



Local Government Performance Assessment

Isingiro District

(Vote Code: 560)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	50%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	43%
Educational Performance Measures	40%
Health Performance Measures	44%
Water Performance Measures	62%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From MoFPED's inventory/schedule of LG submissions of performance contracts, check dates of submission and issuance of receipts and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If LG submitted before or by due date, then state 'compliant' o If LG had not submitted or submitted later than the due date, state 'non-compliant' • From the Uganda budget website: www.budget.go.ug, check and compare recorded date therein with date of LG submission to confirm. 	<p>Annual Performance Contract Submitted & received at MoFPED on 3/8/2018 which is outside the timeline date of 1st August 2018</p>	No
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 by 30th June (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From MoFPED's inventory of LG budget submissions, check whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The LG budget is accompanied by a Procurement Plan or not. If a LG submission includes a Procurement Plan, the LG is compliant; otherwise it is not compliant. 	<p>Consolidated Procurement Plan was accompanied to the performance contract 2018/2019</p>	Yes
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>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted report to MoFPED in time, then it is compliant • If LG submitted late or did not submit, then it is not compliant 	<p>Annual Performance report- Q4 was submitted to MoFPED and received on 29th August 2018 which is outside the timeline date of 31st July 2018</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY by end of the FY; PFMA Act, 2015).</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of quarterly reports submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the quarterly performance reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted all four reports to MoFPED of the previous FY by July 31, then it is compliant (timely submission of each quarterly report, is not an accountability requirement, but by end of the FY, all quarterly reports should be available). • If LG submitted late or did not submit at all, then it is not compliant. 	<p>Quarterly Budget performance report submitted as follows: Q1 dated 15/3/2018 Q2 dated 16/3/2018 Q3 dated 29/5/2018 Q4 dated 29/8/2018 which was outside the timeline date of 31st July 2018</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Audit</p>			

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and the Auditor General's findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action in line with applicable laws.</p>	<p>From MoFPED's Inventory/record of LG submissions of statements entitled "Actions to Address Internal Auditor General's findings",</p> <p>Check:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted a 'Response' (and provide details), then it is compliant • If LG did not submit a 'response', then it is non-compliant • If there is a response for all –LG is compliant • If there are partial or not all issues responded to – LG is not compliant. 	<p>The district provided and submitted information to the PS/ST on the implementation of Auditor General findings for the financial year 2016/2017 in a letter REF CR/252/1 dated 10th April, 2018 which was received by the Accountant General (MoFPED) on 11th April 2018. All the 5 audit issues were responded to in that response letter. This was before the deadline of 30th April 2018 as required by the PFMA.</p> <p>The submission of responses against the audit findings of the Internal Auditor General were submitted in a letter CR/252/1 dated 12th April 2018 and was received by the MOFPED on 18th April 2018. All the internal audit findings were responded to by the LG.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>The audit report for the FY 2017/18 was unqualified.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) 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 district/ municipality has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 1. 	<p>There was a functional physical planning committee as evidenced by minutes of 18/4/2018</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that district/ MLG has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD score 1. 	<p>There was no evidence that district submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All infrastructure investments are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan: score 1 or else 0 	<p>In the absence of a Physical Development plan, it was difficult to ascertain any consistency of planning with new infrastructure investments</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action area plan prepared for the previous FY: score 1 or else 0 	<p>There was no evidence that the Action area plan was prepared for the previous FY</p>	<p>0</p>

<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>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.	<p>From the approved annual work plan for the current FY sectors had no priorities clearly narrated. There was no evidence that the District had conducted a budget conference. In the absence of descriptions of priorities in the Annual work plan for FY 2018/2019 and Budget conference report, it was difficult to establish the linkage.</p>	<p>0</p>
--	--	--	----------

<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>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</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 differences appear, a justification has to be provided and evidence provided that it was approved by the Council. Score 1. 	<p>From the approved annual workplan for the current FY sectors had no priorities clearly described in the AWP. Therefore, it was difficult to establish the linkage with the 5 year Development plan</p>	<p>0</p>
--	---	---	----------

<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>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</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 2. 	<p>No evidence that Project profiles were developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline</p>	<p>0</p>
<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 score 1. 	<p>Annual Statistical Abstract with gender disaggregated data was compiled and presented to the TPC of 11th July 2018</p>	<p>1</p>

<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 	<p>There was 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 Council .</p> <p>Sitting, Drilling, Casting and Installation of production in Ngarama, Ruborogota, Kikagate and Endizi Sub counties.</p> <p>Construction of Ngarama water scheme Phase II, Construction of two Classrooms with 36 seater desks at Rwakahunde SDA P/S in Masha, Construction of Classroom Block with 36 desks at Ruyanga P/S, Mechanized road maintenance Kabuyanda-Kaburara 7.0km Were some of the infrastructure projects implemented that show linkage with the approved budget by the Council</p>	<p>2</p>
<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 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 	<p>From the review of payments certificates for the following investments; Silting, Casting, & Installation production wells in Ngarama, Ruborogota, Kikagate and Endizi Sub Counties, Construction of Ngarama water Scheme Phase II, Construction of two Classrooms with 36 seater desks at Kagabagaba P/S.</p> <p>All these investments were completed as per work plan by end of FY. The District has already issued final certificates of completion indicating 100% execution.</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects 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 	<p>From the District Annual budget performance report a number of projects have been reported completed within the budget and these include:</p> <p>Construction of Classroom Block with 36 furniture at Nyamuyanaza Central P/S ,Construction of Ngarama water scheme Phase II at UGX 190,520,311, Silting, Casting, & Installation production wells in Ngarama, Ruborogota, Kikagate and Endizi Sub Counties UGX 139,015,800,Construction of 2 classroom block with 36 seater desks at Rwakahunde SDA P/S in MashaSub county UGX 61,788,458, Mechanized road maintenance Kabuyanda-Kaburara 7.0km UGX 33,555,200,Mechanized road maintenance Nsiika-Kamutummo UGX 38,848,600 . All were completed within approved budget</p>	2
<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&M budget on infrastructure</p>	0
Human Resource Management			
<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 the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not all HoDs positions are substantively filled at the LG of Isingiro district as at FY 2017/18. As per approved staff structure, there are 13 HoDs and heads of units. In Isingiro district, 10 HoDs positions are substantively filled. This represents 77% (rounded) of positions filled. Broken down as follows: <p>? Chief Finance Officer (filled by Byagagiire Innocent) – position is substantively filled as per appointment letter dated 28/6/2016 signed by CAO Eswilu Donath under min extract DSC896/06/2016(d)(1).</p>	0

? Head Statutory Bodies, (Kyogabiire Oliver) – position is substantively filled as per letter dated 6.02.18 and signed by Eswilu Donath under min extract DSC2060/2018.

? District Education Officer (Nkuba Godfrey) – position is not substantively filled but the incumbent is assigned duties as per letter dated 30/4/2018, signed by Ahabwe Irene which and unreferenced.

? Principle Human Resources Officer position (Irene Ahabwe) –No personal file was presented for accessing documents. It was therefore not possible to obtain and ascertain evidence that would enable credible information whether this officer was substantively appointed or just assigned duties in that office. During the first day of assessment, neither the Senior HR Officer nor her junior were present. The assessment was facilitated by their secretary and records/registry staff.

? District Internal Auditor position (Kagirita Benon) – position is substantively filled as per appointment letter dated 25/2/2015 and signed by Eswilu Donath, CAO.

