



Local Government Performance Assessment

Kaabong District

(Vote Code: 559)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	17%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	52%
Educational Performance Measures	40%
Health Performance Measures	64%
Water Performance Measures	63%

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>Kaabong District Local Government submitted the Final Performance Contract on 2nd August 2018 and approved on the same date as per the submission schedule of MoFPED, which was after the deadline of 1st August 2018.</p> <p>Note: The PFMAA LG Budget guidelines require the submission to be by 30th June. However, this date was revised to 1st August 2018 as per the request from MoFPED.</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>Kaabong District Local Government submitted a Budget for FY 2018/2019; including a Procurement Plan for FY 2018/2019 on the 2nd August 2018 as per the submission schedule of MoFPED. The District Council approved the Budget under MIN. 04/DC/5/2018 during the Council meeting held on 30th May 2018.</p> <p>However, the submission of the Budget for FY 2018/2019; including a Procurement Plan for FY 2018/2019 was done after the deadline of 1st August 2018 as required.</p> <p>Note: The PFMAA LG Budget Guidelines require the submission to be by 30th June. However, this date was changed to 1st August 2018 as per the request from MoFPED.</p>	<p>No</p>
--	--	---	-----------

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>The Annual Budget Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 was submitted on 3rd September 2018 (as per computer-generated date on the Q4 report submitted to MoFPED). Kaabong DLG was missing on the MoFPED Submission Schedule.</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline 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>All the four Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for Kaabong DLG for FY 2017/2018 were submitted to MoFPED as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter One Report was submitted on 12th January 2018 to MoFPED and approved on the same date (as per Submission Schedule of MoFPED). • Quarter Two Report was submitted on 19th February 2018 to MoFPED and approved on 20th February 2018 (as per Submission Schedule of MoFPED). • Quarter Three Report was submitted on 20th May 2018 to MoFPED and thereafter approved on 28th May 2018 (as per Submission Schedule of MoFPED). • Quarter Four Report was submitted on 3rd September 2018 to MoFPED (as per computer-generated date on the Q4 report submitted to MoFPED). Kaabong DLG was missing on the MoFPED Submission Schedule. <p>The reports for the first three quarters were submitted by end of the FY as per PFMA Act, 2015 – Section 21 (3). However, the Quarter Four Report was submitted on 3rd September 2018, which was after the end of FY 2017/2018 contrary to the legal requirement</p>	No
Audit			
<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and the Auditor General's</p>	<p>From MoFPED's Inventory/record of LG submissions of statements entitled</p>	<p>The Accounting Officer submitted to the PS/ST information regarding the</p>	No

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.

“Actions to Address Internal Auditor General’s findings”,

Check:

- 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.

status of implementation of all the 14 findings raised by the Internal Auditor General in FY 2016/2017 on 26th/3/2018 Ref. CR/156/8 later than the recommended date of 28th February 2018 contrary to provisions of the PFMA 2015 section 11 2g.

These queries included:

- Budget & review performance
- Non-transfer of grants to LLGs
- Delays in procurement process
- Delays to run the advert for recruitment of Road gangs.
- No budget provision for payment of retention for boreholes drilled in FY 2015/2016.
- Incomplete projects, amongst others

In addition the Accounting Officer submitted to PS/ST information regarding the status of implementation of 7 findings raised by the OAG for FY 2016/2017 on 26th /3/2018 Ref. CR/156/8 later than the recommended date of 28th February 2018 contrary to the provisions of the PFMA 2015 section 11 2g.

These queries were:

- Unaccounted for funds.
- Utilization of medicines & health supplies.
- Inadequate controls surrounding domestic arrears.
- Unauthorized excess expenditure.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to implement budget as approved by Parliament. • Lack of land titles. • Low recovery of Youth Livelihood Funds. 	
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>Kaabong obtained Unqualified Audit Opinion for FY 2017/18</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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CAO / Kaabong appointed members to the DPPC (as per letter Ref: CR/D/213/01 dated 10th October 2017). However, the committee was not functioning properly. Only two meetings were held - on 24th June 2018, and 3rd November 2017. • There was a Records Book where submitted plans were entered by the Physical Planner. 	0
<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>The DPPC had only held two meetings, i.e. on 24th June 2018, and 3rd November 2017. These minutes were not submitted to the PS / MoLHUD as required.</p>	0

<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>Kaabong DLG did not have a physical development plan. Therefore, all infrastructure investments were not informed by a Physical Development Plan because the latter was non-existent.</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 were no local area physical development plans prepared by Kaabong DLG during FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>0</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

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.

• Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.

