



LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Soroti District

(Vote Code: 553)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	3	50%
No	3	50%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	xxx	<p>Soroti DLG submitted a Draft Performance Contract for FY 2017/2018 on 27th April 2017 and issued with receipt (No. 0582) by MoFPED. Then the Final Performance Contract for FY 2017/2018 was submitted on 27th July 2017 (as per Submission Schedule in MoFPED).</p> <p>The submission of the Final Performance Contract was after the mandatory deadline of 30th June 2017.</p>	No
Assessment area: Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	xxxxx	<p>Soroti District Local Government has a Budget for FY 2017/2018 including a Procurement Plan for FY 2017/2018.</p>	Yes
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			
<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	xxxxx	<p>The Annual and Quarterly Budget Performance Report for FY 2016/2017 was submitted on 18th August 2017 (Receipt No. 4563) issued by MoFPED. This was a late submission.</p>	No

LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)

xxxxxx

All four Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for FY 2016/2017 were submitted to MoFPED as indicated below:

o Quarter One submitted on 2nd December 2016 (Receipt No. 0143) issued by MoFPED.

o Quarter Two submitted on 2nd February 2017 (Receipt No. 0) issued by MoFPED.

o Quarter Three submitted on 19th May 2017 (Receipt No. 0736) issued by MoFPED.

o Quarter Four submitted on 18th August 2017 (Receipt No. 4563) issued by MoFPED.

All quarterly reports were submitted late. The requirement is that quarterly reports should be submitted by the end of the following month after the end of each quarter.

No

Assessment area: Audit

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by April 30 (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action (PFMA Act 2015; Local Governments Financial and Accounting Regulations 2007; The Local Governments Act, Cap 243).</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>Responses were submitted to the Permanent Secretary/ Secretary to the Treasury (PS/ST) on 17th February 2017 covering the nine areas below. This is well before 30th April as required by the PFM Act, 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Unsupported pension payments ii. Understaffing iii. Low absorption iv. Under collection of Local Revenue v. Non Disposal of expired drugs vi. Over payment of salary vii. Un accounted for funds viii. Lack of Land Titles ix. Failure to dispose of assets <p>Therefore, compliant.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>Unqualified audit opinion for FY 2016/17 as per Auditor General Report of December 2017. Therefore, compliant.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Soroti District

(Vote Code: 553)

Score 46/100 (46%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality; and (ii) all Town Councils in a District are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a municipality/district has: • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 2.</p> <p>• All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2.</p>	0	<p>• There is a Physical Planning Committee. It held meetings on the 11th May 2017; 7th February 2017; 17th June 2017; and 22nd December 2016.</p> <p>• There is a Registration Book – it has a column for recording the date of submission but omitted a column for 'date of approval' of plan. THEREFORE, it was not possible to ascertain whether the committee considers new investments within 28 days.</p> <p>There was no Physical Development Plan for entire district. Due to this, therefore, it was not possible to check the consistency of the investments with the physical development plan.</p> <p>It was established that there are Local Physical Development plans for the Rural Growth Centres of Adamasiko, Ochuloi, Achuna, Alongo, Gweri, Tubur; Amen 'A'; Amen 'B', Ogasia Cell; and Oderai.</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>	<p>• Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.</p>	2	<p>The priorities in AWP for FY 2017/2018 WERE SAID to be based on the outcomes of budget conference.</p> <p>HOWEVER, there was no Budget Conference Report availed to ascertain this. Instead the Budget Framework Paper for FY 2017/2018 was availed to justify the linkage.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If different, justification has to be provided and evidence that it was approved by Council. Score 2. 	2	<p>The capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for FY 2017/2018 are derived from the approved Five-Year District Development Plan (2015/2016 – 2019/2020). For example, under Education there is:</p> <p>Construction of a 2 Classroom block with Solar Panels - Amotot in Kamuda SC and Takaramiam in Gweri SC (Page 53 – Soroti DLG Approved Budget – 2017/2018). This links with the DDP II (Page. 115 – Summary of Programmes and Projects – Table 29)).</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 1. 	0	The project profiles were not 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	A statistical Abstract is available in soft form. There is no evidence in the various minutes of the meetings held that it was ever presented to DTPC.
4	<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All infrastructure projects implemented by Soroti DLG in FY 2016/2017 were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the District Council. Refer the Fourth Quarter LG OBT Performance Contract Progressive Report for FY 2016/2017 – [Administration - Pages 77; Production – Pages 87 – 88; Health – Page 93; Education - Page 96; Roads and Engineering – Pages 101 – 102; Water – Pages 106 - 107; Natural Resources – Pages 109 & 111; Planning – Page 130].