? District Health Officer (Dr. Edison Tumuserure) position is substantively filled as per appointment letter dated 12/09/2012 and signed by Alex Kwizera under minute extract DSC619/09/2012(1).

? District Production & Marketing (Karugaba Aloysius) – position is substantively filled as per appointment letter dated 20.2.2018 signed by Eswilu Donath under minDSC2067/2/2018(a)1.

? Senior Procurement Officer (Kamwine Frank) – position substantively filled as per appointment letter dated 23/5/2018 and signed by Eswilu Donath under min DSC3019/5/2018.

? Dist Community Development Officer (Mugarura Edward) – this position is substantively filled as per appointment letter of 24/7/2015 under minute extract DSC808/07/2015 signed by Eswilu Donath.

? Trade & Industry (Musinguzi Patrick Danny) – position is substantively filled as per appointment letter dated 13/06/2018 and signed by Eswilu Donath under min extract DSC/3027/5/2018(1).

? District Engineer (Abenaitwe Asafu Turyamureba) – position is substantively filled as per letter dated 25/8/2016 and signed by Eswilu Donath under min DSC934/08/2016(a)1.

? Natural Resources Officer (Bwengye Emmanuel) – position is NOT substantively filled but incumbent only assigned duties as per unreferenced letter dated 22/12/2014.

10 out of 13 HODs were found to have been substantively appointed. This represents 77%.

<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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appraisals during FY 2017/18: Only 5 HoDs were found to have been appraised during FY 2017/18 using standard guidelines from MoPS. Only 5 HoDs were appraised in Isingiro district e.g. Community Based Services Officer was appraised by Eswilu Donath as per appraisal report found in his personal file and dated 30/7/2017, District Health Officer was appraised by Eswilu as per report dated 30/10/2017, Works Engineer was appraised as per appraisal report dated 4/9/2017 and signed by Eswilu. Others were appraised by Eswilu Donath too as per appraisal reports found in their files dated 4/9/2017. This represents 38% of HoDs appraised. 	<p>0</p>
<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 % of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to DSC minutes and submission lists viewed dated 8.05.2018, 6/03/2018 and 30/4/2018, 24/7/2017, 25/10/2017 and 17/01/2018 in Isingiro district, a total of 137 positions were submitted for recruitment at DSC during FY 2017/18. These submissions carried positions such as Engineering assistant, Community Development Officer, IT Officer, Internal Auditor, Treasurer, Veterinary Officer, senior clinical Officer, Health Officer, Forestry Officer, and Anaesthetic Officer etc Reference numbers of the submissions were: CR/214/1 and CR156/4 and signed by Eswilu Donath. Some of other positions submitted include: IT Officer, Enrolled Nurses, Enrolled Midwife, Parish Chiefs, and Education Assistants etc, Submission lists were consulted and contained all the 137 positions considered. New Vision adverts of 29/6/2018 with a receipt of payment, serial number 563330 issued by Vision Group and dated 26/6/2018. Internal adverts dated 31/7/2018 and signed by Nimusiime Willis, 20/8/2018, 20/8/2018 and a handwritten advert of 19/6/2018 confirm that all the 137 positions were considered. Short list dated 1/3/2018, 23/3/2018, 28/11/2017, 13/3/2018, 28/11/2017 etc also further add to confirmation that these positions were all considered for recruitment. That is 100% 	<p>2</p>

<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 % of positions submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 87 staff were submitted for confirmation during FY2017/18 in Isingiro district. Submission lists for confirmation viewed variously dated 20.06.2018, 1/6/18, 20/6/18, 13/12/17, 19/2/18, 2/5/2018 and 11/04/18 – all signed by Eswilu Donath were viewed as containing staff for confirmation. The lists contained staff positions such as Education assistants with reference number as EDU/D/13945 and all presented the 87 staff to District Service Commission for confirmation. Some of the staff carried in these submission lists are: Education Assistant, Enrolled Midwife, Enrolled Nurse, Parish Chief, Town Agent etc. List of confirmed staff verified confirmed that all the 87 staff submitted were considered for confirmation. The DSC meetings also confirmed staff to their positions some of whom were Tukwasibwe Appolo, Turyamureba, Nakanwagi Noelina, Atukwase Andrew, Mutumuliza Aisha, Mubangizi Elly etc confirmed the confirmation consideration of the 87 staff. The list of confirmed staff in Isingiro district during FY 2017/18 indicated that all 87 staff as per evidence explained above. This represents 100% of staff confirmed during FY 2017/18. 	<p>1</p>
<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 % of positions submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 44 staff were submitted to DSC for disciplinary action. According to the submission list and minute extracts some of the 44 cases were considered during DSC meeting sessions 190 of 13/12/2017, 193 of 30/01/2018, 200 of 14/3/2018. According to the lists verified, these DSC meetings considered all the 44 disciplinary cases submitted to DSC during financial year 2017/18. It is therefore evident that all the 44 staff were considered for disciplinary action in Isingiro district. This is 100%. 	<p>1</p>

<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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Of the 105 staff verified as recruited during FY 2017/18, not all of them entered salary payroll within 2 months of recruitment in Isingiro district. This information is derived from recruited staff list. The salary payroll register also which included IPPS numbers of the staff recruited verified from record of documents presented indicated when these new staff accessed first salary. This register revealed that all these new staff accessed salary within the 2 months of recruitment. For example, a sample of 10 of these 105 staff recruited verified accessed salary payroll as follows: <p>July Silverio (Educ. Asst) was recruited 25th / July 2017 and accessed payroll in Sept. 2017 (2months later),</p> <p>Amumporire Christine (Education Asst.) was also recruited as per letter dated 9/5/2018 and accessed salary payroll in 28th May 2018 (1 month later). Ssenyondo Muzamiru (Asst Animal Husbandry officer) and Tuhaise Kenneth (Parish Chief) and Tumuhimbise Fred (Asst. Animal Husbandry Officer) were recruited by letter dated 9/5/2018 and accessed first salary through payroll of 28th May 2018 (1 month later), Bamwogoro Henry (driver) was recruited on date found in a letter of 19/6/2018 and accessed first salary on payroll dated 28/07/2018 (1 month). Therefore, payslips and salary payroll register plus appointment letters viewed clearly provided evidence that only 10 out of the sample of 10 staff accessed salary payroll within 2 months of recruitment. This is 100% of compliance.</p>	<p>3</p>
<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 that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2 	<p>Isingiro District LG submitted 14 staff who retired during FY 2017/18. The list indicated that the 14 staff retired in different months within the FY17/18. Only 1 out of 14 accessed pension payroll within 2 months of retirement. For example, Sikiri Frank (Education Asst. II) retired on 28.11.2018 and has not yet accessed pension payroll about 6 months later. Besigye Mathias (Education Asst II) retired on 1st April 2018 and has not yet accessed the pension payroll as at Oct 2018 (6 months later), Haabwa Taita (Parish Chief) retired on 18/02/2018 and has not yet accessed pension payroll as at Oct 2018 (8 months later), Kibikire Nathan retired on 28/4/2018 and has not yet accessed pension payroll by the time making this assessment in Oct 2018 (5months later), Besigye Mathias is only one who accessed salary within 2 months after retiring in April 2018. Out of the 14, only 1 was compliant by accessing pension payroll within 2 months of retirement. That is 7%.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Revenue Mobilization</p>			