The priorities in the Kaabong DLG AWP for FY 2018/2019 were based on the outcomes of budget conference that was held on 14th November 2017.

For instance under:

• Health: 'Rehabilitation of an OPD at Morulem HC II' (Page 50 of AWP for FY 2018/2019) and Budget Conference Report - Presentation of Health Department: 'Infrastructure Priorities – OPD Morulem HC II' - Page 6.

<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>The capital investments in the approved Annual work Plan for the FY 2018/2019 were derived from the approved Kaabong 5-Year District Development Plan (2015/16 – 2019/20).</p> <p>For example under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health: ‘Staff House Construction’ in AWP for FY 2018/2019 (Page 50) and ‘Construction of 32 Staff Houses’ in the DDP (Chapter 3: District Strategic Direction and Plan - Section 3.6: Summary of Sectoral Programmes / Projects – Page 154). • Planning: ‘Construction of two administrative blocks in Lokori and Lotim Sub-County Headquarters’ in AWP for FY 2018/2019 (Page 85) and ‘Construction of administrative block in Kalapata Sub-county Headquarters’ in the DDP (Chapter 3: District Strategic Direction and Plan - Section 3.6: Summary of Sectoral Programmes / Projects – Page 163). • Note: Lotim SC was curved off Kalapata SC as per letter (Ref: ADM/327/328/02 dated 6th November 2015) from Hon. Minister of Local Government (Adolf Mwesige), regarding ‘Creation of New Sub-counties in Kaabong District’. With this development, the District Council decided to construct the administrative block in the new sub-county of Lotim as per meeting held on 30th May 2018 (Min. 04/DC/5/2018 - Reading of the Approval of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o AWP and Budget for FY 2018/2019 o Revenue Enhancement Work Plan o Capacity Building Plan o Recruitment Plan o Procurement Plan). 	
--	---	--	--

<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>The district developed project profiles for the investments in the FY 2018/2019, AWP were discussed by the Kaabong DTPC (as per Minutes of DTPC held on 27th October 2017, Min. 04/DTPC//27/10/17 – Profiling of Priorities for FY 2018/2019).</p>	<p>2</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>The district prepared the Annual Statistical Abstract (2017), with gender disaggregated data and presented it to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making (as per Min. 5/Jan/2018 – Presentation of the Statistical Abstract).</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>The infrastructure projects implemented during FY 2017/2018 (as indicated in the Local Government Quarterly Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 (Vote 559 – Quarter 4), were derived from the Annual Work Plan and Budget Estimates for FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>For example under:</p> <p>Education: 'Classroom Construction and Rehabilitation – Construction of 2 classroom blocks at Lomunyen PS – Lolelia SC, and Pajar PS – Kaabong TC' (LG Quarter 4 Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 – Vote 559 Kaabong - Page 63), and 'Construction of 2 classroom blocks at Lomunyen PS and Pajar PS' (Kaabong DLG AWP and Budget – Page 46).</p> <p>Health: 'Staff Houses Construction and Rehabilitation – Construction of a 4 Unit staff house at Kakamar HC II' (LG Quarter 4 Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 – Vote 559 Kaabong - Page 58), and 'Construction of a 4 unit staff house at Kakamar HC II (Kaabong DLG AWP and Budget – Page 43).</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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>The list of investment projects (32) excluding water and roads) provided by the PDU – Kaabong DLG indicated that all had been completed by 30th June 2018.</p> <p>The examples of completed projects were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renovation of district education office (EDUCATION) – Reference No. Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00034. • Rehabilitation of cattle crush at (KAWALAKOL S/C) – Reference No. Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00036. • Fencing of Lopedo Airstrip at Lodiko s/c (PLANNING UNIT) – Reference No. - Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00001 	<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>The total budget for the 32 investment projects was UGX 1,464,166,667; and the total amount spent was UGX 1,490,531,183.</p> <p>The total expenditure was 101.8% of the total budget.</p>	<p>2</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 the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	<p>Kaabong DLG budgeted UGX 67,495,000 on O&M during FY 2017/2018, and spent UGX 35,260,500.</p> <p>This was 52.2% of the budget for O&M as per Draft Final Accounts for the Year Ended 30th June 2018 (NOT page numbered BUT coded - GL Account Nos. 228002 & GL Account Name: Maintenance – Vehicles; GL Account Nos. 228003 & GL Account Name: Maintenance – Machinery; GL Account Nos. 228004 & GL Account Name: Maintenance – Other).and Kaabong DLG Budget, Vote 559.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Human Resource Management</p>			

