



LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Rukiga District

(Vote Code: 620)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	1	50%
No	1	50%

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	Performance contract submitted & received at MoFPED on 07/07/2017 which later than the timeline date of June 30.	No
Assessment area: Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).	xxxxx	• Budget was submitted accompanied by a Consolidated Procurement Plan.	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	• Not Applicable to the DLG.	N/A
LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)	xxxxxx	• Not Applicable since the DLG is still in Q3	N/A
Assessment area: Audit			

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by April 30 (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action (PFMA Act 2015; Local Governments Financial and Accounting Regulations 2007; The Local Governments Act, Cap 243).</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>From the CAO, this assessment established that Rukiga District Local Government became operational in FY 2017/2018. As such, this indicator is not applicable.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>From the CAO, this assessment established that Rukiga District Local Government became operational in FY 2017/2018. As such, this indicator is not applicable.</p>	<p>N/A</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Rukiga District

(Vote Code: 620)

Score 22/100 (22%)

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: • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 2.</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No functional Physical Planning Committee in place yet. DLG utilises the services of Muhanga Town Council Physical planning committee to consider new investments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical Plan/Structure Plan not yet developed.
2	<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Applicable to the DLG. AWP dated March 2017 is based on the outcomes of the budget conference held by Kabale DLG. The specific priorities include: Public sanitation site to be rehabilitated at Rushebeya; Rehabilitate Shooko Gravity Water flow Scheme; Rukiga DLG Administration Block; Maintenance of Bukinda-Rwakijuma Road.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If different, justification has to be provided and evidence that it was approved by Council. Score 2. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Applicable to the DLG. DLG still utilises the Development Plan of Kabale DLG.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 1. 	0	Specific Project Profiles for the DLG not yet developed
3	<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual statistical abstract, with gender disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum 1 point. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DLG is yet to start compiling the Annual Statistical Abstract.
4	<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2 	0	Not Applicable to the DLG.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	0	Not Applicable to the DLG.
5	<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects and assets during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	0	Not Applicable to the DLG.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	0	Not Applicable to the DLG.
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				

6	LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	0	Rukiga District started 1 st July 2017 and therefore this indicator is not Applicable
	Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3 	0	From the Human Resource Office this assessment established that all the 9 heads of department positions according to the approved staff structure were not substantively filled.
7	The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	0	Rukiga District started on 1st July 2017 and therefore this indicator is not Applicable
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	0	Rukiga District started on 1st July 2017 and therefore this indicator is not Applicable
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	0	Rukiga District started on 1st July 2017 and therefore this indicator is not Applicable
8	Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3 	0	Rukiga District started on 1st July 2017 and therefore this indicator is not Applicable
	Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2 	0	Rukiga District started on 1st July 2017 and therefore this indicator is not Applicable
Assessment area: Revenue Mobilization				

9	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If increase in OSR from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10% : score 4 points • If the increase is from 5 -10% : score 2 point • If the increase is less than 5% : score 0 points. 	0	<p>From the CAO, this assessment established that Rukiga District Local Government became operational in FY 2017/2018. As such, this indicator is not applicable as there were no operations in last FY 2016/2017.</p>
10	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10% : then 2 points. If more than +/- 10% : zero points. 	0	<p>From the CAO, this assessment established that Rukiga District Local Government became operational in FY 2017/2018. As such, this indicator is not applicable as there were no operations in last FY 2016/2017.</p>
11	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	0	<p>From the CAO, this assessment established that Rukiga District Local Government became operational in FY 2017/2018. As such, this indicator is not applicable as there were no operations in last FY 2016/2017.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2 	0	<p>From the CAO, this assessment established that Rukiga District Local Government became operational in FY 2017/2018. As such, this indicator is not applicable as there were no operations in last FY 2016/2017.</p>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				