		<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	<p>A number of investment projects implemented in FY 2016/2017 were NOT completed as per work plan by end of FY. Some of the uncompleted projects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned purchase of 300 Tsetse fly traps and glosinex. By end of FY - 238 were deployed in Gweri, Asuret, and Soroti Sub-counties. Planned construction of 25 five-stance lined pit latrines in each of the primary schools: Amotor in Kamuda Sub-county; Orimai in Asuret Sub-county; Achuna in Tubur Sub-county; Awaliwal in Gweri Sub-county; and Omulala in Asuret Sub-county – None was constructed.
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 Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	0	<p>Not all investment projects were completed.</p> <p>The total budget for O&M (for all departments) for FY 2016/2017 was UGX 84,306,667, while the actual expenditure was UGX 30,356,200.</p> <p>This was 36% of the budget for O&M [as per Reports and Financial Statements for the Year Ended 30th June 2017].</p>
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				
6	<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The heads of department were appraised and had performance reports DEO, DHO, DCDO, DNRO, CFO,

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district does not have a district engineer because the requirements are too high and the district cannot attract staff for that position • The district production and marketing officer was recruited, given an appointment but shortly turned it down. • Staff structure ARC 135/306/01 and staff list
7	<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of the 2nd DSC 15th – 19th and 22nd may 2017 • Minutes of the DSC 6th to 7th march 2017 to 10th march 2017 • Minutes of DSC 4TH MEETING 2016 5TH -8TH SEPTEMBER 2016 • Minutes of DSC 5th meeting 5th -8th Dec 2016 <p>100% staff submitted for recruitment were considered.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of the 2nd DSC 15th – 19th and 22nd may 2017 Minutes of the DSC 6th to 7th march 2017 to 10th march 2017 • Minutes of DSC 4TH MEETING 2016 5TH -8TH SEPTEMBER 2016 <p>100% staff submitted for confirmation were considered</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the DSC 6th to 7th march 2017 to 10th march 2017 Minutes of the DSC held on 30th – 31st may 2016, min.48/05/2016 DSC minutes 2nd meeting 2016, 4th-15th April 2016 min 35/04/2016 Minutes of DSC 5th meeting 5th -8th Dec 2016 <p>100% staff submitted were considered.</p>
8	<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HRO accessed the pay roll in July, 2017. Was given appointment in May. REF: Pay roll July 2017 Staff surveyor was appointed in May 2017 and accessed in July.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2 	0	<p>All files still in MOPS, for approval Recommendation. The process takes long with ministry and distorts the budget because of the arrears.</p> <p>so they have not accessed the pension payroll</p>
Assessment area: Revenue Mobilization				
9	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If increase in OSR from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10% : score 4 points If the increase is from 5 -10% : score 2 point If the increase is less than 5% : score 0 points. 	0	<p>Own Source Revenue collection in FY 2015/16 was UGX 392,133,154 which decreased to UGX 318,666,670 in FY 2016/17 (registering a shortfall of UGX 73,466,484). This translates into a decrease of -18.7%.</p> <p>Therefore, score zero.</p>

10	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10% : then 2 points. If more than +/- 10% : zero points. 	0	<p>Own Source Revenue was budgeted at UGX 1,111,808,000 in the FY 2016/17 and the actual collection was UGX 318,666,670. This translates into a negative variance of UGX 793,141,330, equivalent to -71.3% budget shortfall.</p> <p>Therefore, score zero.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ugx 6,795,000 remitted to Municipal Council on 30th November 2017 • No remittance to Sub-counties during FY 2016/17. This is contrary to Section 85 (4) of the Local Governments Act, CAP 243, and Regulation 39(2) of the Local Government (Financial and Accounting Regulations) 2007 which require 65% of local revenue collected by the higher local government to be remitted to LLGs. <p>Therefore, score zero.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UGX 90,130,000 was spent on council activities in FY 2016/17 • Total local revenue in FY 2015/16 was ugx 392,133,154 • Therefore percentage of money spent on council activities over total local revenue for FY 2015/16 is 26.3% (which is more than 20%). • First Schedule of the Local Governments Act, CAP 243, requires that expenditure on council activities should not be more than 20% of the total local revenue collection of the previous financial year. <p>Therefore, score zero.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The position of Senior Procurement officer is vacant and not yet recruited. The Procurement officer is present with an Assistant.
		<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"> Minutes are present (10 No) for the works projects) and contracts committee reports seen (10 No)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes are present; deviation was when the contractor quoted more than what was planned but was called for a negotiation meeting to lower the price from 272,935,770 to 250,714,000 dated 13th April 2017.
13	<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AWP is missing in the procurement unit Procurement and Disposal Plan has different activities from the AWP for example the AWP has plans like routine road works and mechanised maintenance of Soroti roads and tree planting yet in the Procurement plan has activities like Construction and Renovations of buildings. The PDU has planned infrastructure of the Force on account projects. Procurement plans for the current year is still in soft copies and has projects that were planned in the previous FY included The current FY has only 3 works projects completed with bids yet in the soft copy presented works projects counted totalled to 11.

14

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

0

- Of the 11 infrastructure projects seen, only 3 of the current FY had bids and of these only 2 were completed by 30th August Advert 13th July 2017. The Invitation of bids also includes infrastructure projects of the previous FY.

- 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 Contracts register the one presented is still in raw hand written form.

- For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2.