<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 (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets) from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10 %: score 4. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 2. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>The OSR for the district LG reduced by 79% from UGX 320,021,944 in the FY 2016/17 to UGX 178,563,909 in the FY 2017/18. This variance is much more than the acceptable variance of 10%. (Source: District financial statements for FY 2017/18). The Head of Revenue section (Ms Kyomuhendo Jacinta) indicated that major cause of drastic revenue shortfall was political interference with revenue collection. She said that as a result, most revenue collection contractors were threatened by the taxpayers who pulled out.</p>	<p>0</p>
<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 score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0. 	<p>The actual/budget revenue collection ratio for the FY 2017/18 was 52% (UGX 178,563,909 /340,252,740). This resulted in a budget variance of 48% which is higher than 10 %.(Source: budget and financial statements for FY2016/17).</p>	<p>0</p>
<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 	<p>The financial statements for the FY 2017/18 indicated that Local Service Tax (LST) amounting to UGX 91,285,615. However, it was not possible to identify the amount remitted to the LLGs because the final accounts for Isingiro District for FY 2017/18 were so summarised. The Senior Accountant who attended to the LGPA consultant accepted that it was difficult to sort out the remitted LST to LLGs.</p>	<p>0</p>

<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 total Council expenditures on allowances and emoluments- (including from all sources) is not higher than 20% of the OSR collected in the previous FY: score 2 	<p>While the LG collected UGX 320,021,944 in the FY 2016/17 it was not easy to compute the amount of money spent on Council allowances and emoluments due to the summarised way the LG produced its final accounts for the FY 2017/18. The accounts for the FY 2017/18 only indicated a total figure for Council and statutory bodies. It was therefore not easy to identify the expenditure item for allowances and emoluments. The LG was advised to change the format in which they produced the accounts in future.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<p>The district had substantively appointed senior procurement officer (Kamwiine Frank) appointment letter dated 23/05/2018 under minute DSC 3019/5/2018 and assistant procurement officer (Nareba Sylvia) appointment letter dated 18th January 2008 under DSC minute number 85/12/2007 both appointment letters were signed by CAO.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	<p>For all the 5 sampled projects there were no minutes of the TEC meeting however there were evaluation reports and submitted to the contracts committee as shown below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of two classroom blocks at Ruhimbo P/S, the TEC produced the evaluation report on 4th December 2017 which was submitted to the contracts committee on 08/12/2017. • Construction of Ngarama Gravity Flow Scheme, the TEC produced the evaluation report on 4th December 2017 which was submitted to the contracts committee on 08/12/2017. • Construction of two Junior staff houses at Nshungyezi HC III, the TEC produced the evaluation report on 20th February 2018 which was submitted to the contracts committee on 27/02/2018. • Partial completion of administration block for Isingiro Town Council, the TEC produced the evaluation report on 20th February 2018 which was submitted to the contracts committee on 27/02/2018, • Renovation of the plant clinic at district headquarters the TEC produced the evaluation report on 17th May 2018 which was submitted to the contracts committee on 18th May 2018. 	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	<p>The contracts committee considered the recommendations of the TEC as per evaluation reports and approved the award of the contracts without any deviations for all the five sampled projects as evidenced below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of two classroom block at RuhimboP/S, CC sat on 8th December 2017 approved the evaluation report and awarded under minute number 06/12/CC/17/18. • Construction of Ngarama GFS, CC sat on 8th December 2017 approved the evaluation report and awarded on under minute number 12/12/CC/17/18. • Construction of two Junior staff houses at Nshungyezi HC III, CC sat on 27th February 2018 approved the evaluation report and awarded under minute number 09/02/CC/17/18. • Partial completion of administration block for Isingiro Town Council, CC approved the evaluation report on 27th February 2018 and awarded under minute number 04/02/CC/17/18. • Renovation of the plant clinic at district headquarters, CC approved the evaluation report on 18th May 2018 and awarded under minute number 34/05/CC/17/18. 	<p>1</p>

<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 	<p>There was evidence that the procurement and disposal plan for FY 2018/2019 availed which was signed by the deputy CAO on 18/09/18 and received by PPDA on 18th September 2018 covers all Infrastructure projects in the approved AWP for the current FY 2018/2019. The LG procured as per the procurement plan in the previous FY 2017/18, all the sampled projects that were implemented existed in the procurement plan of the FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/ infrastructure by August 30: score 2 	<p>According to the procurement plan for the FY 2018/2019 which was signed by the deputy CAO on 18th September 2018 and received by PPDA on the same day, there were 32 infrastructure projects (exclusive of road maintenance) and the LG had not prepared the bid documents for any of the infrastructure projects (0%) by 30th August 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2 	<p>The LG had an updated contracts register for the previous FY 2017/2018 with all the five sampled projects registered but procurement activity files were incomplete missing TEC minutes.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	<p>According to PPDA guidelines 2008, all works projects above 50 million open bidding should be used while those below 50 million selective bidding should be used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of two classroom block at Ruhimbo P/S was budgeted 65,477,000Ushs and the procurement method used was open domestic bidding. • Construction of Ngarama GFS was budgeted 190,520,311Ushs and the procurement method used was open domestic bidding. • Construction of two Junior staff houses at Nshungyezi HC III, was budgeted 51,386,640Ushs and the procurement method used was open domestic bidding. • Partial completion of administration block for Isingiro Town Council was budgeted 48,732,230Ushs and the procurement method used was selective national bidding. • Renovation of the plant clinic at district headquarters was budgeted 24,772,370Ushs and the procurement method used was selective national bidding. <p>The above indicated that the LG adhered to procurement thresholds for all the sampled five projects.</p>	<p>2</p>

<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 <p>for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</p>	<p>Four of the five infrastructure projects that were implemented had evidence of certification though not all of them were issued with both interim and completion certificates as indicated below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of two classroom block at RuhimboP/S three certificates were availed first one dated 21/05/18 with the amount due totaling 42,531,295Ushs and approved by CAO on 24/05/18, second one dated 19/06/18 with the amount due totaling 16,398,023Ushs and approved by CAO on 22/06/18 and the third one dated 22/06/18 with the amount due totaling 3,273,851Ushs and approved by CAO on 25/05/18. • Construction of Ngarama GFS only one certificate was availed dated 22nd June 2018 with total amount due of 180,994,306Ushs and approved by CAO on 22/06/18. • Construction of two Junior staff houses at Nshungyezi HC III two certificates were availed first one dated 07/05/18 with the amount due totaling 20,286,324Ushs and approved by CAO on 09/05/18 and second one dated 19/06/18 with the amount due totaling 16,398,023Ushs and approved by CAO on 22/06/18. • Renovation of the plant clinic at district headquarters only one certificate was availed dated 22nd June 2018 with total amount due of 15,671,580Ushs and approved by CAO on 22/06/18. <p>The above indicated that not all projects were appropriately certified and the fifth project (partial completion of administration block for Isingiro Town Council) no certificates were availed to the assessor.</p>	<p>0</p>
<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 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 	<p>Two of the sampled projects (Ruhimbo P/S and Nshungyenzi HCIII) had site boards showing the project name, contractor, client/employer, source of funding and the FY but the contract value and expected duration were not indicated. However the other three (Ngarama GFS, renovation of plant clinic and partial completion of administration block) did not have site boards.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management</p>			