12	<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2 	0	<p>Rukiga DLG does not have a senior Procurement and Procurement Officer. Rukiga District is a new District that started operations in FY 2017/18 and the process of recruiting staff including procurement officers was on-going during this assessment.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TEC minutes prepared for three procurements: Minutes for evaluation for works projects exercise under SGM dated 8th-10th November, 2017. Minutes for Bid Opening Meeting for SFG VIP latrines held on 23/10/17; Minutes for bod opening of procuring laptops, Desktops, printers etc. and Projector for Rukiga DLG dated 23/11/2017.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	1	<p>Contracts Committee Minutes dated 13/09/2017 Ref: CC01/2017/18: Minutes include presentations of submissions from TEC on construction of 5 Stance VIP latrines at 6 Primary Schools under the SFG. Sample contract awards include:</p> <p>Construction of 2 stance VIP latrine at Rushebeya: Contract Number RUKI 620/WRKS/2017-18/00007 awarded to BEB Daffmir Construction and General Agencies Co. Ltd.</p>

13	<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2 	2	<p>The District Procurement and Disposal Plan FY 2017/18 submitted and approved 15/7/2017 covers infrastructure projects:</p> <p>Sample projects include: construction of 5 stance VIP toilets at Kasoni Primary School; Mugambisa Primary School; and Rwempiisa Primary School; and Maintenance of Community Access Roads (LLS) E.G. Kirimbe-Nyamisenyi road in Bukinda Subcounty and Nyamushamba-Rwanyangobe Road in Kashambya Subcounty.</p> <p>Rukiga DLG did not present evidence on procurements made in FY 2016/17 and there was no procurement plan was prepared for FY 2016/17 and the District LG started operating in FY 2017/18.</p>
----	--	--	---	--

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

2

Rukiga DLG prepared 80% of the bid documents for selected investments and infrastructure projects by August 30th .

The DLG issued ITBs for of 5 out 6 (over 80%) bids.

Procurement for works under selective bidding for Construction of 5 Stance VIP latrine lined at Kasooli P/S in Rwamucucu Sub-county. Ref: RUKI620/WRKS/17-18/00005.

Procurement of Works under selective bidding: Bid Document Reference Number: RUKI 620/WRKS/2017-18/00005 for 5 Stance VIP Latrines at Kirundwe Primary School.

Bid Document for Construction of 5 stance VIP Latrine at Bwirambere P/S. Procurement Ref No: RUKI 620/WRKS/2017-18/00001

Bid Document Reference: RUKI 620/WRKS/2017-18/00001 for Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Bwirambere P/S in Kamwezi Subcounty and Bid Document reference RUKI 620/WRKS/2017-18/00006 for Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Rwempisi P/S.

Bid Document Reference No: RUKI 620/SRVC/2017-18/00001 for Management Services e.g parking areas (Parks); Markets and renting a maize Huller (Revenue Collection).

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

0

No updated contracted register was presented by the LG for FY 2016/17 and FY 2017/18. According to CAO and PAS, the contracts register for FY 2017/18 was prepared and could not be traced during this assessment.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	2	<p>Taking the base year for Rukiga as FY 2017/18, Rukiga adhered to procurement thresholds as follows:</p> <p>Selective Bidding: Procurement for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of 5 Stance VIP toilets at Bwirambere P/S: UGX: 20,907,948 5 VIP Stance Latrine lined at Kirundwe P/S. UGX: 21,901,980. Supply of 4 Printers, 5 Desktop Computers, and photocopier and projector: UGX: 28,100,000 Construction of 5 stance VIP toilets at Ntaranga P/S at UGX: 20,907,948 Open Bidding: Advert in the New Vision dated 8/01/2018. Rukiga District Local Government: Invitation to Bid under Open Bidding; Bid Notice Number: 08 RUKI620/WRKS/2017-18/00010: Construction of Rukiga District Headquarters; UGX: RUKI620/WRKS/2017-18/00011: Construction of Rukiga Town Council Office Block; RUKI620/SUPLS/2017-18/00003: Supply of 2 double Cabin Pickups to Rukiga District.
15	<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2 	0	<p>All projects are being implemented in FY 2017/18. Rukiga DLG did not present interim and completion certificates based on technical supervision.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2 	0	All projects are being implemented in FY 2017/18. According to the acting District Engineer, no site board was prepared and labelled with the name of project, contract value, name of contractor, source of funding, expected duration and contract value.
--	--	--	---	---

