New Vision dated Monday, October 03, 2016. 8 positions were filled and the district didn't attract candidates for 4 positions (03 Veterinary Officers and 01 Senior Agricultural Engineer.(Ref: Meeting of the DSC held on 2nd, 3rd and 6 March 2017 under Min: Min 5/2017 b and d)</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>The CAO recommended 15 staff to the DSC for confirmation- Ref: letter dated May 10, 2017(Individual files). All the 15 staff were confirmed (Ref: Extracted minutes of the 41st meeting of the DSC held on June 15, 2017).</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>No cases were submitted to the DSC for disciplinary action in the FY 2016/17.</p>
8	<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>A total of 08 staffs were recruited in the FY 2016/17 and assumed duty on 1st May 2017(Extracted Min of the 39th meeting of the DSC held on 20th and 22nd March 2017).</p> <p>All the 08 staff accessed the salary payroll in June 2017</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2</li> </ul>	0	A total of 03 staff were retired in the FYI 2016/2017. All have not accessed the pension payroll. There was no evidence of submission of files to the MoPS for consideration.
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>	4	The OSR Revenue for 2016/17 was Uganda Shillings 126,922,705 and the previous year shs 104,272,676, this was an increase of 22,650,029 which is 22% as per Annual Financial statements. The Revenue increased from the previous year by more than 10%.
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>	2	The Budgeted Revised Revenue was Ugx 128,000,000 and the Actual collection as per Annual Financial statements was 126,922,000 is a 99% performance

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG is Categorised by LGA 85 (2) “ In rural areas, revenue shall be collected by the Sub county councils and a sub county council shall retain 65%, or any other higher percentage as the district council may approve , of the revenue collected by it and pass the remaining percentage over to the district.”</li> <li>• Local Revenue as per Annual Financial Statements (Page 15 &amp; 20) was 126,922,705 i.e. 100% and 65% = 82,499,758 was retained by the Sub Counties and 35% = 44,422,946 was retained by the District.</li> <li>• Sec 85(4) “ A district council may, with the concurrence of a sub county, collect revenue on behalf of the sub county council but shall remit 65 percent of the revenue so collected to the relevant sub county.”</li> <li>• Annual financial statements (Page 4) shows that Ugx 110,788,000 was shareable. Local Service Tax (3,700,000) and UWA Funds (107,078,000) was remitted to the following Seven LLG (Rubirizi Tc 2,650,000, Katerera Tc 1,050,000, Katerera Sub County 10,977,594, Kyabakara 30,979,465, Kichwamba 32,662,470, Ryeru 13,928,378 and Kirugu Tc 18,530,093).</li> </ul>
		<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	<p>The Local government paid shs 43,012,000 for Councillor Emoluments which is more than 20% of Own Sourced Revenue in the previous financial year. Local Revenue collected in 2015/16 was 104,272,676 i.e. 20% is equivalent to 20,854,535.</p> <p>Though the LG had Authority to spend over and above the 20% of local revenue by 15,792,908, from the Minister of Local Government vide letter referenced ADM/F/75/102 Dated 29th September 2016, this put a maximum ceiling of 36,647,441, which was also exceeded and no evidence for Virement and reallocation as per Ministers letter was availed.</p> <p>Regulation 25 of the LGFAR 2007 was not complied with.</p>

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

<p>12</p>	<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>	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The position of Senior Procurement Officer (SPO) was substantially filled as shown in the appointment letter dated 25th May 2012 signed by the CAO.</li> <li>The position of Procurement Officer (PO) was substantially filled as shown in the appointment letter dated 20th June 2011 signed by the CAO.</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>	<p>1</p>	<p>There was evidence that TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee (CC) in FY 2016/17. For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of Kyabakara Gravity Flow Scheme (GFS) in Kyabakara S/C (Phase I). (<i>Proc Ref No: RUBI 602/WRKS/16-17/0002</i>) dated 16th September 2016 signed by the TEC Chairperson, Secretary and member.</li> <li>Rehabilitation of Kabarugi GFS in Katerera S/C (<i>Proc Ref No: RUBI 602/WRKS/16-17/0035</i>) dated 20th June 2017 signed by the Chairperson and 2 members of TEC.</li> <li>Construction of 2 Classroom Blocks at Kichwamba P/S (<i>Proc Ref No: RUBI 602/WRKS/16-17/0003</i>) dated 15th September 2016.</li> </ul> <p>Supply of materials for installation of 5 lines of Culverts on District feeder roads (<i>Proc Ref No: RUBI 602/WRKS/16-17/0034</i>) dated 12th June 2017 and signed by the TEC Chairperson and members.</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, in the procurement files and minutes of Contracts Committee (CC), that the recommendations from TEC were considered. For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MIN 23/CC/2016/17 and Meeting Reference No: CC/2016/2017-0003 dated 21st June 2016 dated 19th September 2016 indicated approval of recommendations from TEC to award contract to M/S Ferest Investments Ltd at to construct Kyabakara GFS (Phase 1) in Kyabakara S/C at a bid price of UGX 247,023,526.</li> <li>• Min 112/CC/2016/17 and Meeting Reference No: CC/2016/2017 dated 21st June 2016: The CC approved the recommendation of TEC to award the contract to M/S Hamu &amp; Kamu Ltd to rehabilitate Kabarugi GFS in Katerera S/C at a cost of UGX 47,271,000 signed by chairperson and 2 members of CC.</li> <li>• Min 112/CC/2016/17 and Meeting Reference No: CC/2016/2017 dated 21st June 2016: The CC approved the recommendation of TEC to award the contract to M/S Hamu &amp; Kamu Ltd to rehabilitate Kabarugi GFS in Katerera S/C at a cost of UGX 47,271,000 signed by chairperson and 2 members of CC.</li> <li>• Min 036/CC/2016/17 dated 23rd September 2016: The CC approved TEC recommendation to award tender to M/S Richo Investments Ltd to construct a 2-Classroom block at Kichwamba P/S at a cost of UGX 89,228,886.</li> <li>• Min 109/CC/2016/17 dated 13th June 2016: The CC approved TEC recommendation to award tender to Morph (U) Ltd to Supply of materials for installation of 5 lines of Culverts on District feeder roads at a cost of UGX 7,736,198.</li> <li>• All the above minutes of contracts Committee were signed by the Chairperson and 2 members.</li> </ul> <p>In FY 2016/16, the Health Sub-Sector had no development budget.</p>
13	The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Procurement and Disposal Plan (PDP) for the current FY 2017/18 covered all infrastructure projects in the approved AWP</li> </ul>

Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.