2

- Opening bidding advert is filed and seen for projects above 50 million. Of the 10 infrastructure projects presented, they all bided in the Open Domestic bidding. Advert 13th July 2017.
- Construction of a classroom block in Olio P/S in Kamunda sub county 55,059,862 (open biding)
- Construction of a 2 classroom block in Omulala P/S Auret sub county contract price of 50,039,080 (open bidding)
- Construction of a tow in one house for staff in Ocokcan HC II Asuret Sub county contract price 84,450,854 (open biding)
- Construction of a 2 class room block in Ojago P/S Katine sub county 83,981,279 (open biding)
- Fencing and renovation of the veterinary block 60,000,000 (open biding)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only 5 No Interim certificates presented dated 17th March 2017, 17th June 2017, 17th February 2017, 9th March 2017 and 27th April 2017 yet there were more infrastructure projects on going and lacked certificates. Only 2 No final completion certificates were presented dated 22nd January 2017 and 13th July 2017. Other completed infrastructure lacked certificates.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the current year, the infrastructure projects visited have no site boards. The one that had a site board lacked the contract value and it was for the previous FY.
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bank Reconciliation up to date (July 2016 to December 2017) The only items appearing are January 2018 transactions which month is yet to be reconciled because it has not ended. <p>Therefore, a score of 4.</p>
17	<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2. 	2	<p>No pending bills because the system (IFMS) cannot allow printing of an LPO once there is no money to cover the order save for those orders covered under local revenue for example; stationery (receipt books), consultancy fees say, Lawyer’s fees, etc. All bills are handled within 60 days.</p> <p>Therefore, a score of 2.</p>

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.

- Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor and produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 3.

3

Although there is no Substantive Senior Internal Auditor, the LG has an Internal Auditor (appointment letter dated May 17, 2010, reference CR/156/2) who efficiently produces and submits internal audit reports on time. Principal Internal Auditor retired at the end of the FY 2014/15. However, Quarterly Internal Audit Reports for FY 2016/17 were produced and submitted on time as follows;

o 4th Quarter dated 30th August 2017 and e-mailed to MoFPED on the same day 30th August 2017.

o 3rd Quarter dated 18th May 2017 and emailed to MoFPED on the same day 18th May 2017.

o 2nd Quarter date 6th March 2017 and e-mailed to MoFPED on the same day 6th March 2017.

o 1st Quarter – dated 10th November 2016 and e-mailed to MoFPED the same day 10th November 2016

o Hard copy Reports are always submitted after words to the PS/ST.

Since internal audit report are produced and submitted to the relevant recipients, the award of 3 points is justified.

- Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries: score 2.

0

- No audit recommendation and follow up issues discussed in Finance, Planning and Administration and therefore, no recommendation to council.

- LG PAC always meets to discuss Quarterly internal audit reports with no feedback on status of audit recommendation.

Therefore, zero score.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1 	1	<p>Internal audit reports were submitted to CAO and LG PAC as follows;</p> <p>i. 4th Quarter – 29th August 2017 (CAO) and LG PAC</p> <p>ii. 3rd Quarter – 10th August 2017 (CAO) and LG PAC</p> <p>iii. 2nd Quarter – 29th March 2017 (CAO) and LG PAC</p> <p>iv. 1st Quarter – 22nd October 2016 (CAO and LG PAC)</p> <p>Although some reports are yet to be submitted, the LG PAC has met and deliberated on all internal audit reports for FY 2016/17</p> <p>Therefore, score 1.</p>
19	<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No register per LGAM 2007 format The register has motor vehicles and motor cycles only The LG maintains a manual assets register per department after the computer which had been dedicated for that purpose crashed. <p>Therefore, zero score.</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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> unqualified audit opinion: score 4 Qualified: score 2 Adverse/disclaimer: score 0 	4	<p>Unqualified audit opinion for FY 2016/17 as per Auditor General Report of December 2017. Therefore, a score of 4.</p>

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

21	<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2</p>	2	<p>The District Council met and discussed service delivery related issues. For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o MIN. COU 54/05/2017 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 24th – 25th May 2017) o MIN. COU 39/03/2017 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 28th – 29th March 2017). o MIN. COU 40/03/2017 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 28th – 29th March 2017). o MIN. COU 30/12/2016 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 21st – 22nd December 2016). o MIN. COU 17/10/2016 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 5th – 6th October 2016).
22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2. 	0	<p>There is no officer designated to coordinate response to feed-back. However, complaints are usually brought to the CAO, District Chairperson, or RDC; and thereafter discussed in DTPC or DEC.</p>
23	<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</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>There is a Notice Board in the Administration Block (at Soroti District Headquarters) on which the LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedules are displayed.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1 	1	<p>The awarded contracts are usually displayed on the Notice Board in the Administration Block. Also the same information is loaded on to the Government Procurement Portal (under PPDA).</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications, are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1. 	0	<p>Not Applicable. The Central Government did not conduct the Annual Performance Assessment for LGs in 2016/2017.</p> <p>Also the district website is off.</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 	1	<p>The CAO communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during FY 2016/2017. The examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ref: CR/1541 dated 29th July 2016 – Performance Assessment for FY 22016/2017 and Performance Planning for FY 2017/2018 Ref: CR/... dated 21st July 2016 – Operation Wealth Creation Enterprise selection programme. Ref CR/201/5 dated 20th September 2016 – Strategic\guidelines and Directives for Presidential Term 2016 – 2021.
		<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	<p>The district leadership attended community meetings whenever it was alerted e.g. at schools, health units. However, there was no evidence such as reports to support this.</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>	<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"> Guidance is present; the Gender sector is further divided into 3 components of Gender main streaming that focuses on women, Youth livelihood Programme that focuses on youth and People With Disability and Elderly focusing on PWD and elderly people. Gender sector for women had 4 minutes of meetings of FY 2016/17, the YLP had 4 minutes with 2 monitoring reports (12 Dec 2016, 17th May 2017) and PWD sector had 4 minutes (17th July 2017).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that gender focal point has planned activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and that more than 90% of previous year's budget for gender activities has been implemented: score 2. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current year has activities on Gender mainstreaming (women council), disability and elderly people, youth livelihood programs. The budget submitted for the precious year was 4,675,560. Of this, 4,000,000 was spent on activities of women councils which is 86%. Of the total. This budget is only for Gender excluding YLP and PWD. Budgets of Grants programme activities are mixed with LG activities The approved budget was not presented
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Screening forms and certificates seen stamped and signed for all projects undertaken in the district. Monitoring reports present sample dated 26th June 2017, 7th September 2017 and 8th August 2017. Environmental certification for completed projects are also presented for all district projects Sampled 6 approved EIA reports in October 2017, June 2017, May 2017, September 2016 and October 2016