Assessment area: Financial management

16	<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4 	4	From the CFO, the assessment established that Rukiga District Local Government operates 10 bank accounts whose cash books were reconciled up to 31 December 2017.
17	<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2. 	0	From the CAO, this assessment established that Rukiga District Local Government became operational in FY 2017/2018. As such, this indicator is not applicable as there were no operations in last FY 2016/2017.
18	<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor and produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 3. 	0	From the CAO, this assessment established that Rukiga District Local Government became operational in FY 2017/2018. As such, this indicator is not applicable. The current Head of Internal Audit is still in acting capacity.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries: score 2. 	0	From the CAO, this assessment established that Rukiga District Local Government became operational in FY 2017/2018. As such, this indicator is not applicable as there were no operations in the previous FY 2016/2017.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1 	0	From the CAO, this assessment established that Rukiga District Local Government became operational in FY 2017/2018. As such, this indicator is not applicable as there were no operations in the previous FY 2016/2017.
19	<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	0	From the CFO, this assessment noted that Rukiga District Local Government maintains an updated Assets Register, though in a format different from that prescribed by the Local Government Finance Manual. For instance, all assets are recorded in a single list, and not in their respective classes such as land and buildings; motor vehicle and heavy plants; General assets; as recommended by the Local Government Finance Manual.
20	<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> unqualified audit opinion: score 4 Qualified: score 2 Adverse/disclaimer: score 0 	0	From the CAO, this assessment established that Rukiga District Local Government became operational in FY 2017/2018. As such, this indicator is not applicable as there were no operations in the previous FY 2016/2017.
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				

21	<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2</p>	0	<p>Not applicable to DLG. But council activities have since commenced based on the Minutes availed dated as follows: 20/12/2017; 6/10/2017; 6/7/2017 .</p>
22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2.</p>	2	<p>• Mr. Tumwesigire Gideon- Principal Assistant Secretary was appointed as Focal Person to Coordinate responses to feedback (Grievance/complaints under appointment letter dated 14/07/2017.</p>
23	<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published: • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</p>	2	<p>• Very well displayed on the wall at the reception area of the main office office block next to CAO's office.</p>
	<p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1</p>	0	<p>• DLG does not have a specific Notice Board for Procurement information. It was therefore difficult to tell whether the Consolidated Procurement Plan was displayed.</p>
		<p>• 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.</p>	0	<p>•Not applicable to the DLG & the LG Performance wasn't carried out as well.</p>

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"> • Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1 	0	<p>Not Applicable to LG. However the LG has commenced this activity in FY 2017/18. Communication letters from HLG signed off by the CAO to LLGs available on file and sampled as follows: 20/11/2017 Guidelines on School Charges; Invitation to attend a Budget Conference dated 08/11/2017; Invitation for a stakeholder meeting to Harmonize the distribution of Agricultural inputs scheduled for October 23, 2017. Available on file also are responses from LLG to HLG reporting disasters especially landslides dated October 9, 2017.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG during previous FY has conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc..) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Applicable to the DLG.