<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 	<p>There were 10 HoD at U1 E salary scale in the approved establishment / organisation structure. Four (4) were substantively appointed as per their appointment letters;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. D/CAO – LG/P/10708 dated 7th March 2018 2. DEO – CR/156/1 dated 28th February 2008 3. D/CDO – CR/156/1 dated 1st July 2016 4. D/PO - CR/156/1 dated 28th February 20008 <p>Two (2) were appointed Acting Heads of Department as per their letters of appointment as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ag. CFO – CR/D/154/01 dated 1st April 2017 2. Ag. District Engineer – CR/156/6 dated 10th March 2018 <p>Four (4) were performing duties of HoD as follows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Duties of the DHO were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Medical Officer (U3) as per the appointment letter CR/156/02 dated 31st October 2012 2. The duties of the District Planner were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Bio-Statistician (U4) as per the appointment letter CR/156/1 dated 1st November 2007 3. The duties of the D/Commercial Officer were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Accounts Assistant as per the appointment letter 156/3 dated 22nd April 2002 4. The duties of the D/NRO Officer were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Environment Officer (U4) as per the appointment letter CR/D/157/01 dated 1st June 2015 	<p>0</p>
---	---	---	----------

<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 	<p>There was evidence that all HoDs were appraised on the following dates as per appraisal reports seen:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> D/CAO – 2nd July 2018 CFO - 16th August 2018 D/Planner – 15h July 2018 D/Engineer - 17th July 2018 DEO – 1st July 2018 D/CDO – 5th July 2018 D/NRO – 2th July 2018 D/PO – 8th August 2018 D/Commercial Officer – 2nd July 2018 DHO – 2nd July 2018 	<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 staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	<p>Forty-seven (47) new positions were submitted to the DSC for recruitment of new employees for the following departments</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>1. Health Dept.</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Natural Resources Dept.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Community Development dept.</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Works Dept.</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. Administration Dept.</td> <td>21</td> </tr> </table> <p>As per the submission letter CR/157/01 dated 12th October 2017</p> <p>There was evidence that they were all considered during the DSC meetings held between 21st March and 10th April 2018 as per minutes reference DSC/KBG/ 212/ 238/2, minute number 64/DSC/KBG/2918</p>	1. Health Dept.	5	2. Natural Resources Dept.	2	3. Community Development dept.	15	4. Works Dept.	4	5. Administration Dept.	21	<p>2</p>
1. Health Dept.	5												
2. Natural Resources Dept.	2												
3. Community Development dept.	15												
4. Works Dept.	4												
5. Administration Dept.	21												

<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 	<p>Eight (8) names of employees were submitted to the DSC for confirmation of their appointment as per the submission letters dated 21st August 2017</p> <p>There was no evidence that they were considered by the DSC</p>	<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 positions submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	<p>There were no submissions for disciplinary action</p>	<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 	<p>The district recruited forty seven (47) new employees during the month of April 2018.</p> <p>They assumed duty during the month of May 2018, as per the Posting Instruction letters dated 21st May 2018, seen</p> <p>Seven (7) names were sampled and found on the district IPPS payroll for the month of June 2018 as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adee Gertrude Parish Chief, Payroll number - 1023939 2. Ayoo Agnes Odwar Community Development Officer – Payroll number 1023919 3. Logwee Francis, Staff Surveyor - Payroll number- 1023856 4. Atim Helen Senior Assistant Secretary (Lokeri Sub County Chief) payroll number – 1023947 5. Lokol Jino Principal Assistant Secretary, payroll number 858790 6. Maraker Jennifer, Planner, payroll number – 1023951 7. Chepukiru Personal Secretary, payroll number - 102958 	<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>Two employees retired during the FY 2017/18. There was no evidence that they accessed the pension payroll</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>OSR collected in FY 2016/2017 (excluding sale of assets) was Shs. 130,517,005 whereas OSR collected in FY 2017/2018 was Shs. 1181,212,762 which resulted into an increase of Shs. 50,695,757 as per the Council's Final Accounts for FY 2016/2017- page No.18 and Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/2018- page No. 20</p> <p>The percentage increase was: 39%</p> <p>Workings:</p> $50,695,757/97,13,517,005 \times 100 = 39\%$ <p>This increase which complied with the PFMA 2015 Section 45 (3) was attributed to the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG registered more interest groups who benefited from Micro finance under OPM thus more revenue from registration certificates. • Interest earned from bank accounts i.e. Education A/c earned Shs. 42,137,422 and Works A/c earned Shs. 2,598,000. Source: Draft Final Accounts FY 2017/2018 – Annexes to Financial Statements: Trial Balance (not page numbered).
--	--	---

LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

• 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.