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presented works and infrastructure projects all integrated ESMP involving tree planting, restoration of borrow pits are present in the bids. • Environmental certification of Soroi Gweri Toroma road maintenance • Certification of construction of pit latrine Achuna P/S • Certification of construction of maternity ward at Agirigirot HC • Certification of renovation of veterinary office at Soroti municipality
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No land agreements were presented though land consent forms are available but for different projects and in different departments.
		<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 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental certification reports signed and stamped by Environmental Officer were presented and this also acts as basis for the final payment. These can be seen on the 2 final completion certificates presented dated 22nd January 2017 and 13th July 2017.



LGPA 2017/18

Educational Performance Measures

Soroti District

(Vote Code: 553)

Score 29/100 (29%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				
1	<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 	0	<p>According to the Soroti LG Performance Contract 2017/2018, the district has a wage provision of 5,954,942 billion to cater for 826 teachers and 15 Education Assistants/teachers who are due to be recruited in 2017/2018</p> <p>The LG which has 79 Government aided schools, has a deficit of 14 Head Teachers and 8 schools that do not have the minimum of 7 teachers, has not planned to recruit Head Teachers for 2017/2018</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4 	0	<p>According to the district OBT 2017/2018, 8/79 Government aided schools do not have the minimum of 7 teachers and 14/79 schools do not have a Head Teacher</p> <p>Although the recruitment plan proposes the recruitment of 15 teachers in 2017/2018, there is no provision for the recruitment of any Head Teacher</p>

2	<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision o If 100% score 6 o If 80 - 99% score 3 o If below 80% score 0 	3	<p>The wage bill provision provides for a maximum of 864 teachers. Currently the LG has 826 teachers which translates into 95.6%</p>
3	<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	6	<p>The approved structure has 2 positions for inspector of schools i.e. Senior Inspector of Schools and Inspector of Schools. Both positions are filled</p>
4	<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of Primary Teachers: score 2</p>	2	<p>The recruitment plan from the Education Department indicates that 15 Education Assistants/ Teachers are due to be recruited in 2017/2018</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>The LG does not plan to recruit School Inspectors because both positions for Inspectors are 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>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>	3	<p>The two inspectors of schools were appraised and have appraisal reports</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>	3	<p>• All the substantive head teachers had performance reports</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>There was no evidence that the LG Education Department had a systematic way of communicating guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in 2016/2017.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, the circulars and guidelines (for 2016/2017) availed included;</p> <p>A circular from MOES on Primary Teachers Recruitment Exercise FY 2016/2017 dated 29/9/2016</p> <p>A circular from DES/MOES on Teacher Support Supervision dated 30/6/2017</p> <p>A circular from UNEB on PLE Administration Expenses dated 10/9/2017</p> <p>A circular from UNEB on PLE Center Numbers for Abule Tubur P/S, Awoja Bridge P/S, Takaramiam P/S and Ojom P/S dated 12th April 2017</p> <p>A circular from MOES on EMIS number for Primary Schools dated 7/12/2016</p>
---	--	--	--	---

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

0

Meanwhile the schools visited which were; Orimai P/S, Otatai P/S, Gweri P/S, Owalei P/S and Opuyo P/S presented circulars most of which were different from those that the district presented at the time of assessment. Also, the schools that were visited presented different circulars from those of their counterparts

In Orimai the Head Teacher presented two letters which included a circular from MOES on Management of Teacher and Head Teacher Associations dated 21/12/2016 and another from MOES on Career Opportunity and Life Skills Development Campaign by National Association of School Community ICT Outreach

The Head Teacher in Otatai presented no circular from the National Level channelled through the district for the FY 2016/2017

The Head Teachers in Gweri and Opuyo presented 1 circular from the Ministry of Public Service on change of dates of birth for public officers dated 6th February 2017

The Head Teacher of Owalei presented a circular DES/MOES on Teacher Support Supervision dated 30/6/2017