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

25	<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG gender focal person has provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities score 2. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GFP/DCDO prepared and presented a report on Gender mainstreaming in all DLG departments: Report dated: 24/08/2017. HODS Attendance Sheet was attached to this report. • GFP disseminated Gender mainstreaming materials to various CDO for various sub counties. Report dated: 19/09/2017. All CDOs signed the report. • GFP conducted/CDOs training on gender mainstreaming: Training Report dated 6/09/2017. Attendance list of participants attached.
----	---	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that gender focal point has planned activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and that more than 90% of previous year's budget for gender activities has been implemented: score 2. 	2	<p>The GFP prepared a work plan for FY 2017/18. The work plan has gender mainstreaming activities which include: Support to Disability and the Elderly (PWDs); Culture Mainstreaming; Representation of women council; Support to Youth Councils; Children and Youth Services; UWEP and YLP projects monitoring, YLP; Adult learning etc.</p> <p>GFP spent over 90% of budgeted funds for Community Development services which include: Conducting sensitization meetings on gender mainstreaming in 6 LLG. Budgeted for UGX: 547,250. Gender was allocated UGX: 547,250; Amount Spent: UGX: 547,250 (100% implementation). Voucher Number 3/9 dated 4/9/2017 was presented.</p>
26	<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 2 	2	<p>The District Natural Resource Officer /Environmental Officer submitted the following:</p> <p>A quarterly report FY 2017/18 dated 16/12/2017 on activities conducted including environment screening/assessment for selected projects: Environmental Assessment Report Dated 21/2/2017: For Muhanga NASA Nursery School in Muhanga Town Council, Rukiga District;</p> <p>Inspection Report dated 09/11/2017 for proposed Powerline across Mwibaale Wetland in Mwibaale Cell, Muhanga Ward, Muhanga Town Council, Rukiga District.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	0	<p>LG did not present evidence to suggest that environmental and social management plans are considered in bid documents.</p> <p>Sampled bid documents with no ESM input include:</p> <p>RUKI620/WRKS/2017-18/00005: Construction of 5 Stance VIP latrine lined at Kasooni P/S in Rwamucucu Subcounty under selective bidding. Bid document dated 10/10/2017.</p> <p>RUKI620/WRKS/2017-18/00001: Construction of 5 Stance VIP latrine lined at Bwirambere P/S in Kamwezi Sub-county: Bid Document dated 10/10/2017</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1 	0	<p>No land title or agreement of land ownership was presented during this assessment. According to CAO, Rukiga District started operations in FY 2017/18 and most activities including construction of District Headquarters are scheduled to start in FY 2017/18 and the process of acquiring land titles or inventory of lands owned by the district ownership is ongoing.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2 	0	<p>Rukiga has recently been accorded district status and had no completed projects at the time of this assessment. The District Natural Resource Officer/ Environment officer could not produce signed Environmental and Social mitigation certification forms for completed projects.</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Educational Performance Measures

Rukiga District

(Vote Code: 620)

Score 22/100 (22%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				
1	<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance contract for Rukiga DLG FY 2017/18 shows that education (p15) has budgeted for 772 teachers in FY 2017/18 sufficient to meet the threshold of one head teacher and teacher per class
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4 	0	<p>List of schools and staffing reviewed shows two Schools: Ngoma II(7), Kabira(7), do not have the threshold of one H/T and one teacher per class</p>

<p>2</p>	<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100% score 6 o If 80 - 99% score 3 o If below 80% score 0 	<p>6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of teachers of the DLG provided shows that 774 teachers in place while ceiling stands at 740 • According to performance contract approved LG approved structure shows that 772 teachers are approved for payment in FY 2017/28 • Wage bill provision in Performance contract shows wage bill for all Teachers at 772(page 15) • All required number of teachers in place -100%
----------	--	---	----------	--

<p>3</p>	<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	<p>6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LG approved structure vide ARC 135/306/01 dated 3rd October, 2017 shows that Education Department should have three inspectors(Principal, Senior, and inspector of schools) Wage Bill provision FR 2017/18 is for only one inspector of schools • List of department staff shows only one inspector of schools in place for whom a wage bill provision is provided
<p>4</p>	<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of Primary Teachers: score 2</p>	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The performance contract Rukiga DLG FY2017/18 shows that education (p15) has reached the required number of teachers required as per wage provision for 772 teachers
		<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>	<p>0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No recruitment plan provided or availed to ascertain School inspector recruitment. Staff list shows only one inspector (acting) is in place instead of three.

5	<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY • 100% school inspectors: score 3</p>	0	<p>Rukiga District started on 1st July 2017 and therefore this indicator is not Applicable</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised head teachers during the previous FY. • 90% - 100%: score 3 • 70% - 89%: score 2 • Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<p>Rukiga District started on 1st July 2017 and therefore this indicator is not Applicable</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>	<p>• Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1</p>	0	<p>• Not applicable as DLG started this FY 2017/18</p>
		<p>• Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level, including on school feeding: score 2</p>	0	<p>• Not applicable as DLG started this FY 2017/18</p>
7	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all private and public primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that all private and public primary schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59% score 1 o Below 50% score 0.</p>	0	<p>• Not applicable as DLG started this FY 2017/18</p>