- 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

and Budget for FY 2017/18. A sample of 5 investments listed below from the current PDP were also included in the approved AWP & budget for current FY 2017/18. The projects are:

- Construction of 2-Stance VIP Latrines at Katerera Town School funded by DWSCG was see on page 52 of the approved AWP for FY 2017/18.
- Construction of Kyabakara Gravity Flow Scheme (GFS) in Kyabakara S/C (Phase I) was seen on page 52 in the approved AWP for FY 2017/18.
- Gravelling of 4Km district feeder roads funded by Uganda Road Fund (URF) was also seen on page 46/47 of the approved AWP for FY 2017/18.
- Routine maintenance of 128km of district feeder roads funded by URF was seen on page 47 in the approved AWP for FY 2017/18.
- Construction of 2 classroom block at Munyomyi P/S was also indicated in the approved AWP for FY 2017/18.
- Construction of Kyabakara GFS (Phase II) in Kyabakara S/C was seen on page 52 in the approved AWP for FY 2017/18.
- Rehabilitation of 3 shallow wells and 2 boreholes in Katunguru, Ryeru and Rutoto and Kyabakara were seen on page 52 of the approved AWP for FY 2017/18.
- However, Kabarugi GFS was not in AWP for FY 2017/18 because by the time the funder (UNICEF) declared to fund the project, the district had already approved the AWP. Therefore, the district water department made a water sector workplan to include the Kabarugi GFS and was approved by Council.
- Rubirizi District LG made procurements in FY 2016/17 as per the PDP for FY 2016/17. For example, all the 3 sampled projects below were procured according to the PDP.
  - i. Construction of Kyabakara Gravity Flow Scheme (GFS) in Kyabakara S/C (Phase I). (*Proc Ref No: RUBI 602/WRKS/16-17/0002*).
  - ii. Construction of 2 Classroom Blocks at Kichwamba P/S (*Proc Ref No: RUBI 602/WRKS/16-17/0003*).

				Supply of materials for installation of 5 lines of Culverts on District feeder roads ( <i>Proc Ref No: RUBI 602/WRKS/16-17/0034</i> ).
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Out of a total of 18 infrastructure projects which required the bid documents in the PDP for FY 2017/18, only 11 bid documents (61.11%) were prepared by 30th August 2017.</li> <li>The PDP for current FY 2017/18 also indicated projects which did not require bid documents because they are procured under the Force Account (e.g funded by URF) and implemented by district staff using DLG road equipment. Also micro-projects (supplies) did not require Bid documents. The SPO prepared only 11 bid documents out of the 19 projects which required bid documents. Hence 61.11% marks obtained. This was attributed to the delay to submit requisitions using the LGPP Form (1) to the PDU by sub counties and Heads of departments. The PDU starts writing bids only when the user departments submit the LGPP Form (1) requesting to start the procurement process.</li> </ul> <p>In the PDP for FY 2017/18, the deadline for bid invitation was 3rd July 2017 and bid closing/opening date was 21st July 2017 for some projects and 24th July 2017 for others.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Contracts Register for FY 2016/17 was not updated with completed procurement activity files for FY 2016/17. For example, rehabilitation of Kabarugi GFS was included in the Contracts Register but did not fill the procurement reference number and status of project.</li> <li>However, the construction of the 2 classroom block at Kichwamba P/S was included on 12th May 2017.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore the contracts register was partially updated/filled.</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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was evidence that Rubirizi DLG adhered to procurement thresholds as shown in the Contracts Register and Procurement files [i.e. LGPP form (1)] and PDP. For example, the value of all projects and the procurement methods used were within the thresholds recommended by PPDA 2006. A sample of 4 projects below was considered : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of Kyabakara GFS (Phase I) in Kyabakara S/C was estimated at 247,023,526 and open domestic bidding (ODB) was applied.</li> <li>Rehabilitation of Kabarugi GFS in Katerera S/C was estimated at UGX 47,271,000 and Selective Bidding was applied.</li> <li>Construction of 2 classroom blocks at Kichwamba P/S was estimated at UGX 89,228,886 and open domestic bidding was applied.</li> <li>Supply of materials for installation of 5 lines of Culverts on District feeder roads was estimated at a cost of UGX 7,736,198 and Selective Bidding was applied by the PDU.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
15	<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>All works projects implemented in FY 2016/17 were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision. Completion certificates were signed by the District Engineer and CAO. The certificates were attached to payment requests submitted to Finance Department as indicated in the Vouchers, progress report, and requisition by the contractor, and BoQs that were attached. For example projects included: (i) Construction of a 2 classroom block at Kichwamba P/S.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>Not all the works projects for FY 2017/18 were labelled (Site Boards) indicating the name of the project, the contractor; source of funding and actual contract value. For example, construction of a 2 classroom block at Kichwanba P/S did not have a sign post (estimated at UGX 150,000) and metallic site board (estimated at UGX 450,000) because these items were removed from the BoQs so as to generate funds to partly cover the shortfall of UGX 533,549 that was needed to top up to UGX 88,695,337 to meet the total bid price of UGX 89,228,886 recommended by TEC and approved by Contract Committee with consultations from the education sector.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management				
16	<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>All the 18 Bank Accounts in Stanbic (2) and in Bank of Africa (16) (Total 18 Bank Accounts) were reconciled up to December 2017 and the Monthly Statements were signed by the CFO and CAO. The statements are in the Monthly reports and cash books.</p>
17	<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2.</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From Payments register for 2016/17, and from the sample made on payments, Water sector (Date Requested by Ferest (Payee) 23/1/2017 and date paid 23/2/2017 in favour of Kyabakaba Gravity Scheme worth Ugx 153,157,900. Another request on 20/3/2017 was paid on 13/4/2017 as additional pay worth Ugx 69,572,000. Payment didn't exceed one month from the date of submission of request.</li> <li>Education Sector payments to Richo requisitioned on 1/3/2017 &amp; 23/5/2017 were paid on 9/3/2013 and 25/5/2017. This was in respect to Classroom construction at Kicwamba PS, worth 21,409,936 &amp; 58,506,195 respectively they were paid in a period not exceeding a month after requisition.</li> </ul>

18

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.