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level, including on school feeding: score 2 	0	<p>The minutes that were availed indicate that Head Teachers meetings were held on 27th July 2016, 4th October 2016 and 15th June 2017 .</p> <p>None of the minutes addressed matters in the circulars availed during assessment .</p>
7	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all private and public primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all private and public primary schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59% score 1 o Below 50% score 0. 	0	<p>In Q1, 2016/2017, all Government aided schools were inspected in the area of learning achievements. A report dated 10th November 2016 was produced;</p> <p>In Q2, 2016/2017, all Government aided schools were inspected on the effectiveness of Head Teachers performance. A report dated 21/2/2017 was produced.</p> <p>In Q3, 2016/2017, 28/79 Government aided schools were inspected. A report dated 22nd June was produced</p> <p>In Q4, 2016/2017, inspection was done. In the report that was seen, only 16 schools were reached</p> <p>This translates to 35%</p> <p>(drawn from 79 Government aided and 109 Private Schools)</p>

8	<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4 	<p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>There are no minutes to attest that the Department held meetings to discuss the school inspection reports</p> <p>The LG submitted school inspection reports to DES for the 2nd and 3rd Quarter of 2016/2017.</p> <p>The acknowledgement from DES is dated 24th June 2017. Both reports were submitted on the same day.</p> <p>However DES requires that LGs should submit a report for the 4 Quarters</p> <p>There is no evidence of deliberate follow up of inspection recommendations</p>
9	<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5 	<p>0</p>	<p>The List found in the LG Education Department lists 79 Government aided Primary schools, which is similar to the list of schools in the OBT. Meanwhile, EMIS lists 90 Government aided primary schools and 49 private schools</p>

Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5

0

The list from the district is inconsistent with EMIS and with OBT in relation to enrolment data in the Primary Schools

For instance; On the list in the Department, Ojago P/S has 752 pupils. The same school has 728 pupils under OBT and 704 under EMIS

Obyarai P/S has 664 pupils on the list in the Department. The same school has 823 pupils under OBT and 683 under EMIS

Ajonyi P/S has 507 pupils on the list in the Department. The same school has 513 pupils under OBT and 596 under EMIS

Oimai P/S has 974 pupils on the list in the Department. The same school has 973 pupils under OBT and 954 under EMIS

Merok P/S has 725 pupils on the list in the Department. The same school has 733 pupils under OBT and 715 under EMIS

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc...during the previous FY: score 2 	2	<p>The Education, Health, and Community Based Services Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2016/2017. Refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 25th – 26th April 2017 Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 9th – 10th March 2017 Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 13th – 14th December 2016. Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 24th – 25th August 2016.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2 	2	<p>The Education, Health, and Community Based Services Committee sat and generated reports for presentation to the District Council. Refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report of the Education, Health, and CBS Committee presented during the District Council meeting held on 24th – 25th May 2017. Report of the Education, Health, and CBS Committee presented during the District Council meeting held on 28th– 29th March 2017.
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	<p>At the time of assessment, the School Management Committees (SMCs) files for the schools were not availed. This meant that the functionality of the SMC could not be ascertained</p>

12	<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	0	<p>There were no postings of all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants on the district notice boards.</p> <p>At the 5 schools that were visited, information on the grants was posted in the Head Teachers office save for Opuyo P/S that had not posted the grants for 2017.</p>
----	--	---	---	---

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

13	<p>The LG Education department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	0	<p>Procurement requests to PDU from the Education Department were submitted late as follows;</p> <p>Construction of a Classroom block at Takaramiam at 56,300,000/=. Submitted on 22nd May, 2017</p> <p>Supply of Laptop to the Education Department at 3,365,000/=. Submitted on 22nd May, 2017</p> <p>Supply of 36, 3 Seater desks to Takaramiam P/S at 5,000,000/= Submitted on 22nd May 2017</p> <p>Renovation of the Education Department Block at 58,000,000/=. Submitted on 10th July 2017</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>	<p>• Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</p>	3	<p>There is evidence of timely certification of contract execution, recommendation and payment to suppliers e.g;</p> <p>i. Ayo & Sons General Enterprises</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Nature of contract – Construction of 2 classroom blocks at Omulala Primary School. o Date of award – 23rd March 2017 o Contract signing – 27th March 2017 o Payment Request – 10th April 2017 o Date of certificate – 2nd May 2017 o Date of payment – 20th June 2017 <p>ii. Elgonia Two Builders Ltd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Date of award – 6th December 2016 o Date of request – 3rd March 2017 o Date of certificate – 13th March 2017 o Approval date – 28th March 2017 o Payment date – 12th April 2017 <p>Therefore, a score of 3.</p>
----	---	--	---	--

Assessment area: Financial management and reporting

15	<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	0	<p>The department submitted the Annual Performance Report for 2016/2017 (and all four quarterly reports) to the Planner. However, since in DPU there has not been any recording schedule for submission of departmental OBT Baby Files for subsequent integration into the Master OBT Database, it could not be ascertained whether the submission was by mid-July 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"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 4 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points o If all queries are not responded to score 0 	2	<p>There is evidence that sector provides information to Internal Audit on the status of implementation of findings. For example,</p> <p>i. Report for 1st Quarter 2016/17 – Letter dated 8th May 2017 by Deputy CAO, reference CR/252/1 about unaccounted for funds totaling ugx 12,670,000. ACCOUNTABILITY FORM 34B of UGX 8,680,000 dated 11th November 2016 was among accountability for that audit query.</p> <p>ii. Letter dated 8th May 2017 by Deputy CAO, reference CR/252/1 about unaccounted for funds totaling ugx 15,925,548. Submission for UGX 14,700,000 was one of the accountabilities for the query.</p> <p>Therefore, a score of 2.</p>
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				