8	<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 • 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 • Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable as DLG started this FY 2017/18 • Not applicable as DLG started this FY 2017/18 • No inspection reports provided as the DLG has only carried out one lot of inspection in Current FY 2017/18 and not in FY 2016/17 as it was not in existence then
9	<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of Schools submitted for review by DEO shows that DLG has 71 government aided schools • The list of schools reviewed shows a total of 20 private schools in Rukiga DLG • EMIS data obtained from MoES shows 68 government aided schools and 4 private schools

		Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of schools and enrollment shows a total of 26,848 pupils • EMIS data shows that UPE enrolment is 27,278 Pupils
--	--	---	---	--

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc...during the previous FY: score 2 	0	Not applicable to this DLG which began operations in FY 2017/18
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2 	0	Not applicable to the DLG which began operations in FY 2017/18

11	<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO) • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80% schools: score 0</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMC files for Schools found in DEO office for 71 Schools • Sampled five school Wacheba, Kakatunda, Kihorezo, Kihanga Boys, and Katungu Primary schools and all have SMCs in place • No discussion of budget or resource issues seen in Minutes of the five schools sampled • No minutes of the three meetings on file to show three mandatory meetings held as required as minutes have not been updated since the transfer from Kabale in the creation of the new district
12	<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Display of UPE IPFS for all schools for FY 2017/18 seen on Notice board • UPE grants releases for Term 1, 2018 seen on display at the notice board

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

13	<p>The LG Education department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DLG Started in FY 207/18 and so measure does not apply
14	<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	0	<p>From the CAO, this assessment established that Rukiga District Local Government became operational in FY 2017/2018. As such, this indicator is not applicable.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				
15	<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	0	<p>Not Applicable since DLG became operational in FY 2017/18.</p>

16	<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 4 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points o If all queries are not responded to score 0 	0	<p>From the CAO, this assessment established that Rukiga District Local Government became operational in FY 2017/2018. As such, this indicator is not applicable as there were no operations in last FY 2016/2017.</p>
----	---	---	---	--

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

17	<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc....: Score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No circular or correspondence or minutes of meetings provided to ascertain dissemination of guidelines on senior women and men on how to handle Hygiene and reproductive health.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No guidelines on sanitation seen as no minutes available for review for meetings between Head teachers/schools and DEO
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sampled five school Wacheba, Kakatunda, Kihorezo, Kihanga Boys, and Katungu Primary schools and all have SMCs in place and meet the guidelines on gender composition

18	<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 3: 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not provided with any document to show meeting of DEO with Teachers/Head teachers/schools • Sampled schools shows no environment guidelines or clubs in place
----	--	---	---	--



LGPA 2017/18

Health Performance Measures

Rukiga District

(Vote Code: 620)

Score 20/100 (20%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human resource planning and management				
1	<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY • More than 80% filled: score 6 points, • 60 – 80% - score 3 • Less than 60% filled: score 0</p>	3	<p>The current positions filled are at 68.7% (227/323). From the Performance Contract, there was no wage bill provision to hire for vacant posts for primary health workers.</p>
2	<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 4</p>	4	<p>The Health Department submitted the comprehensive recruitment plan to HR department on the 14th January, 2018. The Health department requires to hire 52 out of 96 vacant posts, however, there is no wage bill provision for recruitment for this current financial year and as such was not included in the Performance Contract</p>
3	<p>The LG Health department has ensured that performance appraisal for health facility in charge is conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the health facility in-charge have been appraised during the previous FY: o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<p>Rukiga District started on 1st July 2017 and therefore this indicator is not Applicable</p>

4	<p>The Local Government Health department has equitably deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers equitably, in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY: score 4 	4	<p>The health workers as indicated on the staff list were deployed at the health facilities visited. At Mparo HCIV 42 staff were indicated on their attendance roster, 5 at Kitojo HCII and 24 staff at Bukinda HCIII as indicated on the staff list at the DHO's office</p>
---	--	--	---	--

Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision

5	<p>The DHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 • Evidence that the DHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	0	<p>This is not applicable as Rukiga is a new district and facilities were previously under Kabale District. However, the DHO has a file for all communications from Ministry of Health received in this current FY17/18</p> <p>This is not applicable as Rukiga district started this financial year.</p>
---	--	--	---	---

6	<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3</p> <p>Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY: • If 100% supervised: score 3 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	0	<p>This is not applicable since it was required to look at the 4 mandatory DHT supervision reports in the FY16/17.</p> <p>This is not applicable since it was required to look at the 4 mandatory DHT quarterly supervision reports in the FY16/17. The facilities had been supervised by Kabale district health office</p>
---	---	---	---	---

7	<p>The Health Sub-district(s) have effectively provided support supervision to lower level health units</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities have been supervised by HSD and reports produced: • If 100% supervised score 6 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 4 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 2 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	0	<p>This is not applicable since it was required to look at the 4 mandatory DHT quarterly supervision reports and monthly DHT meetings in the FY16/17. The facilities had been supervised by Kabale district health office</p>
8	<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</p> <p>• Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</p>	0	<p>This is not applicable since it was required to look at the 4 mandatory DHT quarterly supervision reports and monthly DHT meetings in the FY16/17. The facilities had been supervised by Kabale district health office</p> <p>This is not applicable since it was required to look at the 4 mandatory DHT quarterly supervision reports and monthly DHT meetings in the FY16/17. The facilities had been supervised by Kabale district health office</p>
9	<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for health facility lists as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: o List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10</p>	0	<p>Rukiga has a total of 34 facilities (23 Govt, 6 PNFP, 5 PFP) and they are all submitting HMIS reports to Ministry of Health. Copies of HMIS 105 reports for Q1 were available at the DHO's 34 reports were counted and available in DHIS2 as per report provided by MoH. Although 29 facilities are in the PC as to receive PHC funds, only 26 facilities received in Q1 and Q2. It was indicated that the 3 facilities (Nyakarambi HCII, Kamwezi Kashekye HCII and Muhanga C.O.U) are still listed under Kabale district however, they were neither on the list of facilities receiving PHC funds in Kabale district</p>

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	0	Not Applicable to DLG which began operations in FY 2017/18
	Maximum 4 for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	0	Not Applicable to this DLG which began operations in FY 2017/18
11	The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning Maximum 5 points	Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5 If 80-99% : score 3 If 70-79%: : score 1 If less than 70%: score 0 	0	The three sampled facilities have current functional HUMC committees however there was no evidence of all the 4 mandatory meeting minutes for FY16/17 at Mpaaro HCIV and Bukinda HCIII while at Katogo HCII HUMC meetings were held on 29.09.16, 15.12.16, 20.03.17 and 10.06.17
12	The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants Maximum 3 for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	3	There were 29 facilities published on the noticeboard to be receiving PHC funds

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

13	<p>The LG Health department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2 	0	<p>The Health department submitted the procurement request on 12th July 2017. They could not submit earlier as the district was not yet established</p>
		<p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	2	<p>The health department submitted Q1 procurement request on 13th September 2017 for office stationary, fuel, lubricant and oil for the vehicle</p>
14	<p>The LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time: • 100% - score 8 • 70-99% – score 4 • Below 70% - score 0 	0	<p>Not applicable since facilities were supported under Kabale district to submit procurement plans for the current financial year to NMS. The district was established in FY17/18</p>
15	<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 2 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points 	0	<p>From the CAO, this assessment established that Rukiga District Local Government became operational in FY 2017/2018. As such, this indicator is not applicable as there were no operations in last FY 2016/2017.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				

16	<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	0	<p>Not Applicable since the DLG became operational in FY 2017/18.</p>
17	<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year • If sector has no audit query score 4 • If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If all queries are not responded to score 0 	0	<p>From the CAO, this assessment established that Rukiga District Local Government became operational in FY 2017/2018. As such, this indicator is not applicable as there were no operations in last FY 2016/2017.</p>
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				
18	<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2 	2	<p>The current HUMC composition meets the gender requirements of at least a third of the members to be female: Mparo HCIV has 4/8 members, Kitojo HCII 3/6 members and Bukinda HCIII has 2/5 members' female</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2 	0	<p>There was no evidence that the DHO's office had issued guidelines on sanitation to the health facilities</p>