<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>	<p>0</p>	<p>The LG has no substantial Senior Internal Auditor. Reason is that the previous one left in November. Adverts were placed in the Newspapers on 14th October 2017 shortlists made and one of the applicants appealed to Public Service in a letter dated 24th November 2017 and the process was halted pending PSC advice. The position has since not been filled.</p> <p>All the Quarterly Audit reports for FY 2016/17 were prepared and submitted to the Speaker.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p>The Internal Audit submitted to the Chairman were copied to the LG PAC on the following dates 26th October 2016, 13th January 2017, 21st March 2017 and 26th September 2017 for the 4 quarters respectively.</p> <p>The CAO and TC Rubirizi shared the status of implementation of Audit queries in a Letter dated 21/12/2017 which was copied to LG PAC.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>	<p>The reports were submitted to the Chairman on the following dates 26th October 2016, 13th January 2017, 21st March 2017 and 26th September 2017 for the 4 quarters respectively. They were copied to Internal Auditor General, MOLG, Auditor General, MOFPED, LGPAC and the CAO (Accounting Officer)</p> <p>PAC is reviewing LG 1st Quarter 2016/17 and Rubirizi Town Council for 4th Quarter 2015/2016 and 1st Quarter 2016/17. The PAC reports were submitted to Council in January 2018.</p> <p>Members of PAC were appointed on 28th Feb 2017 and started work during the last financial year.</p>

19	<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>The Asset register is available and it was up todate and is kept in the Authorised format of the Accounting Manual AC 33(a) - General, AC33 (b) - Vehicle and Plant additions on 27th November 2017 of Wheel Loader, Reg No. UG2089W And Motor Grader, Reg No. UG2065W were posted and AC 33(c)- Land and Buildings</p>
20	<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY: • unqualified audit opinion: score 4 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</p>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unqualified Opinion for the FY 2016/17. Auditor General Report dated 29th December 2017 page 227.</li> </ul>
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council is functional and discusses service delivery issues; for example: Council meeting held on 29/9/16, Minute ; MIN:COU:53//2016(b): presentation and discussion of Finance, Investment and administration report;</li> <li>Council minute: Min: COU53/2006 (c) Committee on Social Services–education: presentation and discussion of reports sitting of 29th/3/2017 under MIT/COU: 08/2017 presentation and discussion of Social Services Committee report.</li> </ul>
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>	2	<p>The CAO appointed the District Information Officer to coordinate response to complaints and respond to feedback from citizens ; letter of appointment dated 16th May 2017.</p>

23

The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)

Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

Evidence that the LG has published: • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2

2

- The LG published information on public notice boards, the LG staff payroll, pensioner payment schedule Dec. 2017,
- Displayed circular on salary arrears payment made October 2017, dated 22/11/2017.

• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1

1

The LG procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published on the noticeboard eg, as contained in Q1 report displayed details of updated procurement plan for goods, works, and non-consultancy services FY 2016/17

• 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

“N/A Central Government did not conduct the Annual Performance Assessment for LGs in 2016/17”.

24	<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<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>	1	<p>There was evidence that the DLG communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs. These included; Planning and budgeting guidelines, Nutrition guidelines, Monitoring and supervision Tool, Budget and implementation guidelines , National Integrated Early Childhood Policy 2016, Guidelines on School feeding, and nutrition intervention program Letters and circulars to LLGs on most of the above were available.</p> <p>which were received by representatives from LLGs on different dates as per the recipient list signed.</p>
		<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	<p>No evidence was seen that district in the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. fora, barazas, radio programmes etc..) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation.</p>

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

25	<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>			<p>There was evidence that the Gender Focal Person (GFP) provided guidance and support to sector departments on how to mainstream gender into their activities within FY FY2016/17. For example,</p> <p>(i) On 6th September 2016, Community Based Service (CBS) department conducted a capacity building workshop funded by UNICEF to train Heads of Departments (HoDs) and LLG officials (Sub County Chiefs) &amp; In-charges of Health Facilities (HCIIIs) on gender mainstreaming in planning and budgeting.</p> <p>(ii) The Head of CBS is also a member of TPC purposely to guide TPC on ensuring that gender activities are included in the procurement process.</p>
----	---	--	--	---

• Evidence that the LG gender focal person has provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities score 2.

2

(iii) CBS supported the Water department by having a CDO attached to the water department to ensure gender mainstreaming in the activities of the water department e.g formation and training of water user committees (WUCs) of which at least 2 members must be females on the WUC.

(iv) CBS supported the education sector, under a UNICEF funded project, to sensitize parents & caregivers on positive health living, looking for alternatives to corporal punishment, child rights, and problems of teenage pregnancies. It was conducted in 3 Wards (Nyakagyenzi at St Joseph P/S, Hacu at Kacu P/S and Katerera at Mugyera P/S as indicated in the 3rd Quarter Report for FY 2016/17. A total of 308 people attended (i.e. 144 males and 164 females)

(v) CBS also works with the Works department and PDU and TPC to review the infrastructure projects BoQs to ensure that gender is mainstreamed e.g VIP Latrine stances are separated for males and females in schools. SCDO is a member of TPC.

(vi) TPC meeting held on 28th June 2016, the CDO (Barekye Dinah) presented on Youth Livelihood programm (YLP) and UWEP groups for approval. See TPC Minute: RUBI/TPC/Min 80/2017.

(vii) Integrated approach to cascading and implementing the National Integrated Early Childhood Development Policy (MoGLSD 2006) in which all sector departments e.g Health, Education, Water and CBS went to for a 2 day sensitization workshop on 9th -10th August 2016.

(viii) On 26th October 2016, CBS together with education sub sector participated in launching Safe Schools project held at Rugazi P/S in they trained teachers, parents and pupils on the following: stopping corporal punishments, stigmatisation of teachers and school children, safety at school, menstrual health and environment compound.