<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 	<p>The monthly bank reconciliation statements (BRS) for the FY 2017/18 were updated, verified and approved. Except for the TSA Account, the rest of the bank reconciliation statements for other bank accounts (such as UMFSNP, Global Fund, Youth Recovery, UWEP, UNICEF, DICOSS etc) were not done for the new FY 2018/19 for the for the months ended July, August and September 2018. There was no adequate explanation from the Senior Accountant for the non-compliance with the LGFAR on the preparation of BRS.</p>	<p>0</p>
<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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2. 	<p>In the education, health and water sectors, all the 13 sampled payments were cleared on time (within 30 days) as provided for in the contracts ie there were no overdue payments(For detailed payments, see the sections of education, health and water sectors below) .</p>	<p>2</p>
<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: 1 point. • LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2. 	<p>The District Internal Auditor (Mr Mwesigye Benon Kagirita) was substantively appointed a Principal Internal Auditor (scale U2) by the District Service Commission under minute DSC774/02/2105/b as per appointment letter dated 25th Februar 2015 signed by the Chief Administrative Officer (ESUILU DONATH). This position is as per the LGPA Manual.</p>	<p>1</p>

<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"> • LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2. 	<p>The DIA produced 4 quarterly Internal Audit reports. First quarterly report was signed on 31st October 2017. The Second quarter report was dated 31st January 2018. The 3rd quarter report was dated 27th April 2018 and the 4th quarter report was dated 31st July 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<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>	<p>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 from all quarterly audit reports: score 2.</p>	<p>There was no evidence of information to LGPAC and Council on the implementation of the implementation of Internal Audit findings. There was no evidence of submission of the status of implementation of internal audit issues to LGPAC and Council.</p>	<p>0</p>
<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 internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1. 	<p>There was evidence that internal audit reports for the FY 2017/18 were submitted to both AO and LGPAC on the following dates respectively :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st quarter report on 30th /09/2017 . 2nd quarter report on 31st /01/2018 3rd quarter report on 27th /04/2018 4th quarter report on 31st /07/2018 <p>However, there was no evidence of review and follow up of all internal audit issues for the FY 2017/18. There was no evidence of LGPAC minutes or reports in respect of that matter.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG maintains an up- dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	<p>The assets registers were in place and in a prescribed format. In addition there was evidence of an updating them. For example a number of assets put in place by the LGs in the FY 2017/18 could be traced in the assets registers eg. 2 classrooms block & 33 three seater desks at Rwakahunde SDA PS, a 2- classroom block+ 36 three seater desks at Kagabagaba PS, 2 classroom block +36 three-seater desks at Rwamwijuka PS and 2 classroom block +36-three seater desks at Saani Pentecoastal PS.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion 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 	<p>The external audit report for the FY 2017/18 was unqualified.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>The district availed a set of council minutes for the FY 2017/2018 as follows: 30/5/2018,28/3/2018; 20/12/2017, 25/10/2017,23/8/2017 and all the sets of minutes provide proof that Council met and discussed service delivery related issues including; inspection of school/monitoring performance,operating theatre at Rugaaga HCIV,Construction of OPD at Kashumba</p>	<p>2</p>

<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 1. 	<p>There was no evidence that LG designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints</p>	<p>0</p>
<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"> • The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which should be displayed at LG offices and made publically available: score 1 	<p>There was no evidence that the LG specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievance</p>	<p>0</p>
<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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2 	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had published payroll and pensioner schedule on public notice board</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1. 	<p>There was no evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts had been published</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</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. 	<p>There were no evidence that the LG performance assessment results for previous financial year had been published</p>	<p>0</p>
<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 	<p>1 The District planner communicated and explained national guidelines on Discretionary Development Equalisation Grant (DDEG) for 2018/2019 to LLG planners on 4/12/2017</p>	<p>1</p>

<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 LG during the previous FY 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. 	<p>There was no proof that this activity was conducted</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<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 and CDO have provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion into their activities score 2. 	<p>The CDO provided guidance to sector departments as evidenced in the report on gender awareness training for women groups in lower local governments dated 17th November 2017 signed by Senior Community Development Officer.</p>	<p>2</p>

<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 gender focal point and CDO have planned for minimum 2 activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and address vulnerability and social inclusions and that more than 90 % of previous year's budget for gender activities/ vulnerability/ social inclusion has been implemented: score 2. 	<p>The LG CDO had planned for sensitization meetings on gender violence, gender awareness meetings, mentoring LLG staff on gender and donations among others as activities for the current FY 2018/2019 as provided by the Gender Focal Person and evidenced in the AWP for the current FY 2018/2019.</p> <p>The previous year's budget was 2,140,635,670Ushs as evidenced in the budget of the FY 2017/2018. The total expenditure as provided by sub-accountant for community development services department and signed by for CAO on 8th October 2018 amounts to 1,499,635,000Ushs which was 70% of the previous year's budget. This showed that less than 90% of the previous year's budget was implemented.</p>	<p>0</p>
<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 1 	<p>No evidence of environmental screening was availed for all the five sampled projects (construction of two classroom block at Ruhimbo P/S, construction of Ngarama GFS, construction of two junior staff houses at Nshugyezi HCIII, renovation of the plant clinic at district headquarters and partial completion of administration block for Isingiro town council) and there was no proof that mitigation measures were planned and budgeted for.</p>	<p>0</p>

<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 the LG integrates environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	<p>There was no proof of integration of environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents for all the sampled projects that were implemented in the FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<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 all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1 	<p>For all the sampled projects there was no proof of land ownership availed to the assessor.</p>	<p>0</p>

<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 all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO: score 1 	<p>For all the sampled projects there was no evidence that environmental and social mitigation certification forms were signed by the environmental officer and CDO.</p>	<p>0</p>
<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 the contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance (new one): Score 1 	<p>There was no evidence that environmental and social clearance was done for all the sampled projects.</p>	<p>0</p>

<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 officer and CDO monthly report, includes a) completed checklists, b) deviations observed with pictures, c) corrective actions taken. Score: 1	<p>There was no evidence that the environmental officer and CDO report monthly therefore no completed check lists and observed deviations for all the four projects implemented.</p>	<p>0</p>
---	---	--	----------

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>The LG education de- partment 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>	<p>• 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</p>	<p>Some P7 schools in Isingiro District did not meet the minimum requirement: for example, Kamutiganzi, Karunga, Karyamenvu P.S, had 7 classrooms but budgeted for 5 teachers. This was according to the PBS generated on for on 03/08/2018, 04:01.</p>	0
<p>The LG education de- partment 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>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</p>	<p>According to the evidence from the PBS generated on 03/08/2018, 04:01, deployment of teachers and head teachers fell below the minimum requirements. For example, Kigabagaba P.S, had 7 classrooms but budgeted for 5 teachers and no head teacher, Rwabyemera P7 had 4 teachers budgeted for but no head teacher. Several other schools had similar issues.</p>	0

<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>Data from the PBS generated on 03/08/2018, 04:01, showed the staff ceiling for Isingiro District for Primary Schools according to the wage bill as 1181 but currently the staff structure is filled at 1144 teachers thus a difference of 37 staff. This translates to a 97% structure filling.</p>	<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>According to the staff structure approved by Ministry of Public Service on 2nd November 2017, Ref:ARC135/306/01, for Isingiro District, the local government is supposed to have two school inspectors. Indeed the two positions were filled with 1 senior inspector appointed on 8th May, 2014 by DSC Minute number 743/5/2014 (e) (1) and 1 inspector of Schools appointed on 25th February 2015, under DSC minute number 774/02/15 (e)</p>	<p>6</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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary Teachers: score 2 	<p>The education department submitted a recruitment plan on 10th October 2017 and a replacement plan for FY 2018/19 which was received on same day by the HRM office.</p>	<p>2</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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Inspectors: score 2 	<p>The district has already filled all inspectors' positions as per the staff structure and recruitment plan did not show the gap of Inspector of schools</p>	<p>2</p>
--	---	---	----------