19	<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that the LGs has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal : score 2 points.	2	<p>There was evidence of a distribution list of guidelines to HF in-charges. Facilities that were provided with National Infection Prevention and Control Guidelines 2013 which includes medical waste management. These guidelines were issued during a meeting the DHO had with Health facility in-charges on 15th December 2017</p>
----	---	---	---	--



LGPA 2017/18

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Rukiga District

(Vote Code: 620)

Score 7/100 (7%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: score 10 	0	<p>From the DWO it was established that there no data for safe water coverage available</p> <p>- from the AWP for the DWO it was established that the district targeted Kitunga GFS in Kashambya subcounty but its safe water coverage was not available</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"> Evidence that the LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY: score 15 	0	<p>It was established that the district was created in the financial year 2017/2018 they were no operations in the previous year 2016/2017</p>
Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision				

3	<p>The LG Water department carries out monthly monitoring and supervision of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually. • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15 • 80 - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10 • 70 - 79%: score 7 • 60 - 69% monitored: score 5 • 50 - 59%: score 3 • Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored -score 0</p>	0	<p>It was established that the district was created in the financial year 2017/2018 they were no operations in the previous financial year 2016/2017</p>
4	<p>The LG Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: o List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10</p>	0	<p>- From the MoWE it was established that there was no data for MIS reports for Rukiga.</p> <p>From the performance contract it was established that there was data for the construction of kitunga GFS in kashambya subcounty.and 2 stance toilet at mparo RGC in OBT however the workplan and MIS for Rukiga submitted to the line ministry could not be established</p>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				

5	<p>The LG Water department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	0	<p>From the DWO, it was established that there were no procurement request submitted to PDU</p>
6	<p>The DWO has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the DWO prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2 	0	<p>It was established that the district was created in the financial year 2017/2018 they were no operations in the previous financial year 2016/2017</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	2	<p>From the district it was established there was a toilet constructed of 2stance at Mparo RGC with a ramp for PWD a privacy and a separation wall for men and women</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	0	<p>It was established that the district was created in the financial year 2017/2018 they were no operations in the previous financial year 2016/2017</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2 	0	It was established that the district was created in the financial year 2017/2018 they were no operations in the previous financial year 2016/2017
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	0	It was established that the district was created in the financial year 2017/2018 they were no operations in the previous financial year 2016/2017
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				
8	<p>The LG Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	0	It was established that the district was created in the financial year 2017/2018 they were no operations in the previous financial year 2016/2017
9	<p>LG Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year If sector has no audit query score 5 If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 If queries are not responded to score 0 	0	It was established that the district was created in the financial year 2017/2018. As such, there were no operations in the previous financial year 2016/2017.
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				

10	The LG committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3 	0	It was established that the district was created in the financial year 2017/2018 they were no operations in the previous year 2016/2017
	Maximum 6 for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	0	It was established that the district was created in the financial year 2017/2018 they were no operations in the previous year 2016/2017
11	The LG Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2 	2	It was Established from the notice board that the grants releases and expenditure were dispalyed
	Maximum 6 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2 	0	From the DWO it was established that a 2 stance pit latrine constructed at Mparo RGS, was not labelled
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	0	From the notice board it was established that were no display of tenders
12	Participation of communities in WSS programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	0	From the DWO it was established there were no community application files
	Maximum 3 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O&M funds and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, for the current FY: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the DWO it was established that there were no receipts for the collection of funds for O&M No minutes from the communities

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

13	The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	0	From the DWO there was no environmental screening
	Maximum 4 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1 	0	From the DWO it was established there were no environmental reports
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	0	From the DWO it was established that there were no supervision reports that were conducted
14	The LG Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If at least 50% WSCs are women as per the sector critical requirements: score 3 	0	From the DWO it was established that, the data for gender on water user committed was not available
15	Gender- and special-needs sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/RGCs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3 	3	From the sampled on sanitation facility it was established that the toilet constructed at mparo RGC had separate wall for men and women and a ramp for PWDs
	Maximum 3 points for this performance measure			