(ix) CBS developed an action plan dated 10th September 2017 in which it will involve the DEO to conduct 5 dialogue meetings in schools with the activation of the child rights clubs working closely with CDOs and later follow up members for VAC prevention and reporting.

		<p>However, only 1 department/ Sector (Water department) had a specific CDO allocated to it to support in mainstream gender in water sector activities within Rubirizi district</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that gender focal point has planned activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and that more than 90% of previous year's budget for gender activities has been implemented: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>	<p>There was evidence that gender focal person planned activities to strengthen women roles in FY 2017/18 as shown in the approved AWP &amp; Budget for FY 2017/18 and the District Development Plan. Minutes from TPC also indicated inclusion of gender activities in the monthly progress reports presented by the CBS department.</p> <p>However, out of the total UGX 193,802,971 cumulative expenditure on gender activities excluding wage in FY 2016/17, only UGX 53,283,971 was spent on gender activities) as per the final approved AWP &amp; budget for FY 2016/17 and also as indicated in the final accounts. Hence representing 27.49 percent (inclusive of non-wage &amp; domestic development) for CBS department.</p>



LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

- 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

Environment screening & ESIA was conducted on mainly the following projects that were funded from the Central Government:

i Proposed Kyambura Worker's Camp and material site for the Hydro-Electricity Power dam at Omukabare B and Kyeizogombe village in Kirugu S/C. This was evident in a letter to NEMA dated 15th June 2016 signed and stamped by the Environment Officer and received by NEMA on 21st July 2016.

ii Mining of Pozzolana at Kyambura C village, Kyambura parish in Kichwamba S/C as shown in a letter submitted to NEMA dated 17th June 2016 signed and stamped by the Environment Officer.

iii Construction of Agro-Processing Facility (APF) in Kichwamba S/C (*CAIIP-3/Rubirizi/APF-Shelter/Lot 18*) funded by CAIIP-3. There was evidence of a letter submitted to CAO indicating that Environment screening was done to determine compliance to environment regulations during the execution of the works in Kicwamba.

iv. Construction of APF in Katerera S/C under CAIIP3 (*APF-Shelter/Lot 17*).

However, the following projects did not undergo screening yet according to the environment office, screening is a mandatory requirement:

i. Rehabilitation of Kabalugi GFS in Katerera S/C.

ii. Construction of Kyabakara GFS phase I in FY 2016/17 and Phase II in FY 2017/18.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>Rubirizi DLG integrated environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents and BoQs. For example:</p> <p>i. Bid documents for Rehabilitation of Kabarugi GFS in Katerera S/C indicated that environmental mitigation measure to include fencing of site using treated eucalyptus poles or live fence, barbed wire, landscaping and planting of grass all to the approval of the Engineer.</p> <p>ii. BoQs for the construction of Kyabakara GFS also indicated that the contractor should protect the source in front of the structure in accordance with the cross-section on drainage, inclusive of planting sustainable grass. Estimated to cost UGX 105,000 only.</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>No completed infrastructure project was on Government owned land that had proof of ownership (Land title, Agreement or MoU). For example, in Rubirizi district, no Government primary school is on land with a Land Title. However, the district started the process of acquiring 1 Land title per year for all the untitled Government land.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>For example, the construction of the 2 – Classroom block with an office at Kicwamba P/S was completed. The interim certificate was signed by the Senior Environment Officer (SEO) on 1st March 2017 and site inspection was done by the District Engineer on 27th February 2017 while the Environment assessment report was signed and stamped by the SEO on 22nd May 2017.</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Educational Performance Measures

Rubirizi District

(Vote Code: 602)

Score 80/100 (80%)

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>According to Page 43 of the Performance Contract, the LG budgeted for 3,699,562,000 for at least a Head teacher and 7 teachers per school (staff registers PP29-PP68 in the performance contract of 7/6/2017 and related acceptance letter of 6/7/2017 by CAO)</p> <p>The LG has deployed a Head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school as per staff lists which indicate 473 teachers (279 M, 198F) are deployed in the 56 government schools.</p> <p>In the visited schools, at Rugazi Central, there was 1 Head teacher and 12 teachers for the 325 pupils (166 M 159F), at Butoha there is 1 Head teacher and 11 teachers for the 762 pupils (399 M 363 F), at Kyenzaza Integrated there was 1 Head teacher and 19 teachers for the 452 pupils (221 M 231F). At Nyabubare Islamic there is 1 Head teacher and 7 teachers for the 233 pupils (114 M 119 F)</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>	3	<p>There is evidence that the LG has substantially filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision. 473 teachers out of the approved 503 teachers (approved structure) are in post implying 94% of the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision has been filled. There are only 28 vacant posts.</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>	6	<p>There are 3 inspectors in the approved structure and these positions are filled.</p> <p>The file numbers for the three inspectors are:- Twesigye Exervier F/No. 671, Komugisha Nary F/No. 293, and Tumisiime Benon F/No. 612.</p> <p>Two inspectors are due for retirement in August and December 2018.</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>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>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY. Recruitment plan for 28 primary teachers in place. 10 of these slots have been advertised as per New Vision of 9/11/2017. The submission for recruitment of the 10 teachers was done on 25/10/2017</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 School Inspectors: score 2</p>	2	<p>There is no need for recruitment of inspectors currently as these are presently filled..</p>
5	<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>100% school inspectors: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>The LG had 1 Senior Inspector of Schools and 2 Inspector of Schools in the FY 2016/2017. All the Inspectors were appraised by July 2017 (CR/D/671 and CR/D/612)</p>
	<p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised head teachers during the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>90% - 100%: score 3</li> <li>70% - 89%: score 2</li> <li>Below 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	0	<p>The LG had a total of 47 primary school head teachers in the FY 2016/2017. 10% (4) was sampled and only 01 had a complete appraisal (both a performance agreement and a report). Three had no performance agreements and performance reports and only 01 had a performance agreement. (CR/D/620, CR/D/546, CR/D/31 and CR/D/464)</p>

Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection

6	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>The LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY. In 4 of the visited schools the following circulars were in their possession indicating that the department had communicated guidelines on:-</p> <p>Facilitators Guide and Monitoring Tool, Submission of Wage-bill information based on MoES new customised structure dated 20/3/2017, Submission of student enrolment and bank details dated 20/3/17, Seedlings for tree planting dated 05/10/2016, the Master data Payroll 2016/17 dated 24/8/2016 and referenced 164/3, among others.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level, including on school feeding: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Minutes of meeting held 21/7/2017 and 15/6/2017 (with an attendance list of 78 head teachers) indicate the department held meetings with head teachers to explain and sensitise them on Ceasing submission of Form "X" (circular dated 20/4/2016), Evaluation of implementation of scheme of service (circular dated 31/3/2016), among others.</p>

<p>7</p>	<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>100% - score 12</li> <li>90 to 99% - score 10</li> <li>80 to 89% - score 8</li> <li>70 to 79% - score 6</li> <li>60 to 69% - score 3</li> <li>50 to 59% score 1</li> <li>Below 50% score 0.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>10</p>	<p>School inspection reports and inventory of schools inspected indicate majority of primary schools were inspected at least once a term. Quarterly Inspection reports dated Q1 (9/11/2016), Q2 (10/2/2017), Q3 (24/7/2017), and Q4 (27/7/2017) were reviewed.</p> <p>The evidence is further corroborated by the findings from schools visited, namely:-</p> <p>Butooha 22/11/2016, 17/10/2016, 30/6/2016, 3/4/2017, 29/3/2017, 2/3/2017, and 2/12/2016.</p> <p>Rugazi Central on 5/6/2017, 14/3/2017, 21/7/2016, and 10/6/2016.</p> <p>Kyenzaza was inspected on 18/2/2017, 23/2/2017, 23/3/2017, 5/7/2017 by the DIS and the DEO visited the school 4 times in addition to DIS visits</p>
<p>8</p>	<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>	<p>4</p>	<p>The Education department discussed school inspection reports aimed at implementation of recommendations in reports. For example, Minutes of joint SMC/Foundation body meeting held 19/7/2017 at Nyabubare Islamic P.S indicate that the Head teacher had carried out recommended internal support supervision at school on 10/3/2017, 4/4/2017, 15/6/2017, and 28/6/2017.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Inspection reports and accountabilities for all quarters in 2016/17 were submitted according to information availed by DES.</p> <p>Acknowledgement letters signed by DES dated 24/7/2017, 7/4/2017, 24/2/2017, and 8/7/2017 further confirm the submissions to DES by the LG.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>Follow-up on recommendations from Schools Inspections are made as indicated in letter dated 25/1/2017 and referenced CR 158/1</p>
9	<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5</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>	0	<p>There is no evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data on schools. EMIS data indicates a total of 77 public and private schools while the LG indicates a total of 101 schools (56-government and 45 private)</p> <p>There is no evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data on enrolment. LG indicates a total enrolment of 23,052 (with 11,619 F and 11,333 F). EMIS data from the ministry shows a total of 28,555 pupils (14,086 M and 14,469 F).</p>

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> </ul>	2	<p>In meeting held on 2/3/2017, Minute 6 (b) The DEO presented a request on ongoing of registration of pupils under NIRA. DEO requested for distribution of iron sheets which equalled to 110 sheets to three schools of Kashoha P.S (40), Mugyera P.s (30), Butoha (40)</p> <p>On 3/3/2017 minute 29/2017 Education presented monitoring report which highlighted disciplinary cases to four teachers and four other cases who had absconded were forwarded to CAO for disciplinary action. Under the same minute, they also discussed SFG completed projects like Kijogombe P.s classroom completed. Kacu P.S latrine completed.</p> <p>Council approved the sector implementation Plan on 18/5/2017 under Min COU 31/2017</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Education sector committee layed for approval 2016/2017 budget &amp; work plan under Min.COU 16/2016(d) of 27/04/2016.</p> <p>Three items were presented for approval in a meeting held on 2/9/2016 Min 5/2016/17 Part B, 30th/10/2016 Min 14/2016/17 Part B, and 3/3/2017 Min 29/2016/17</p>

11	<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO) • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80% schools: score 0</p>	5	<p>There is evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs. The visited schools confirmed having held the 3 mandatory SMC meetings as follows; Rugazi Central P.S on 6/11/2017, 25/9/2017, and on 27/6/2017. Butoha SMC had met on 29/6/2017, 3/3/2017 &amp; 21/3/2017, 17/10/2016/2016, and 17/6/2016. Nyabubare Islamic P.S had held meetings on 5/12/2016, 4/3/2016, and 5/2/2016</p> <p>Kyenzaza had met three times as well.</p>
12	<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</p>	3	<p>There is evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants. Schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants are publicised on general noticeboard at CAOs office and the CFO's office</p>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				
13	<p>The LG Education department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<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>	4	<p>There is 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. A procurement request signed by the DEO was initiated on 9/3/2017 for construction of 2 classroom block at Kichwamba P.S valued at Shs 22,556,986, Construction of VIP Toilet at Mugyera valued at shs 2,078,525, supply of 30 g pre-painted iron sheets for Katsyoha, Butoha, Mugyera, and Karagara primary schools.</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>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the Contract samples and payment requests, certificates of the payments in favor of Richo Investments, in regard to Classroom Construction of Kicwamba PS, works worth Ugx 79,916,131. The payments were made on time. Not exceeding one month from the time of requisition to the time of payment.</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>	4	<p>The department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on time. Submission of Annual Performance report 2016/17 was done on 30/6/2017.</p>
----	--	--	---	---

16	<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 4 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points o If all queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Sector had 2 queries ‘on unspent funds’ during the financial year and they were all responded too and the status of implementation was availed in letter dated 6 / 12 /2017 from CAO to SIA.</li> </ul>
----	---	---	---	--