17	<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</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	<p>There is no evidence of dissemination of guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills</p>
	<p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<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	<p>There is no evidence of issue and explanation of guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	1	<p>The requirement of the gender composition as per the 2nd Schedule of the Education Act 2008 is at least 2 women on the Foundation Body which has a total of 6 people.</p> <p>The schools visited were; Orimai P/S, Otatai P/S, Gweri P/S, Owalei P/S and Opuyo P/S.</p> <p>The Foundation Body of the SMCs in each of the 5 schools had 2 women and 4 men which is consistent with the gender composition guideline of SMC's</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"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 3: 	0	<p>There is no evidence of issue of guidelines on environmental management to the schools by the Education Department in collaboration with the Environment Department</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Health Performance Measures

Soroti District

(Vote Code: 553)

Score 39/100 (39%)

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"> • The structure for primary health workers not filled and district service commission was not fully constituted
2	<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 4</p>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The health department submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to HRM on 15th September 2017 composed of all health needs
3	<p>The LG Health department has ensured that performance appraisal for health facility in charge is conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the health facility in-charge have been appraised during the previous FY: o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The health centre iv in charge has not been appraised. • There is only one because the other has been elevated to regional referral hospital.

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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DHO informed this assessment that since no recruitment done the deployment is net yet done
---	--	--	---	--

Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision

5	<p>The DHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 	0	<p>The DHO presented only one evidence of a training report and communication for roll out of revised consolidated guidelines for prevention and treatment of HIV 2017 facility by facility. This evidence is not sufficient to justify that all guidelines and policies were communicated to facilities.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DHO office informed this assessor that the office lacks a budget line for dissemination of guidelines and policies. In addition, the flow of guidelines from the national level is not consistent and not done properly. The documents are delivered without a plan and a budget for dissemination to health facilities etc

6

The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services

Maximum 6 points for this performance measure

Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3

3

Support supervision report of 7th april 2017 and November 21, 2016 demonstrate that the DHT supervised HC IV and Hospitals and during the supervision of units in HSD the team computed performance in key output indicators for all Units in the health Sub-districts. reviewed the basic health care services for all units, Human resource, essential medicine and health supplies among others.

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

3

- Support supervision report of 7th December 2016 demonstrate that the DHT extensively supervised lower level health facilities which include; Agrig riroi HCII, Arabaka HCII, Awaliwa HCII Madera Catholic NGO HCII, OJom HCII and in all facilities the supervision reports talks about weaknesses/gaps identified, general management issues, Human resource gaps, HMIS issues, financial resources and issues of infrastructure

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>A visit to Tirir Health facility discovered the following regarding supervision of health facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HSD make supervision visits but do not make reports, • The HSD use supervision log books at lower health facilities to fill in the purpose of visit findings and comments <p>The supervision log books have information regarding visits, purpose of visit and findings but the overall documents found at the facility do not provide enough evidence to justify that the health facility has been supervised because there was no specific report documented on the subject.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	0	No evidence seen
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 	0	No evidence presented to show that recommendations are followed up

9	<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for health facility lists as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A list of health facilities and their reporting rate summary was presented as evidence whereby expected reporting and actual reporting was consistently the same. Scoring 100% OBT reporting consistent with HMIS reports
---	--	---	----	---

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"> • Evidence that the council committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	2	<p>The Education, Health, and CBS Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2016/2017. Refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 25th – 26th April 2017 • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 9th – 10th March 2017 • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 13th – 14th December 2016. • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 24th – 25th August 2016.
----	---	---	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	2	<p>The Education, Health, and Community Based Services Committee sat and generated reports for presentation to the District Council. Refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report of the Education, Health, and CBS Committee presented during the District Council meeting held on 24th – 25th May 2017. • Report of the Education, Health, and CBS Committee presented during the District Council meeting held on 28th– 29th March 2017.
11	<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 5 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5 • If 80-99% : score 3 • If 70-79%: : score 1 • If less than 70%: score 0 	5	<p>Committee members appointment letters were presented as evidence for the membership of Soroti HCIII. Minutes were presented as evidence of a functioning HUMC referring to a meeting of HUMC for Tirir HCIV, dated 18th October 2016 where the meeting discussed health facility budget and made approval. The report indicated that HUMC meeting discussed other issue like shortage of staff</p>
12	<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no display of PHC grants seen on district notice boards and notice board of Tiriri health centre IV
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 DHO claim to have submitted procurement requests to PDU - in time but there is no vivid evidence.</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 DHO submitted procurement requests to PDU on 13/6/2017</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>The DHO insisted that the activity is conducted during level II and Level III kit review conducted annually. A list of participants that attended a similar planing exercise was presented as evidence but was dated 27/1/2016 and this is outdated for this assessment.</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>	<p>• Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points</p>	<p>There is timely certification, recommendation and payment to suppliers e.g;</p> <p>i. Contractor – Elgonia Two Builders Ltd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Construction of a staff house at Ococan HC II o Date of award – 15th May 2017 o Contract signing – 16th May 2017 o Date of request – 13th June 2017 o Date of certificate – 15th June 2017 o Date of payment – 27th June 2017 <p>ii. Omaks General Enterprises Ltd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Nature of contract – fencing of Tubar HC II o Contract date – 16th December 2016 o Date of request – 5th June 2017 o Date of certificate – 15th June 2017 o Approval date – 15th June 2017 o Payment date – 27th June 2017 <p>Therefore, a score of 2.</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>The department submitted the Annual Performance Report for 2016/2017 (and all four quarterly reports) to the Planner. However, since in DPU there has not been any recording schedule for submission of departmental OBT Baby Files for subsequent integration into the Master OBT Database, it could not be ascertained whether the submission was by mid-July 2017.</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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	4	<p>There were no audit queries for the health sector during the 1st and 4th Quarters when the sector was audited by internal audit.</p> <p>Therefore, maximum score of 4.</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>A sampled Health facility Tirir has 2 women and 6 men on the Health Unit management committee</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>No evidence shown</p>
19	<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LGs has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal : score 2 points. 	0	<p>No evidence presented</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Soroti District