Original budget for local revenue in FY 2017/2018 was Shs. 284,493,000 against which Shs. 181,212,762 was collected representing a budget out-turn of 63.7% as per the LG Budget Performance report for July 2017 – June 2018 (not page numbered), and Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/2018- page No.20.

Therefore the LG budget realization was 36.3% below the planned local revenue for FY 2017/2018.

Workings:

$$181,212,762/284,493,000 \times 100 = 63.7\%$$

Therefore, the Budget realization/ratio was:

$$100\% - 63.7\% = 36.3\%$$

This budget realization which contravened the LGFAR 2007 section 32 was attributed to the following factors:

- Low revenue base for LLGs thus low 35% transfer to the District.
- Revenue planned from Kidepo National Park of Shs. 187,726,000 in FY 2017/2018 was not collected at all.

Source: Budget Performance for July 2017 – June 2018 (page not numbered).

<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 District collected Shs. 48,391,381 in FY 2017/2018 in respect of Local Service Tax.</p> <p>Source: Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/2018- page No. 20.</p> <p>However, the District only transferred Shs, 2,000,000 to Kaabong Town Council as per PV-9/8 dated 16th/8/2017 and retained Shs. 46,391,381 representing a sharing ratio of 4.1% to 95.9% contrary to LGA Cap 243 as amended, Regulation 85 (4).</p> <p>No transfer was made to the rest of the 18 sub-counties.</p> <p>This contravention of the recommended sharing formula of 65% to 35% in the LGA Cap 243 as amended was largely attributed to the fact that the LG's only source of revenue was LST and Agency fees thus could not adhere to the recommended sharing formula.</p> <p>The only revenue which was shared equitably in accordance with the law was Shs.1, 000,000 collected on behalf of Sidok sub-county in respect of a fine charged on impounded charcoal on 5th/2/2018. Shs. 650,000 in respect of 65% was transferred by the District to Sidok LLG on 12th/2/2018 vide PV- 9/2</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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actual local revenue collected in FY 2016/2017 was Shs. 130,517,005 of which 20% equivalent to Shs. 26,103,401 was supposed to be the maximum expenditure for Council emoluments and allowances in FY 2017/2018. Source: Final Accounts for FY 2016/2017- page No.18 However actual expenditure on Council emoluments and allowances in FY 2017/2018 was Shs.26, 431,000 representing 20.3% above the recommended 20% contrary to the 1st Schedule Regulation 4 of the LGA Cap 243 as amended. <p>Source: 4th quarter Performance Report to MoFPED for FY 2017/2018- page No. 12.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workings: $26,431,000/130,517,005 \times 100 = 20.3\%$ No evidence of written authority from the Minister of Local Government to spend beyond 20% was sought by the Accounting Officer contrary to 1st Schedule Regulation 4 (A) of the LGA Cap 243 as amended. 	<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 no Senior Procurement Officer. Duties were performed by a Procurement Officer as per his appointment letter CR/156/1 dated 28th March 2008</p>	<p>0</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>The LG TEC conducted business on a number of days to evaluate procurements under both open and selective bidding for the 2017/18 FY. TEC for example evaluated the sampled projects as follows, Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00002 Construction of a 4 unit staff house at Kakamar HCII and Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00007 on 15th-16th November 2017 under minute 06/11/2017. Construction of a classroom block at Pajar primary school. On 16th-17th January 2018 under min.04/01/2018 Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00020 Construction of a plant clinic at the production department. On 22nd February under min. 06/02/2018 ,</p> <p>Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00001 Fencing of Lopedo Airstrip and</p> <p>Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00034 Renovation of district education office on 21st March under min.05/01/2018 .</p>	<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 LG Contracts Committee awarded the evaluated projects as follows; Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00002 Construction of 4 unit staff house at Kakamar HCII and Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00007 Construction of a classroom block at Pajar primary school were awarded on 8th January 2018 under MINO4/JAN/DCC/2017/18. Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00020 Construction of a plant clinic at the production department on 7th February under MINO4/FEB/DCC/2017/18 ,</p> <p>Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00001 Fencing of Lopedo Airstripo on 27th February under MINO4/FEB/DCC/2017/18 and Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00034 Renovation of District education office on 23rd March 2018 under MINO4/MAR/DCC/2017/18. The Contracts Committee based its decisions to award contracts for projects on the recommendations of TEC.</p>	<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>The District procurement and Disposal plan for 2019/18 covered all the infrastructure projects as in the approved district annual work plan . For example, under the Education department the following infrastructure projects were included; Construction of a staff house at Longerep primary school, staff house at Lopedo primary school, classroom block at Lowaky primary school (page 3 of 22 in the Dist, proc. Plan 2018/19).</p> <p>Under the Planning unit, Construction of Lotim sub-county headquarters (page 6 of 22) and under health, Construction of a 4 unit staff house at Timu HCII (page 9 of 22). The LG made procurements for 2017/18 FY in adherence to the procurement plan.</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>The district had not prepared any bid documents for infrastructure/investment projects for 2018/2019 FY. Information got from the procurement officer revealed that they were still preparing the bid documents and were planning to complete the process by end of September.</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 district did not have an updated Contract register as the provided Contract register book did not show detailed information about the executed contracts. There was no information on amount paid on the contracts, as well as the amount</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>The LG adhered with procurement thresholds for the projects implemented in 2017/18 FY. This was evidenced through the following awarded projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00002 Construction of 4 unit staff house at Kakamar HCII worth 67,500,000 (open domestic bidding), 2. Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00007 Construction of a classroom block at Pajar primary school worth 61,633,200 (open domestic bidding) 3. Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00020 Construction of a plant clinic at the production department worth 41,000,000 (selective bidding) 4. Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00001 Fencing of Lopedo worth 73,251,000 (open domestic bidding) 5. Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00034 Renovation of District education office worth 24,950.000 (selective bidding) 	2
<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2 	<p>The works projects implemented in 2017/18 were appropriately certified and all the 5 sampled projects were issued with certificates of completion as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Construction of staff house at Kakamar HCII was issued with a certificate of completion on 30th June 2018, -Construction of a classroom block at Pajar primary school. on 28/9/2018, -Construction of a plant clinic at the production department on 28/9/2018 , -Fencing of Lopedo Airstrip on 28/9/2018 and -Renovation of district education office on 28/9/2018. 	2