Monitoring and Inspection

<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 has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% school inspectors: score 3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 2 School Inspectors in Isingiro district local government, as shown by the list of inspectors and personal files verified. It is evident by looking into personal files and school inspectors' list that both 2 school inspectors were not appraised during FY 2017/18. No appraisal reports were found in their personal files. This therefore demonstrates non-compliance and represents a percentage of 0%. 	<p>0</p>
---	--	--	----------

<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 has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary school head teachers o 90 - 100%: score 3 o 70% and 89%: score 2 o Below 70%: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 189 Primary Schools in Isingiro district. A sample of 10% of 189 Primary schools was made to make 19 Primary Schools. Thus personal files of 19 Head Teachers of these schools were presented and analysed. Reviewing these personal H/Teachers' files, there was no appraisal reports or performance agreements were found in 8 of them. This implies that 8 primary school head teachers were not appraised during FY 2017/18. Some of the head teachers sampled included the following for example Tushemerirwe Peninah of Kibona Girls' Pr. School, Twesigye George of Kamaaya P Sch., Tumwekwase Setrine of Kyabishaho Pr School, Muhumuza Omar Bikwatsizehi of Rwekubo Pr Sch., Bwiruka Abel of Kagogo United P. Sch., Tumusiime Edmond of Burigi COU P School, Rubarema Charles of Rwabyemera P School, Asiimwe Johnson of Kabatangare P School, Natukunda of Kyanza P School, etc. Out of the sampled files, it is found that 11 of the head teachers in Isingiro district were appraised during FY 2017/18. This means that appraisal of 11 primary school head teachers represents compliance at 58% in Isingiro district. 	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>None of the three circulars required for verification were available at the Isingiro DEO's office. Therefore there was no evidence of communicating them to schools.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: score 2 	<p>No evidence was found to show dissemination of the circulars to the schools.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all registered primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59 % score 1 o Below 50% score 0. 	<p>Insingiro District had 62 licensed and registered schools: of these 40 schools were visited every term and had Inspection reports presented for terms one and two of 2018. This therefore translates to 65% of schools inspected for the period under review.</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>Basing on the schools visited, the education department held meetings on 02/07/2018 and 15/06/2018 with head teachers where issues from inspections were discussed and resolutions made on the same.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>The district submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES). An acknowledgement letter dated 15th April 2018 was seen in the District Submission files.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed- up: score 4. 	<p>Although there were a number of schools inspected, reports produced with recommendations, there was no evidence of following up these recommendations.</p>	<p>0</p>
<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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>The list of schools in the PBS had a difference with that provided by the MoES: the PBS had 184 while the MoES list had 174, a list in the DEO's Office, has 189 government aided schools. This therefore brings a discrepancy.</p>	<p>0</p>
<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>	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS: score 5 	<p>The enrolment data for 2017/2018 according to the district PBS records was 90,753, while enrolment from the MoES list was 94,818. This gives a variance of 4,063 pupils which is a significant difference. However, the difference is attributed to the schools that were missed out on the MoES list and the influx of refugees.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The LG committee re- sponsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented 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 	<p>Council Committee responsible for Education met on the following days; 30/5/2018,28/3/2018; 20/12/2017, 25/10/2017,23/8/2017 and discussed issues like Construction of teachers house at Nyabubare primary school</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG committee re- sponsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>There was no evidence that the education sector committee presented issues that required council approval</p>	<p>0</p>
<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/ MEO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80 % schools: score 0 	<p>A file with approved SMCs was accessed at the DEO's office and other files with minutes from SMCs and the sampled schools had their meetings, but majority of them were held in 2016 and 2017. Detail of the most recent is as follows:</p> <p>Kahirimbi P/S: 1st March 2018, 4th October 2017</p> <p>Rwera P/S: 20th April 2018, 25th October 2018, 29th June 2017</p> <p>Kaberebere Town.S: had minutes for 2nd term 2017 and older ones of 2016</p> <p>Rwekubo P/S: 16th November 2017, and older, no minutes for 2018.</p> <p>Rwamurunga P.S:24th November 2017 and older, no minutes for 2018</p>	<p>0</p>

<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 <p>e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</p>	<p>There was no posting on the notice boards or walls of the district of the non-wage recurrent grants. Among the primary sampled schools, Rwekubo and Kihirimbi P.S did not have the posting anywhere</p>	<p>0</p>
---	---	--	----------

Procurement and contract management

<p>The LG Education department has submitted input into the LG procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements,</p> <p>to the Procurement Unit 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 input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	<p>No evidence was availed.</p>	<p>0</p>
---	---	---------------------------------	----------

Financial management and reporting

<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. 	<p>The LG education department certified and recommended payments to suppliers on time because the 5 sampled contracts (agreements) were paid for within 30 days stipulated in the contracts as indicated below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Amba East African Ltd –PV.EDUC/06/2018 for UGX 32,141,005 for construction of 2 classroom block at Rwakahunde PS was invoiced on 26/06/2018 and paid on 03/06/2018 (8days). 2. Regitex Technical Services Ltd - PV.EDUC/06/2018/008 for UGX 15,473,340 was invoiced on 18/06/2018 and paid on 18/06/2018(1day) 3. NIJ Engineering& Consultancy Ltd –PVEDUC/26/06/2018 for UGX 22,722,764 for construction of 2 classroom block and furniture at Rwamwijuka PS was invoiced on 18/06/2018 and paid on 18/06/2018 (1 day) 4. Buld Wide Holdings Ltd-PV.EDUC/05/2018/047 for UGX 42,531,295 for construction of 2 classroom block +furniture was invoiced on 24/05/2018 and paid on 04/06/2018(5days) 5. ESMO Holdings ltd PV.EDUC/06/2018/27 (UGX 17,747,908) for construction of 2-classroom block+ furniture at Saani Pentecoastal PS was invoiced on 26/06/2018 and paid on 26/06/2018 (1 day). 	<p>3</p>
<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 15th of July for consolidation: score 4 	<p>Planner the annual performance report for the previous FY 2017/2018 for Consolidation on 29/8/2018 which is later than the timeline of mid- July</p>	<p>0</p>

<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 o If all queries are not responded to score 0 	<p>The education department did not have audit queries to respond to.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			