(Vote Code: 553)

Score 40/100 (40%)

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>	<p>• 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</p>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district safe water coverage data for Soroti district local government is reported at 75.62% (source approved work plan and Budget of Soroti district local government FY 2017/2018 dated 08/08/2017, page 8). • Soroti district local government is comprised of seven (7) rural sub counties with safe water coverage as shown here under: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Arapai s/c- 72.07% - Asuret s/c- 91.26% - Gweri s/c – 62.34% - Kamuda s/c- 68.58% - Katine s/c 74.63% - Soroti s/c – 82.69% - Tubur s/c – 88.90% <p>This is according to approved work plan and Budget financial year 2017/2018 page 9 dated 08/08/2017.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the above it was established that the sub counties with safe water coverage below the district safe water coverage were being targeted for safe water facilities as seen here under: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 deep bore hole drilling in Agule village, Gweri parish, Gweri s/c DWDCSG at estimated cost of 21,000,000/= - 1 deep bore hole in Ariet village, Aukot parish, Gweri s/c DWDCSG at estimated cost of 21,000,000/= - 1 deep bore hole in Owolo

				<p>village, Otatai parish, Asuret s/c DWDCSG at estimated cost of 21,000,000/=</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 deep bore hole in Ongunai village, Aमित parish, Kamuda s/c DDEG at estimated cost of 21,000,000/= - Construction of Adamasiko piped water scheme in Ojom village, Katine s/c DWDCSG at estimated cost of 102.000.000/= (page 16 approved projects for the financial year 2017/2018) <p>This is evident enough that DWO planned to increase safe water coverage for sub counties below the district coverage.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No approved budget was obtained for the previous financial year 2016/2017. • No annual progress reports were obtained for the previous financial year 2016/2017. • Conclusion, these documents were taken by external auditors and have not been returned to the DWO. It was not evident that the LG water department implemented budgeted water projects in the target sub counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous financial year(2016/2017)
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>No annual progress reports and supervision / monitoring reports for the previous financial year 2016/2017 were obtained at the DWO. The verbatim explanation obtained at the DWO is that external auditors carried them to Mbale and they haven't been returned to the water department of Soroti district local government to be verified for the ongoing local government performance assessment exercise.</p>
4	<p>The LG Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: o List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10</p>	10	<p>• Information obtained at MoWE indicates that data in mis reports and OBT is consistent and similar to that obtained at the DWO.</p> <p>For example lists of water facilities in mis report and OBT for the current financial year 2017/2018 indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No of supervision visits during construction as 24 - No of sources tested for quality as 28 - No of water sanitation promotional events as 9 - No of deep boreholes drilled (hand pump and motorised)as 8 - No of deep boreholes rehabilitated as 6 - No of water supply systems constructed (GFS, borehole pumped, surface water) as 01. <p>This justifies the allocated score to the district local government.</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"> Whereas Soroti district water department submits procurement requests to the DPU, they had no official stamp of the water department. This made it impossible to authenticate them as valid documents for official use. No submission reports on procurement were obtained at DWO albeit, sector annual work plan and budget existing at the district water department.
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 If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DWO has no substantive contract manager appointed to manage procurement documentations at the DWO. This makes procurement records management next to impossible. For example no contract management plan was obtained to ascertain when planned water and sanitation activities would be implemented as planned or if wss infrastructures are being constructed as per the BOQs/ specifications. No minutes of site meetings were reviewed to establish if the agreed actions between the DWO and the contractor / consultant were implemented by the contractor. A sample of 5 water projects was not taken since no information or data on contracts was obtained. No BOQ/ specification were obtained per water/ sanitation facility at DWO was obtained.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No hand over reports were obtained at DWO to justify completion of projects
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No completion certificate was obtained at the DWO to check if completed projects were certified as one of the PPDA critical requirements
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	3	<p>i. There is evidence of timely certification of contract execution, recommendation and payment to suppliers.</p> <p>ii. The 2 contract files (KLR Uganda Limited for drilling 11 deep bore holes in various Sub-counties and Roma Furnishings Limited for supply of assorted furniture to Water office) were certified, recommended and payment made on time.</p> <p>Therefore, score 3.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				
8	<p>The LG Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	0	<p>The Water department submitted the Annual Performance Report for 2016/2017 (and all four quarterly reports) to the Planner. However, since in DPU there has not been any recording schedule for submission of departmental OBT Baby Files for subsequent integration into the Master OBT Database, it could not be ascertained whether the submission was by mid-July 2017.</p>