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> <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> <li>• Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Guidelines on gender were disseminated on 6/10/2017. The guidelines focused on hygiene of boys and girls, Gender Based Violence and the target group was senior women teachers and old pupils.</p> <p>There is evidence the LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on sanitation. Targeted activities were carried out between 12/6/2017 -/21/6/2017 addressing children with special needs, and recruitment of teachers for children with special needs</p> <p>The School Management Committees meet the guideline on gender composition, namely; that at least 30% of members on the SMC representing the Foundation body are females. Rutooto-Busingye P.S has the following females; Julia Kabanda, Jenina Busingye, and Irene Kyomugisha. Butoha had three females; Angella Kyomukama, Clemencia Kyokunda, and Molly Banturaki. Kyenzaza had three females; Nalongo Kyomukama,</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>	3	<p>The LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management. Meeting held on seedlings for tree planting at Nyabubare Islamic P.S on 5/10/2016. A Wildlife Club has been formed at Kyenzaza Integrated P.S while a 1-day training was organised jointly by Environment office and DEOs office on tree planting and environmental education and a 4-page handout presented availed</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Health Performance Measures

Rubirizi District

(Vote Code: 602)

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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The approved structure has a total of 207 staff</li> <li>• The wage bill for FY2017/2018 is UGX 1,277,803,008</li> <li>• Filled positions are 104</li> <li>• Filled percentage is 50.2%</li> </ul>
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the performance contract there is no plan to recruit the missing positions for FY2017/2018</li> <li>• The DHO mentioned that the health wage bill was capped so no recruitments would be done</li> </ul>
3	<p>The LG Health department has ensured that performance appraisal for health facility in charge is conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the health facility in-charge have been appraised during the previous FY: o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0</p>	8	<p>The LG had 03 HC IIIs and 01 HC IV in the FY 2016/2017. All the HC III In-charges were appraised by August 2017 and HC IV on 26 of July 2017(CR/D/243 and CR/D/87)</p>

<p>4</p>	<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>	<p>• 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</p>	<p>0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The staff list from DHO office was compared with staff lists at the sampled health centres. Below is the analysis</li> <li>• Note: During the field visit to the sampled health units, 2 health centres were found to be closed by 2.00 pm (Mutoha HCII and Mushumba HCII). So verification could not be done.</li> <li>• Of the health centres visited there was a discrepancy between the DHO list and the staff list at the HC</li> <li>• Staff at other facilities could not be verified as they were closed</li> </ul> <p>1 Rugazi HCIV DHO-39, HC-37</p> <p>2 Kichwamba HCIII DHO-14, HC-12</p> <p>3 Rugazi Mission HCII DHO-4, HC-4</p> <p>4 Butoha HCII DHO-3, HC-0</p> <p>5 Mushumba HCII DHO-7, HC-0</p>
<p>Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision</p>			

5

The DHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities

Maximum 6 for this performance measure

• 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

- The following circulars were shared by the DHO
- ADM/141/428/0 on procurement of drugs dated 17th August 2017. Sent out to health facilities on 29th September 2017
- PHC guidelines 2016
- Clinical guidelines 2016
- The circular ADM/141/428/0 had a note of circulation on it with no evidence that it reached the facilities
- The sampled health facilities had a different set of circulars and they got them from different sources rather than the DHO's office.
- Rugazi HCIV had a similar copy of clinical guideline 2016 as shared by DHO
- The document tracking systems at the DHO office and at the facilities made it difficult to track this type of correspondence.



		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On 12th December 2016 an in charges meeting was held with an agenda item where the DHO presented the Health Sector Service Standards – July 2016</li> <li>From the DHO files, minutes for only one in charge meeting could be located (12th Dec 2016)</li> </ul> <p>However 2 HCs could not be assessed because they were closed.</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>	Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rubirizi has one HCIV and no district hospital</li> <li>At the time of assessment, for the financial year 2017/2018, Quarter 1 supervision report dated 25th July 2017 was complete including Rugazi HCIV</li> <li>From the report, all the 15 health centres as the DHO list were included in the supervision</li> </ul>

		<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY: • If 100% supervised: score 3 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	3	<p>Below are the reports which were obtained from the DHOs file for the financial year 2016/2017. All reports included all the health units listed</p> <p>Period Report Date</p> <p>Q1 Jul – Sept 2016 (20th September 2016)</p> <p>Q2 Oct – Dec 2016 (12th January 2017 )</p> <p>Q3 Jan – Mar 2017 (6th April 2017)</p> <p>Q4 Apr – Jun 2017 (20th June 2017)</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>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rubirizi is one HSD hence the DHT supervision reported under indicator 6 is the same as the HSD supervision. Having separate supervision visits would be a duplication of activities.</li> </ul>
8	<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was limited reference to actions/recommendations contained in previous monitoring report in the successive reports</li> <li>• No clear linkage could be established with findings of supervision reports and the discussions of the DHT meetings</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 health facilities were closed so the assessment could not be done.</li> </ul> <p>At Kichwamba HCIII, in the supervision log book on page serial 251614, there was a comment that the medicine store should be cleaned regularly.</p> <p>No follow up action was indicated. At the sampled health facilities, there was a support supervision log book which contained recommendations from individual officers as opposed to a team visit as presented in the supervision report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no evidence of the specific recommended actions being executed.</li> </ul>
9	<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for health facility lists as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HMIS contains 30 facilities while OBT contains 15 facilities</li> </ul>

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the council committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In a council meeting held on 20th June 2017 under minute COU/14/2016 (b), the social services committee recommended for approval of the work plan including the health sector work plan</li> <li>The annual work plan for 2017/2018 was approved under minute COU/31/2017 in the same meeting</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the council meeting held on 20th June 2017 under MIN 6(a), DHO presented report to committee. Among the issues discussed included family connect (IT) where pregnant mothers with children below 2 years are enrolled on the system to receive automatic reminders for services.</li> <li>Two health centres were recommended to get vaccination fridges, that is, Kyabakara Heath Centre two and Kishenyi Health Centre two.</li> </ul>

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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From DHOs file, all the 5 sampled units have HUMCs. From the field visit to compare if they all held the 4 mandatory meetings, below are the findings;</li> <li>• Rugazi HCIV – 5 meetings</li> <li>• Kichwamba HCIII – 3 meetings</li> <li>• Rugazi Mission HCII – 2 meetings</li> <li>• Mushumba HCII – closed</li> <li>• Butoha HCII - closed</li> </ul>
12	<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 2 closed units did not have the grant notices displayed outside.</li> <li>• The allocations for financial year 2017/2018 were displayed on a notice board in the DHO office reception area at the district contrary to the requirement of displaying in a public area outside the office</li> <li>• Similar PHC grant notices were found at the notice boards of the 3 sampled health facilities</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				