<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>There were no projects under implementation in 2018/2019 as the bid documents had not been prepared.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management</p>			

The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.

• Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment:
score 4

The LG had not yet been rolled on IFMS. It operated 22 Cash books/ Bank Accounts a sample of which were:

- Kaabong District General Fund A/c.
- Kaabong District Administration A/c.
- Statutory Bodies A/c.
- Health A/c.
- LGMSD A/c.

All the monthly bank reconciliations for FY 2017/2018 were prepared by the respective sector Accountants, reviewed by the District Accountant and approved by the CFO as per sampled June 2018 bank reconciliations below:

• Kaabong District General Fund A/c was reconciled on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per bank statement: 494,764 and balance as per cash book: 494,764.

• Kaabong District Administration A/c was reconciled on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per bank statement: 3,718,990 and balance as per cash book: 16,990.

• Statutory Bodies A/c was reconciled on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per bank statement was 12,337,210 and balance as per cash book: 102,710.

• Health A/c was reconciled on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per bank statement: 82,201,566 and balance as per cash book: 303,316.

• LGMSD A/c was reconciled on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per bank statement: 79,575,422 and balance as per cash book: 77,686.

However, July to August FY 2018/2019 had not been made due to delays in procuring the 22 Cash books. They were procured in September 2018.

<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2. 	<p>There was evidence of timely payment of suppliers during FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M/s Caltex Service – Kaabong Invoice No. 1369 dated 26th/3/2018 for Shs. 1,140,000 was recommended for payment by CAO on 14th/5/2018 and was paid on 18th/5/2018 vide PV 13/05 within 49 days. • M/s Atoduko Enterprises request for payment of Shs. 15,811,110 on 28th /2/2018 for construction of staff house at Narengapak P/S was recommended for payment by CAO on 14th/3/2018 and paid on the same day vide PV 05/03. • M/s Sure Deal 2004 General Traders Ltd request for payment of Shs. 9,456,570 on 12th/4/2018 for construction of 2 stance lined latrine at Kakamar P/S was recommended for payment by CAO on 4th/5/2018 and paid on 15th/5/2018 vide PV 12/05 within 23 days. • M/s Zakaria & Sons General Enterprise Invoice No. 099 dated 29th/8/2017 for Shs. 1,450,000 was recommended for payment by CAO on 30th/8/2017 and paid on 31st/8/2017 vide PV 20/8 within 2 days. 	<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 LG did not have a substantive Senior Internal Auditor as required.</p> <p>However, Owilly Bob Richard was appointed as Internal Auditor on 1st/6/2016 under DSC Min. 46/2016 (1) was</p> <p>The LG did not have a substantive Senior Internal Auditor as required.</p> <p>However, Owilly Bob Richard was appointed as Internal Auditor on 1st/6/2016 under DSC Min. 46/2016 (1) was caretaking as Head of Internal Audit. He did not have a formal letter of assignment from CAO.</p> <p>The LG efforts to recruit a substantive Head of Internal Audit had been rendered futile by the Government ban on recruitment.</p> <p>as Head of Internal Audit. He did not have a formal letter of assignment from CAO.</p> <p>The LG efforts to recruit a substantive Head of Internal Audit had been rendered futile by the Government ban on recruitment.</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"> • LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2. 	<p>The LG produced all the 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/2018 in accordance with the LGA Cap 243 as amended section 90 (2) as indicated below:</p> <p>Q1 on 30th/10/2017 Ref: CR/D/651/01, addressed to District Speaker.</p> <p>Q2 on 15th /2/2018 Ref. CR/D/651/01 addressed to District Speaker.</p> <p>Q3 on 30h/5/2018 Ref: CR/D/651/01, addressed to District Speaker.</p> <p>Q4 on 18th/8/2018 Ref. CR/D/65118, addressed to District Speaker.</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>No evidence was provided to the assessment team regarding information to the Council and LGPAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for FY 2017/2018</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>All the 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/2018 were submitted to the Accounting Officer and LGPAC as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAO & LGPAC on 30th/10/2017 Ref: CR/D/651/01 • CAO & LGPAC on 15th/2/2018 Ref. CR/D/651/01. • CAO & LGPAC on 30th/5/2018 but CR/D/651/01. • CAO & LGPAC on 18th/8/2018 Ref. CR/D/651/01. <p>However, there was no evidence that the 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/2018 were reviewed and followed-up as required as at the time of this assessment.