9	<p>LG Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 5 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 If queries are not responded to score 0 	3	<p>Internal Audit Report for 1st Quarter 2016/17 – Letter dated 8th May 2017 by Deputy CAO, reference CR/252/1 about unaccounted for funds totaling ugx 18,939,000 – accountabilities were dated 11th November 2016.</p> <p>Therefore, a score of 3.</p>
---	--	--	---	--

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3 	3	<p>The Works, Production, and Natural Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2016/2017. Refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 24th April 2017 and 8th May 2017. • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 6th – 7th March 2017 • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 7th – 8th December 2016. • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 23rd – 24th August 2016.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	3	<p>The Works, Production, and Natural Committee met and generated reports for presentation to the District Council. Refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report of the Works, Production, and Natural Committee presented during the District Council meeting held on 24th – 25th May 2017. • Report of the Works, Production, and Natural Committee presented during the District Council meeting held on 28th– 29th March 2017.

11

The LG Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency

Maximum 6 points for this performance measure

• The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2

0

• There was hardly any information on the district notice boards showing the AWP, budget and water development grants releases and expenditures was displayed as per the PPDA act and minutes discussed at advocacy meetings.

• No information on the district website pertaining to procurement in the water sector of soroti district local government was obtained since even logging in was not possible.

• From a sample of 5 water projects visited name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding were inscribed as seen here under:

- Alaki B bore hole

Funded by: DWS

DWD 20/3/2017

Installation depth 45m

Drilled by EA Boreholes

Drilled depth 77m

- Omirio village water project

DWD 48111

Funded by: PAF

12/3/2015

Contractor Galaxy Agro Tec ltd

- Alere Bore hole

Funded by: DWSCG

DWD 66222

FY 2016/2017

Date of installation 19/03/2017

• All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding:

2

<p>Contractor and source of funding score 2</p>		<p>Constructed by EA Boreholes</p> <p>Drilled depth 77 m</p> <p>Installation depth 42 m</p> <p>- Angopet single mothers Bore hole</p> <p>DWD NO:46692</p> <p>Completion date 5/1/2018</p> <p>Constructed by: Ebowa Investment ltd Funded by: PAF 12/3/2015 Contractor Galaxy Agro Tec ltd</p> <p>- Alere Bore hole Funded by: DWSCG DWD 66222 FY 2016/2017 Date of installation 19/03/2017 Constructed by EA Boreholes Drilled depth 77 m Installation depth 42 m</p> <p>- Angopet single mothers Bore hole DWD NO:46692 Completion date 5/1/2018 Constructed by: Ebowa Investment ltd</p>
<p>• Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>• No contract information has been displayed on the district notice boards and or district website indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding was obtained at Soroti district local government.</p>

12	Participation of communities in WSS programmes Maximum 3 points for this performance measure	<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 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application files were obtained at DWO as evidence for demand driven approach in access to WSS projects. This justifies the attached score. I.e. Ariet village application a bore hole dated 6/10/2017, Gweri village application for bore hole dated 2/8/2017, Olegei/ Asuret village application for bore hole dated 13/01/2017 and Orobai village application for bore hole dated 29/9/2016 and stamped by the office of LC1 chair man of the area local council 1.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O&M funds and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, for the current FY: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No sector mis information was obtained at DWO on management of o and m funds There were no community minutes indicating collection of funds for o and m at DWO.

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

13	The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management Maximum 4 points for this performance measure	<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 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the district environment office screening templates for wss projects was established and being conducted. I.e. screening for Gweri village borehole was done on 12/9/2017, Olegei village borehole on 13/3/2017. And Orobai village bore hole on 4/10/2016 however, most projects required no EIA reports for their implementation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mitigation plan was obtained at the district environment office to show that there is follow up in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in project execution in previous financial years

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	0	<p>There was no evidence that construction and supervision of contracts was being carried out by the DWO to ascertain if they had a clause on environmental protection as a critical requirement to meet compliance with good environmental and social protection practices. No contracts supervision plan was available at DWO for verification.</p>
14	<p>The LG Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If at least 50% WSCs are women as per the sector critical requirements: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No list of WSC members was obtained at DWO. Besides, the software monitoring / progress reports obtained shows that encouragement of gender participation exists but not at 50% as a basic requirement in management of water source points and funds collected by community members for o and m in the software files.
15	<p>Gender- and special-needs sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/RGCs.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The under mention public sanitation facilities visited meet conditions of equity and inclusion as there were separate stances for males, females and a ramp for PWDs <p>Institutions visited are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acetgwen P/S in sorotri sub county - Opuyo p/s in soroti sub county - Abelet p/s in soroti sub county - Gwere p/s in Gweri sub county - Gweri piped water supply project