13	<p>The LG Health department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2</li> </ul> <p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No separate procurement plan was prepared as the department did not have any money for any procurements</li> <li>The department submits direct requests to finance for any operational requirements</li> </ul>
14	<p>The LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time:</li> <li>100% - score 8</li> <li>70-99% – score 4</li> <li>Below 70% - score 0</li> </ul>	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The HCIV directly deals with NMS and had receipts of the medicines from NMS</li> <li>Interviews with the 3 sampled health facility in charges revealed that they submit their NMS requests to the DHO office for coordination and forward management</li> <li>The DHO had a file of copies of all receipts from NMS to the 15 respective health facilities.</li> </ul>
15	<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 2 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points</li> </ul>	0	<p>No development funds for the last two financial years and hence no payments made to the suppliers. Funds available for Wage and Non-Wage recurrent expenditure.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				

16	<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>The health department submits soft copies of all quarterly reports and annual report to the district planner. The planner consolidates all department reports and the bundle was submitted to MoFPED on 28th July 2017.</p> <p>There was no specific evidence of the health department submitting to the planner.</p>
17	<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year • If sector has no audit query score 4 • If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points • If all queries are not responded to score 0</p>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Sector had 2 queries on unspent funds and they have been responded to and the status of implementation of recommendations was averted. In a letter dated 6 / 12 /2017 from CAO to SIA.</li> </ul>

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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rugazi HCIV – 2 female, 5 male</li> <li>• Kichwamba HCIII – 3 female, 4 male</li> <li>• Rugazi Mission HCII – 2 female, 8 male</li> <li>• Mushumba HCII – closed</li> <li>• Butoha HCII - closed</li> </ul>
----	--	--	---	--

		<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>• Rugazi HCIV – No guidelines, toilets not marked</li> <li>• Kichwamba HCIII – No guidelines, toilets not marked</li> <li>• Rugazi Mission HCII – No policy, toilets marked</li> <li>• Mushumba HCII – closed</li> <li>• Butoha HCII - closed</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>• Rugazi HCIV – No guidelines seen</li> <li>• Kichwamba HCIII – No guidelines seen</li> <li>• Rugazi Mission HCII – No guidelines seen</li> <li>• Mushumba HCII – closed</li> <li>• Butoha HCII - closed</li> </ul>





## **LGPA 2017/18**

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Rubirizi District

(Vote Code: 602)

Score 53/100 (53%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: score 10</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The District safe water average was 65.8% as of 30th June 2017</li> <li>According to the Annual Work Plan 2017/18 the following water projects were planned; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rehabilitation of 5 shallow wells and 3 springs</li> <li>Construction of Kyakabara GFS phase II</li> <li>Construction of 1 spring tank in Katunda</li> <li>Extension of Katuguru water system</li> <li>Rehabilitation of Nyamabare GFS</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>It should be noted that Kirugu sub-county with safe water coverage at 32% (below district average was not targeted. The raised argument that NWSC is to take it over does not hold as actual operations had not commenced by the time of the assessment.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the Annual Work Plan and Budget, these water projects were implemented; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Kyakabara GFS Phase I at 261,000,000/=</li> <li>o Rehabilitation of the source of Kabarogi GFS at 12,500,000/=</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>These projects are in Katerera and Kyabakara sub-counties. Kirugu Sub-county which was below district safe water average with 32% had no water project implemented in the Financial Year.</p>
Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision				

<p>3</p>	<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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15</li> <li>• 80 - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10</li> <li>• 70 - 79%: score 7</li> <li>• 60 - 69% monitored: score 5</li> <li>• 50 - 59%: score 3</li> <li>• Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored -score 0</li> </ul>	<p>10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In FY 2016/2017 Rubirizi District implemented the following projects; construction of Kabaka ra GFS, rehabilitation of 5 shallow wells and 3 springs, Extension of Katunguru water system and Kabarongi GFS.</li> <li>• The DWO prepared a Monitoring &amp; Supervision plan which CAO approved on 31st October 2016. In the plan each project would be monitored at least once every week by the appointed contract manager.</li> <li>• The water department monitored at least each of the WSS facilities. For example, existence of an inspection progress report on rehabilitation of Kabongi GFS and one protected spring in Katanda Sub-county (RUBI: 602/wrks/16-17/0064) The report duly signed by the contract manager and DWO.</li> <li>• The County Water Officer under the department of Water monitored and supervised Kyabakara GFS once every month. For example, submission of report to DWO detailing status &amp; progress dated 13th January 2017</li> <li>• However, the monitoring reports documented did not tally with the proposed 4 times monthly supervision.</li> </ul>
----------	--	--	---

4	<p>The LG Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	10	<p>Rubirizi District Local Government submitted consistent data regarding list of water facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of sources in “submission of the WATSAN DATA update for first quarter 2016/2017 dated 16th November and submission of WATSAN data updated for 4th quarter 2016/17 dated 19th June 2017 had similar/exact information with what is in ministry of water data base. Projects that where in MIS, OBT and Annual Work Plan included;</li> </ul> <p>Extension of Kyabakara GFS Phase II in Kyabakarasub-county</p> <p>Rehabilitation of Nyabaale GFS in Katerera sub-county</p> <p>Extension of Katunguru water supply system in Katunguru sub-county</p> <p>Rehabilitation of shallow wells in Nyeru, Rutoto and Katerera sub-counties</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The District Water Office submitted procurement requisition for the projects on the 12th/5/2017. This was beyond the stipulated time frame of 30th April.</li> </ul>
---	---	---	---	---

6

The DWO has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts

Maximum 8 points for this performance measure

• 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

2

• A letter of appointment was issued dated 18th October 2016 written by DWO and approved by CAO designating Patrick Magera as a Contract Manager for Kyabakera GFS by the District Water Officer. This is in line with LG (PPDA) Regulations 119(2)