</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 LG assets register was maintained only for Motor vehicles but contrary to the format in the Local Government Accounting Manual 2007 i.e. Form AC 33(a) Register of Fixed Assets – General, Form AC 33(b) Register of Fixed Assets – Motor Vehicles & Heavy Plants, Form AC 33(c) Register of Fixed Assets – Land & Buildings.</p> <p>The other two sections of the assets register i.e. Register of Fixed Assets - Land & Buildings and Register of Fixed Assets – General, were not maintained at all.</p>	<p>0</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>Kaabong DLG obtained Unqualified Audit Opinion for FY 2017/18</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>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 Council met and discussed service delivery related issues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Min. 82/8th of June 2018 –Standing Committees Reports; and Min. 83/8th of June 2018 – Reconstitution of Standing Committees of Council (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 8th June 2018). Min. 04/DC/5/2018 – Reading of the Approval of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AWP and Budget for FY 2018/2019 Revenue Enhancement Work Plan Capacity Building Plan Recruitment Plan Procurement Plan <p>(Minutes of District Council meeting held on 30th May 2018).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Min. 73/29th of March 2018 – Laying of the Draft District Budget Estimates for FY 2018/2019 (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 29th March 2018). Min. 62/12th December 2017 & 14th February 2018 – Approval of the Supplementary Budget Production Department; and Min. 63/12th December 2017 & 14th February 2018 – Reading of the Committee Recommendations (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 12th December 2017 & 14th February 2018). Min. 53/09/2017 – Creation of new Administrative Unit; and Min. 54/09/2017 – Reading of Committee Recommendations (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 29th September 2017). 	<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 feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 1. 	<p>The CAO / Kaabong appointed Mr. Wambi Francis (PHRO) as “Focal Person for Framework on Good Governance” (as per letter Ref: CR/202/3 dated 27th April 2018). The key role of the officer was ‘To receive complaints from the public, community, and generally the service of Kaabong concerning service standards, customer care and presentation of individual officers to the public in line with the Public Standing Orders 2010 (F-a) sub-section (1-9).</p>	<p>1</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>At the time of assessment, there was no specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances. There was no records book to register complaints brought to the attention of the appointed officer.</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>The district had not published the Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on any public notice boards and other means. According to the HRO, the payroll and pensioner schedule were removed by the contractors who had renovated the administrative block at Kaabong District headquarters.</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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The procurement plan was not displayed on any Notice Board. There was no other relevant information for FY 2018/2019 displayed on the notice board at the Kaabong PDU Office and the other blocks at the District headquarters. 	<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>The Kaabong DLG annual performance assessment results (for FY 2016/2017) and implications were disseminated during the extended DTPC meeting held on 25th June 2018 (as per Min. 7/TPC/JUNE/2018 – Dissemination of the Assessment Report for 2017/2018 by DCAO).</p> <p>Note: The extended DTPC meeting was also attended by the SAS of the various LLGs in Kaabong DLG.</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 the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1 	<p>The CAO / Kaabong DLG communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during FY 2017/2018 as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter from CAO to all SAS (Ref: CR/252/1 dated 9th November 2017) regarding “Audit of Sub-counties for the Year Ended 2015/2016”. • Letter from CAO to all SAS and TC (Ref: CR/103/10/1 dated 28th September 2017) concerning “Non-Submission of Financial Statements for FY 2016/2017”. The letter was drawing the attention of the officers to ‘Statutory Instrument No.42, Part V Section 25 of the PFMR 2016’. • Letter from CAO to all SAS (Ref: CR/103/10/1 dated 28th September 2017) regarding “Non-Submission of Management Responses for FY 2014 – 2015 / 2015 – 2016” 	<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 evidence that the Kaabong district team conducted discussions during FY 2017/2018 (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation. For instance, there was a radio talk show on ‘Voice of Karamoja (Etoil a Karamoja)’ as per receipt No. 322 dated 8th October 2017 in lieu of radio talk show amounting to UGX 1,200,000. The lead person was Mr. Lolin (formerly RDC / Kaabong). Other team members included Mr. Abuku Mark (District Chairperson / Kaabong), Mr. Richard B. Ssajjabbi (CAO / Kaabong), and Mr. Kibwita Godfrey A. (for DHO / Kaabong). The talk show was held during 8th – 11th October 2017.