<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 teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills, etc.: Score 2 	<p>The DEO's office provided a copy of circular dated May 5th 2018, disseminated to the schools urging senior women and men to ensure hygiene, life skills, and primary health care.</p>	<p>2</p>
<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 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 	<p>During meetings held on 2nd July and 15th June on 2018, with head teachers the education department has scantily mentioned the guidelines, it is not clear which guidelines they were actually indicating.</p>	<p>0</p>
<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 School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	<p>The Guidelines on gender composition for the SMCs says the committee should have at least 2 females on the team. All the sampled schools adhered to this guideline: for example for the sampled schools; Kaberebere Town School had 2 females, Rwekubo P.S had 5 females, Kihirimbi P.S had 4 females members.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide- lines on environmental management are dissemi- nated and complied with</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 1: 	<p>There was a circular provided that was disseminated to all schools talking about environmental awareness: the circular urged the head teachers to pass on messages of environmental conservation to parents and pupils and to form environment clubs.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide- lines on environmental management are dissemi- nated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all school infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 1 	<p>No evidence was provided.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide- lines on environmental management are dissemi- nated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1 	<p>No evidence was provided.</p>	<p>0</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health care workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health care with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 80% filled: score 8 • 60 – 80% - score 4 • Less than 60% filled: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the performance contract (generated on the 03/08/2018 04:01) and approved structure revealed that there are 455 established position of primary health workers filled. • Review of wage IPFs in performance contract (generated on the 03/08/2018 04:01) revealed that there are 455 positions of health worker with a wage bill provision of 4,186,355,292/= for the year 2018/19 • Hence more than 80% of the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY has been filled 	8
<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan for primary health care workers to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/re- quest to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of primary health care workers: score 6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the performance contract (generated on the 03/08/2018 04:01) revealed that there was a staff establishment and recruitment plan for the year 2018/19. • Review of the recruitment plan revealed that 495 vacant positions of primary health care workers had been included. • There was a submission letter from the DHO to the CAO copy to Principle Human Resource officer dated 14th May 2018 and received by the HRM on the same day. 	6

<p>The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital In-charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 4 Health Centre 4s in Isingiro district with their respective In-charges as follows: <p>Tusiime Fortunate Nabanza is In-charge of Rwekubo HC4 and records in his personal file indicate that she was appraised as per report dated 28/3/2018 by Ahabwe Irene. Dr. Ampeire Isaac Petiti who is In-charge of Kabuyanda HC4 was appraised during FY 2017/18 as per appraisal report viewed and dated 2/7/2018 and signed by Eswilu Donath. In-charge of Nyamuyanja HC4 is called Dr. Buhamizo Martin. He was appraised as per appraisal report found in his personal file dated 20/8/2018 and signed by Dr. Edson Tumusherure. The fourth HC4 in Isingiro district is called Rugaaga HC4 and it is headed by Mugerwa Enock. Equally, there is no evidence of appraisal in his personal file, that is, there was no appraisal report found in his personal file and no effort was made to produce or present any. Therefore it is safe to conclude that this in-charge was not appraised during the FY 2017/18.</p> <p>Therefore, 3 out of the 4 HC4 In-charges of Isingiro district were appraised during FY 2017/18, which is 75%.</p>	4
<p>The Local Government Health department has 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 in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY, and if not provided justification for deviations: score 4 	<p>The number of midwives and enrolled nurses deployed at Rwekubo HC IV (2enrolled nurses, 5 enrolled midwives & 3clinical officers), Kamuli HC II (1 enrolled nurses, 1 nursing assistants, 1 porter & 1 Askari) and Mabona HC III (2 enrolled nurse & 2 enrolled midwife) as counted on the health worker`s list on deployment are consistent with the staff Lists submitted with the budget of 2018/19</p>	4
Monitoring and Supervision			

<p>The DHO/MHO 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/ MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 	<p>There was no evidence (a communication letter) to indicate that the MHO communicated ALL of the following guidelines issued by the national level in the FY 2017/18:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Health Guidelines for Local Government Planning Process Health Sector Supplement – 2017 Ministry of Health, Sector Grant and Budget Guidelines to Local Governments FY 2018/19 Ministry of Health, Policy Strategies for Improving Health Service Delivery 2016-2021 	<p>0</p>
<p>The DHO/MHO 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/ MHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	<p>There were no DHT meeting minutes provided to indicate that the DHO held discussions with the health facility in-charges and among others explaining the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level.</p> <p>In addition none of the sampled health facilities (Rwekubo HC IV. Mabona HC III & Kamuli HC II) had copies of the three prioritized guidelines</p>	<p>0</p>
<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/MHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: score 3</p>	<p>There was no Q1 Integrated support supervision report</p> <p>Q2 Integrated support supervision report dated 19th December was presented. The only HC IV reported as covered in this report is Kabuyanda HC IV.</p> <p>Q3 and Q4 Integrated support supervision reports were presented for FY 2017/18.</p> <p>In addition to this a review of the supervision log book at Rwekubo HC IV revealed that the DHT had supervised that HC IV only twice (on the 13th November 2017 and 27th March 2018) during the FY 2017/18.</p> <p>Hence the DHT did not supervise 100% of the 3 HC IVs at least once in a quarter</p>	<p>0</p>

<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/MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% supervised: score 3 • 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>The DHT provided no evidence (copies of support supervision reports by the HSDs) to indicate that all 3 HSDs supervised lower level health facilities within the FY 2017/18</p> <p>During the visit to Rwekubo HC IV only 3 of the 4 quarterly mandatory HSD supervision reports were provide</p> <p>Review of the supervision log book at Mabona HC III revealed that it had NOT been supervised by Isingiro North HSD in the FY 2017/18</p> <p>Review of the supervision log book at Kamuli HC II revealed that it had only been supervised by Rwekubo HC IV only once (on the 27th February 2018) during the FY 2017/18</p>	<p>0</p>
<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 all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	<p>The health department and HSDs did not provided the 4 mandatory quarterly integrated support supervision reports for the FY 2017/18.</p> <p>Review of the only set of DHT meeting minutes presented during the assessment (dated 6th November 2017, 20th November 2017 and 26th March 2018) did not have a minute or record of discussions of the mandatory quarterly integrated support supervision reports and using the reports to make recommendations</p>	<p>0</p>

<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 recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 	<p>There was no record of discussion of neither the DHT nor HSD integrated support supervision reports. Hence no recommendations to be followed upon.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding 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"> List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10 	<p>The lists of health facilities receiving PHC funding (in PBS generated on the 03/08/2018 04:01) is consistent with the list received from MoH (health facilities reporting 2018/19).</p> <p>All 52 health facilities in PBS are also on the HMIS list from MOH.</p>	<p>10</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<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 LG committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>Council Committee responsible for health met on 30/5/2018,28/3/2018; 20/12/2017, 25/10/2017,23/8/2017 discussed service delivery issues forexample nomination of Health management committee for Kabuyanda,Rwekubo,Rugaaga, Nyamuyanja HCIVS</p>	<p>2</p>