• Contract management plan written by the District Water Officer to CAO for approval for construction of Kyabakara GFS(Contract no:RUBI 602/wrks/16-17/0002 stipulating the roles of each stake holder.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bills of Quantities are in place well signed and adhered to; for example, an activity schedule/work plan for construction of Kyabakara GFS clearly illustrate what would be done (RUBI/wrks/16-17/0002)</li> <li>• There was proof after visiting selected facilities that they were constructed as per design for example;</li> </ul> <p>Kyabakara GFS the construction followed the BoQs perfectly well, size and of reservoir tanks met (2 tanks of 650cc each), number of outlet taps constructed (6 taps), appropriate pipe work used, suitable and water friendly grass planted and live wire fence installed.</p> <p>With Kabarongi GFS in Katerere sub-county, right pipe work used i.e 2 inch pipes installed and stipulated length of of 2.5kms covered.</p> <p>Safe water source (tap) established to cater for people that used the former source before establishment of the scheme.</p> <p>Construction of a barbed wire around the source, a small gate around the source</p> <p>Planting suitable grass around the source.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well as project commissioning was done by the District to beneficiary communities, formal project handover from contractor to the District Local Government was not done for projects for example contract RUBI/wrks/16-17/0002</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The District Water Officer appropriately certified all WSS projects. For example, there are certificates of practical/partial completion of Rehabilitation of Kabongi GFS (contract No: RUB 602/wrks.16-17/0064). It is clearly signed by the DWO On 30th May 2017</li> <li>Certificate of practical/partial completion of construction of small springs in Katanda Sub-county RUB602/wrk16-17/00064</li> </ul>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	3	<p>On the 2 sampled payments to Ferest in regard to Kyabakaba Gravity scheme payments worth Ugx 222,729,000 were certified and requisitioned as per contract on time. Payments were made in not more than a month from the date of requisition to the time of payment.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				
8	<p>The LG Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5</li> </ul>	5	<p>The water department submitted the annual performance report for Financial Year 2016/2017 on the 6th of July 2017 to the Planning Unit</p>



9	<p>LG Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 5 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 If queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	3	<p>The sector had one query of “Unspent funds” during the financial year. The sector had responded to it and the status on implementation was availed through memo. In a letter dated 6 / 12 /2017 from CAO to SIA.</p>
---	--	--	---	---

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>The sectoral committee on water sat and discussed water related issues and the progress of on going construction projects.</p> <p>it was under MIN:FIN65/2016, briefs from sectors in a meeting that sat on the 2nd of March 2017</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>Rubirizi District Council meeting that was held on the 18th of May 2017, the committee on water presented before council and in that meeting construction of Kyabakara GFS(phase II) was approved. This was under Min.COU 31/2017.</p>
11	<p>The LG Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On the district central notice board water sector specific information was displayed. Rural Water Grants received and expenditures are clearly/ easily accessed by the public.</li> <li>• Also displayed was the shortlist of selected companies from the bidding process.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Labels on constructed facilities indicating Project name, date of construction, contractor and source of funding. E.g Project Name: Kabakara GFS, Source of funding: District Rural water and sanitation grant, Contractor: Ferest Investments Ltd, Financial Year: 2016/2017. Labels were clear and in bold.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on tenders and contract awards displayed on the notice board. For instance, information of Kyabakara GFS and Kabarogi GFS was displayed.</li> <li>Contractor: Ferest Investments Ltd, Contract sum: 261,000,000/= (Kabakara GFS)</li> <li>Contractor: MBOSEMU, Contract sum: 12,500,000/= (Kabarogi GFS)</li> </ul>
12	<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local communities applied for water/public sanitation facilities for example there is evidence of application letter of Kasibo LCI members written to the CAO through the DWO requesting for a gravity flow scheme in their area. It was dated 15th/December/2017. Signed by the chairperson with list of residents as annex.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O&amp;M funds and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, for the current FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The District has a total of 50 WSCs, 45 have been functioning well, 5 committees required re-activation which the District Water Office is currently doing.</li> <li>• All the WSCs for the sampled water facilities (Kyabakara GFS, Nyamabale GFS, Kabarongi GFS and Katerere County GFS) were found with evidence that beneficiaries contribute resources to O&amp;M. For example on Omukambugu Tap-7 (Nyamabale GFS) beneficiaries contribute 1000/= monthly</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---	---

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

13	<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects was not conducted.</li> <li>• Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) where required was not conducted on projects. The excuse was the merge resource envelope available for project execution and Environment screening it was a matter of lack of coordination between Water department and Environment &amp; Natural Resources department.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No flow-up support provided since Environmental screening and EIA where not conducted for water projects.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contracts have a clause on environmental protection. For example, the contract signed between Rubirizi DLG and Ferest Investments Ltd there are clauses “21 to26” clearly stipulates environmental issues i.e</li> <li>• Back filling, cleaning and shaping of the intake area, construction of live fence around the intake area, Protecting the source in front of the structure in accordance with cross section drawings, including planting of suitable grass.</li> </ul>
14	<p>The LG Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If at least 50% WSCs are women as per the sector critical requirements: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the soft ware progress reports it was clear women were duly elected on WUCs however, field consultations conducted unearthed that some resigned sighting pressure from their spouses who did not want them to serve in public domain. E.g. Kabashese WSC which had 4 women out of the 8 members was left with 2 by the time of assessment, Kagorogoro Tap-4 WSC had only 2 out of the 9 committee members, Omukambunga WUC Tap-7 had 7members of which 3 were women.</li> <li>• It was also found out that sensitive positions on most committees are occupied by men. (Chairperson, Vice chairperson, Secretary and Treasurer)</li> </ul>

15	<p>Gender- and special-needs sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/RGCs.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public sanitation facilities sampled included; VIP Latrine in Mongera P/S constructed under district water &amp; sanitation grant, Kyabakara GFS, Katerera GFS, VIP Latrine at Rubirizi DLG, Nyamabale GFS and Kabarogi GFS.</li> <li>• With VIP latrines they had stances for both women and men however, there was no consideration for PWDs</li> <li>• The Gravity Flow Schemes area tap outlets had no provision for People with Disabilities</li> </ul>
----	--	--	---	---