</p>	<p>1</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 district Gender Focal Person provided guidance and support to sector departments on how to mainstream gender in their activities through activities like conducting gender auditing and mentoring of departments and sub counties on integration gender and equity budgeting in the district plans evidenced by progress report dated May 2018.</p> <p>The Gender focal person together with DCDO conducted community dialogue meetings with 78 women groups and dialogued on issues like gender inequality, child headed households, school attendance, and gender based violence and HIV & AIDS.</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 implement-ted: score 2. 	<p>The gender focal person and the CDO planned a number of activities according to the 2018/19 work plan to mainstream gender and they include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conducting gender audit in 14 LLG and 5 sectors. 2. Training and supporting 38 community groups. 3. Collecting data on Gender based violence 4. Training UWEP groups in basic book keeping and group dynamics. <p>(This was got from the approved district AWP 2018/2019 page 69).</p> <p>The gender mainstreaming operational budget for 2017/18 FY was 18,678,866 and it was fully utilised as evidenced by the following payment vouchers. VR 3/6 worth 5.700,000 dated 21/6/2018 being payment for transfer to sub counties.</p> <p>VR 1/3 worth 2,000,000 dated 7/3/2018 for International women day celebrations.</p> <p>VR 07/06 worth 637,000 for office supplies</p> <p>VR 4/6 worth 3,750,000 for monitoring of UWEP groups</p> <p>VR 06/06 worth 3,497,000 for training of sub county SAS and CDOs on UWEP guidelines</p> <p>VR 80/06 worth 633,000 for training of community groups</p> <p>LPO worth 790. 000 for printing and photocopying services.</p> <p>The availed vouchers accounted for 91% of the budget.</p>	<p>2</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>Environmental screening was not done for any of the district implemented projects in 2017/18 FY. The environment Officer claimed that he was not facilitated by the LG to carry out environmental screening</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 inadequate evidence that the LG integrated environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents as only 2 out of the 5 sampled projects had BOQ with some small budget for environmental mitigation. The 2 projects were Fencing of Lopedo Airstrip with a budget of 500,000 and the construction of the plant clinic with a budget of 50,000. Other projects did not cater for environmental mitigation.</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>The sampled projects were implemented on land owned by government though there was no proof of ownership by the district. The sampled projects were;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Construction of staff house at Kakamar HCII , -Construction of a classroom block at Pajar primary school, -Construction of a plant clinic at the production department -Fencing of Lopedo Airstrip -Renovation of district education office 	<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>The Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form was not completed for any of the sampled completed projects. The environment officer was not aware that he needed to complete social and environmental mitigation certificates for the completed 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 the contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance (new one): Score 1 	<p>The contract payments for sampled projects were effected without seeking for any environmental and social clearance as a requirement.</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>The Environmental officer and the Community Development Officer did not write any monthly reports as they did not visit any of the sampled projects during their implementation. They did not see it as part of their work as no one approached/asked them to monitor the project implementation work..</p>	<p>0</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 	<p>The LG Department of Education had 52 Primary schools with 448 Teachers and Head Teachers.</p> <p>There was evidence that for FY 2018/19, under Vote 559, Wages for 448 teachers was budgeted for.</p>	4
<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has 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>The Staff list obtained indicated that each of the schools had at least 7 teachers per school and 1 Head Teacher for all the 52 schools. 5 schools:</p> <p>? kidepo had 4 teachers (up to P4).</p> <p>? Lolelia had 5 teachers (up to P5)</p> <p>? Lomuyen had 5 teachers (up to P4).</p> <p>? Longeret had 6 teachers and</p> <p>? Lopedo had 6 teachers (up to P 6 and P5 respectively).</p>	4
<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>The LG filled 448 positions of primary school teachers and had a gap of 740 positions. The total number of positions approved was 1,208 as per the staff recruitment plan for FY 2017/18. 448 out of 1,208 is only 37.0%, way below 80% which is the minimum for a score of 0.</p>	0