<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 health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>There was no evidence that the health sector committee had presented issues that required council approval</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 6 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 6 If 80-99 %: score 4 If 70-79: %: score 2 If less than 70%: score 0 	<p>HUMCs were not fully functional as not all sampled HFs held the four mandatory HUMC meetings and meetings minutes presented.</p> <p>Rwekubo HC IV - presented the 4 mandatory HUMC meeting minutes dated 29/09/2017, 19/12/2017, 23/03/18 & 29/06/2018</p> <p>Kamuli HC li - presented only 3 sets of HUMC meeting minutes dated 7/12/2017, 29/03/2018 and 22/06/2018</p> <p>Mabona HC III – had NO minutes presented for FY 2017/18.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 4 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 4 	<p>There was posting on the public notice board at the DHOs office of a list of all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants however none of the HFs visited (Rwekubo HC IV, Mabona HC III & Kamali HC II) had a positing of the PHC non-wage recurrent grant received on a public notice board.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and 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 input to procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2 	<p>Review of the performance contract (generated on the 03/08/2018 04:47) revealed that there was a procurement plan for the year 2018/19.</p> <p>There was a submission letter from the DHO to the Procurement Disposal unit dated 29th March 2017 and received by the PDU on the 29th March 2017</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and 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 LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2. 	<p>There was a copy of form PP1 with PD entry name and code – ISIN 560. (Subject of procurement – Construction of structures at different health centers). Confirmation of need was established on the 24th January 2018 and was signed for confirmation of funding by the CAO on the same day</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/ MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4. 	<p>The DHO certified and recommended payments to suppliers on time because the sampled 4 contracts certified and recommended suppliers within 30 days as per the contracts as evidenced below: 1. Katuma Construction Ltd –PV No. HEA/MAY/2018/009 (UGX 20,286,324) for construction of a junior staff house & 2 stance latrine at Nshungyezi Health centre III was invoiced on 08/05/2018/15 and paid on 17/05/2018(7 days).</p> <p>2. Kinombe-Nyakazinga Construction Co Ltd on PV No.HEA/JUNE/2018 (UGX 29,956,041) for construction of Junior staff house at Rushasha HCIII was invoiced on 22/06/2018 and paid on 23/06/2018 (1 day).</p> <p>3. Rwemigo Mordern Contractors & Engineers Ltd- PV No .HEA/JUN/ 2018 (UGX 9,370,982) for construction of OPD at Kashumba HCIII was invoiced on 25/06/2018 and paid on 27/06/2018 (3 days).</p> <p>4. Isingiro Stationery & general Services Ltd (UGX 645,000) for photocopying services was invoiced on 23/01/2018 and paid on 04/02/2018(10 days).</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<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 depart- ment submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	<p>Planner the annual performance report for the previous FY 2017/2018 for Consolidation on 29/8/2018 which is later than the timeline of mid- July</p>	<p>0</p>

<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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG health department had 4 queries in quarter 2 and 2 queries in quarter 3 and 2 issues in quarter 4. There was no evidence of responses by the DHO on the above audit findings in the financial year 2017/18 from internal audit. 	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<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 (i.e. minimum 30 % women: score 2 	<p>All Health Unit Management Committees (HUMCs) at the sampled health facilities met the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum of 30% females on the HUMC).</p> <p>Murema HC II (2 female & 4 male)</p> <p>Rwekubo HC IV (4 female & 5 male)</p>	<p>2</p>

<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 the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2. 	<p>There was no evidence LGs had issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities (No communication letter from the LG was provided).</p> <p>None of the visited HFs had guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities. In addition the toilets at Mabona HC III, and Kamuli HC II were not separated (labeled for Male and Female)</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 2 	<p>The health department implemented 3 health facility infrastructure projects at Rushasha HC III, Kashumba HC III & Nshungyezi HC III (Construction of staff junior houses). However there was no evidence (screening checklist and a risk mitigation plan) provided to indicate that health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 2 	<p>No site visit or inspection reports by the district EO or CDO for the health facility infrastructure project (Construction of staff junior houses) as there were no risk mitigation plan developed in the first place</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal: score 4. 	<p>Off all the HFs visited (Rwekubo HC IV. Mabona HC III & Kamuli HC II), only Rwekubo HC IV had a chart on medical waste management guidelines pinned in either the labor ward and laboratory</p>	<p>0</p>
---	--	--	----------

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<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 district Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below average coverage: score 10 o If 80-99%: Score 7 o If 60-79: Score 4 o If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>Data obtained from MIS reports at the Ministry of Water and Environment and the District Water Office revealed that the average safe water coverage for Isingiro District for FY 2017/18 was 37%.</p> <p>The Sub-counties with safe water coverage below the District average were Endiinzi (36%), Kabuyanda (33%), Kashumba (30%), Mbaare (28%), Masha (24%), Ngarama (35%) and Rushasha (13%).</p> <p>From the Annual Work plans and PBS for FY 2018/19, out of the total Sector Development Grant of UGX 523,548,843 /=, the total budget allocation to Sub-counties below the District average was UGX 377,408,293/= representing 72 % of the total Sector Development Grant and was distributed as follows:-</p> <p>Endiinzi S/C UGX 25,345,000/=</p> <p>Kabuyanda S/C UGX 7,770,256/=</p> <p>Kashumba S/C UGX 2,238,795/=</p> <p>Mbaare S/C UGX 7,770,256/=</p> <p>Masha S/C UGX 5,531,461/=</p> <p>Ngarama S/C UGX 328,752,525/=</p> <p>Rushasha S/C UGX 0</p>	4

The district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)

Maximum 15 points for this performance measure

- Evidence that the district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.

- o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs:

Score 15

- o If 80-99%:
Score 10

- o If 60-79: Score 5

- o If below 60 %:
Score 0

The review annual progress report for FY 2017/18 prepared by the District Water Office revealed that the following projects were implemented:

- Construction of Ngarama Piped Water Scheme Phase II.
- Drilling of 4 No. production boreholes.
- Rehabilitation of 15 No. boreholes.
- Supply and installation of 4 No, communal Rain Water Harvesting Tanks.
- Design of one piped water supply system.

Out of the above projects, the following were implemented in the Sub-counties with safe water coverage below the District average:

- Construction of Ngarama Piped Water Scheme Phase II in Ngarama Sub-county.
- Drilling of two production boreholes in the Sub-counties of Endiizi and Ngarama.
- Rehabilitation of 3 No. boreholes in the Sub-counties of Kashumba, Mbaare and Masha

In capital terms, about 66% of the water projects were implemented in the Sub-counties with safe water coverage below the District average.

<p>The district Water department carries out monthly monitoring of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the district Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>The review of the annual progress report revealed that the District Water Office had constructed the Ngarama Piped Water Scheme Phase II, constructed 4 No. communal Rain Water Harvesting Tanks, rehabilitated 15 No. boreholes, drilled 4 No. production boreholes and designed one piped water supply scheme. The availed periodic inspection reports clearly indicated that all the new projects were regularly supervised and monitored. Data from the District Water Office indicated that there were functional 66 No. protected springs, 113 No. shallow wells, 147 No. deep boreholes, 878 Rain Harvesting Tanks and 272 Public Tap-stands. Monitoring reports on the files indicated that during the FY 2017/18 about 191 water supply points were monitored and supervised every Quarter by the District Water Office supported by the Extension Staff (Health Assistants and Community Development Officers) located at the respective Sub-counties. It is therefore estimated that about 764 out of 1476 functional water supply points were monitored and supervised which represented about 52%.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the district has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: Score 5 • List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>The District Water Office submitted There was evidence that FORM 1 (Data Collection Form for Point Water Sources) and FORM 4 (Source Functionality, Management and Gender) to the Ministry of Water and Environment for capture in the MIS. The list of the water facilities reported in the PBS were consistent with MIS records at the Ministry of Water and Environment which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of Ngarama Piped Water Scheme Phase II. • Drilling of 4 No. production boreholes. • Rehabilitation of 15 No. boreholes. • Supply and installation of 4 No, communal Rain Water Harvesting Tanks. • Design of one piped water supply system. 	<p>5</p>

<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>List of water facilities indicated in the Ministry of Water and Environment MIS reports were consistent with those in PBS as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of Ngarama Piped Water Scheme Phase II. Drilling of 4 No. production boreholes. Rehabilitation of 15 No. boreholes. Supply and installation of 4 No, communal Rain Water Harvesting Tanks. Design of one piped water supply system. 	5
Procurement and contract management			
<p>The district Water department has submitted input for district's procurement plan, 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 input for the district procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	<p>The sector submitted in put for the District Procurement Plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on 27th April 2018 which was within the stipulated time frame.</p>	4
<p>The district 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 contract manager prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2 	<p>There was evidence in form of signed letters that the District Water Officer was appointed Contract Manager by the Chief Administrative Officer to manage and supervise WSS contracts. E.g. for the construction of the Ngarama piped water supply scheme Phase II, the District Water Officer was appointed Contract Manager in a letter dated 29th January 2018. Regarding the drilling of 4 No. production boreholes, the District Water Officer was appointed Contract Manager in a letter dated 19th February 2017. Contract Management Plans were prepared and the review of the sampled WSS projects revealed that monitoring and supervision visits were conducted on monthly basis.</p>	2

<p>The district 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 water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	<p>All designs for water supply and sanitation facilities were approved by the District Engineer and were availed to the Assessor for review. The Assessor inspected the Ngarama piped water supply scheme in Ngarama Sub-county, one production borehole in Ngarama Sub-county and two communal Rain Water Harvesting Tanks in Mbaare Sub-county. All of the water supply and sanitation facilities were found functioning satisfactorily as per engineering designs.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district 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 contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	<p>Certificates of Practical Completion and Handover Reports were prepared, certified and filed appropriately. E.g. Under Procurement Reference No. ISIN 560/WRKS/2017 -18/00008 for the construction of Ngarama piped water supply scheme in Ngarama Sub-county, contracted to M/s GAT Consults Ltd, Certificate of Practical Completion was signed by all parties on 22nd June 2018 and under Procurement Reference No. ISIN 560/WRKS/2017 -18/00010 for drilling of 4 No. production boreholes in the Sub-counties of Ngarama, Endiinzi, Ruborogota and Kikagate contracted to M/s ICON Projects Ltd, Certificate of Practical Completion was signed by all parties on 29th June 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district 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 DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2 	<p>Sampled Interim Payment Certificates showed that the District Water Officer had duly certified the Payment Certificates. E.g. Under Procurement Reference No. ISIN 560/WRKS/2017 -18/00008 for the construction of Ngarama piped water supply scheme in Ngarama Sub-county, contracted to M/s GAT Consults Ltd, Interim Payment Certificate No.1 was duly certified by the District Water Officer on 2nd February 2018. Under Procurement Reference No. ISIN 560/WRKS/2017 -18/00010 for drilling of 4 No. production boreholes in the Sub-counties of Ngarama, Endiinzi, Ruborogota and Kikagate, contracted to M/s ICON Projects Ltd , Interim Payment Certificate 1 was duly certified by the District Water Officer on 25th June 2018. Under Procurement Reference No. ISIN 560/SRVCS/2017 -18/00106 for the design of Kinyara Gravity Flow Scheme, contracted to M/s Build wide Holdings Ltd, Interim Payment Certificate 1 was duly certified by the District Water Officer on 20th June 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The district Water department has certified and initiated payment for works and supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<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"> The LG Water department certified and recommended payments to suppliers on time as provided for the contracts A sample of 4 payment vouchers and contracts showed that all payments were certified and paid within a maximum of 30 days provided for in the contract as evidenced below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> GAT Construction Ltd-PV. No. 116. (UGX 165,355,182) for construction of Ngarama Water Phase II, was invoiced on 22/06/2018 and paid on 29/06/2018 (7 days). ICON Projects Ltd-PV.No.115 (UGX 88,053,530) for siting, Drilling, and installation of 4 production wells, was invoiced on 25/06/2018 and paid on 02/07/2018(7 days). GAT Consult Ltd-PV.121 (UGX 15,639,113) for construction of Ngarama Water Supply phase II was invoiced on 25/06/2018 and paid on 26/06/2018(1day). Build World Wide Holdings Ltd-PV.081 (UGX 26,196,000) for surveying, design and documentation of Kinyara Gravity Flow Scheme/Kabuyanda was invoiced on 22/06/2018 and paid on 25/06/2018 (3 days). 	<p>3</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<p>The district Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Plan- ning 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 	<p>The District Water Office submitted to the District Planner the annual performance report for the FY 2017/18 on 6th July 2018. The Quarter 1 performance report was submitted on 19th October 2017, the Quarter 2 performance report was submitted on 24th January 2018, Quarter 3 performance report was submitted on 9th April 2018 and Quarter 4 including annual performance report was submitted on 6th July 2018. Therefore the annual performance report was submitted earlier than the stipulated date.</p>	<p>5</p>

<p>The District Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</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 	<p>The LG Water department did not have any audit queries in the FY 2017/18.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>findings for the previous financial year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <p>If queries are not responded to score 0</p>		
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The district 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 	<p>The Isingiro District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee held meetings on 13th October 2017, 12th January 2018 and 27th March 2018 to discuss water supply and sanitation issues and prepared submissions to the Standing Committee for Works, Production and Natural Resources which held meetings on 10th October 2017, 22nd May 2018 and 23rd August 2018 and considered among others the reports from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The district 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 water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	<p>The Isingiro District Council meetings were held on 23rd August 2017, 25th October 2017, 20th December 2017, 28th March 2018 and 30th May 2018 where the Standing Committee for Works, Production and Natural Resources presented the reports which contained among others water supply and sanitation issued which required approval from the Council.</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2. 	<p>The was no evidence that the AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures were displayed on the District Notice Boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2 	<p>The water supply projects which were sampled on 5th and 8th October 2018 were the Ngarama piped water supply scheme in Ngarama Sub-county, one production borehole in Ngarama Sub-county and two communal Rain Water Harvesting Tanks in Mbaare Sub-county. All the above projects were clearly labeled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	<p>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) were displayed on the District Notice Boards.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If communities apply for water/ public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	<p>Application letters from communities for water supply/public facilities were not availed for review.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water and Sanitation Committees that are functioning evidenced by either: i) collection of O&M funds, ii(carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, iii) facility fenced/protected, or iv) they an M&E plan for the previous FY: score 2 <p>Note: One of parameters above is sufficient for the score.</p>	<p>The sampled water supply facilities were fenced, properly maintained and functioning satisfactorily. Quarterly reports from Extension staff on functionality of Water User Committees and software activities implemented were available on files.</p> <p>O & M funds were being raised in form of user fees. Communities being served by protected springs and boreholes pay user fee of UGX 500/= per household per month. Whereas for gravity flow schemes, communities pay user fee of UGX 1,000/= per household. The respective Water and Sanitation Committees were responsible for the collection and safe custody of the user fees with the support supervision from the Sub-counties and District Water Office. Each Water and Sanitation Committee kept a book where records of funds received and spent are maintained.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	<p>There was no evidence that environmental screening was conducted for all the projects.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1 	<p>Since no environmental screenings were undertaken, environmental concerns could not be ascertained.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	<p>Sampled construction and supervision contracts did not have clauses on environmental protection.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district 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 and at least one occupying a key position (chairperson, secretary or Treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements: score 3 	<p>Review of information contained in FORM 4 (Source Functionality, Management & Gender) and the Annual Progress Reports revealed that at least 50% WSCs are women and at least one occupied a key position (chairperson, secretary or treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements.</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/</p> <p>RGCs provided by the Water Department.</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 	<p>Due to financial constraints and provision of safe water supply being a priority, no public sanitation facilities have been constructed since FY 2015/16</p>	<p>0</p>
--	--	---	----------