<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>The LG Department of Education had filled both positions of Senior Inspector of Schools and inspector of schools as per the staff recruitment plan for FY 2017/18.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • .Ms. Sangari Santina is senior inspector of schools. • Mr. Lopeyok Hillry is inspector of schools 	<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>There was no evidence that the LG had submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for Primary teachers for the FY 2018/19.</p>	<p>0</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 LG had fully recruited and filled the positions of inspectors of school as per the staff structure</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Monitoring and Inspection</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"> • 100% school inspectors: score 3 	<p>The district had two (2) Inspectors of Schools.</p> <p>Senior Inspector of Schools, appointment letter CR/152/01 dated 1st June 2015</p> <p>Inspector Of Schools, appointment letter CR/156/1 dated 1st January 2006</p> <p>There was no evidence that they were appraised (there were no appraisal reports seen).</p>	<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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 3 o 70% and 89%: score 2 o Below 70%: score 0 	<p>The district had 52 primary schools and therefore 52 Head Teachers as per the district staff list.</p> <p>There was no evidence that they were appraised. There were no appraisal reports seen.</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 communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1 	<p>There was no evidence at the DEOs' office and at the sampled schools that circulars and guidelines were communicated in the previous financial year 2017/18</p> <p>There was one notification of the schools meals food pipeline break from OPM dated 18/9/2017 at the DEO's office, but there was no evidence at the sampled schools that this particular notification was disseminated.</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>There was no evidence that the LG department of Education held meetings with Head Teachers to explain and sensitize them on the guidelines and circulars issued by the national level.</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>The LG department of Education inspected some P/S at least twice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Term III inspection was done between 6-15/11/2017 and the inspection report written and dated 23/11/2017 for 37 out of 52 schools. • Term II inspection was done for 27 schools and report written and dated 18/6/2018 <p>Thus an average of 21.3 % of the schools were inspected in the 3 terms (27+37=64/3 school terms=21.3%, below the minimum 50% lowest score.</p> <p>Thus inspection was done only ? terms (66.6%) for some schools and there was inspection reports</p>	<p>0</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>There was no evidence in form of minutes of meeting to indicate that the department discussed the school inspection reports.</p>	<p>0</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 LG Department of Education submitted School inspection report to DES for terms II and III.</p> <p>The matrix of submission obtained from DES indicated that the department had submitted inspection reports for term II and III.</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>The LG department of Education did not discuss the school inspection reports and thus there was no evidence that recommendation of the reports were followed-up.</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 LG submitted accurate / consistent data on the list of schools, which was consistent with both EMIS reports and PBS for the 52 Primary Schools.</p>	<p>5</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>Enrolment data for sampled schools were not consistent with the PBS generated data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kalongor School data was 692, PBS data was 714. • Lotim school data was 519 and PBS data was 488. • Kathile schools data was 996 and PBS data was 941. • Lomodocho School data was 684, PBS data was 859. <p>The assessment team thus concluded that the School enrolment data was not consistent and not accurate.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>The Social Services Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2017/2018 as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 25th May 2018 (under Min. 5/SSC/28-5-2018 – Presentation of Departmental Work Plans for FY 2018/2019). • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 26th February 2018 (under Min. 5/SSC/2/2018 – Presentation of Departmental 2nd Quarter Report. • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 4th December 2017 (under Min. 6/12/2017 – Presentations from Heads of Department). • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 10th September 2017 (under Min. 4/SSC/9/2017 – Presentation of Departmental 4th Quarter Report). 	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>The Social Services Committee presented issues that required approval to the District Council during FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Recommendations of the Committee of Social Services to the Council of 30th May 2018’ • ‘Recommendations of the Standing Committee of Social Services to Council’. This was dated 26th February 2018. • ‘Recommendations of the Standing Committee of Social Services to Council’. This was dated 4th December 2017. • ‘Recommendations of the Standing Committee of Social Services to Council’. This was dated 10th September 2017. 	<p>2</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>There was evidence that SMCs’ in schools were functional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Komukuny P/S SMC had a meeting on 6/10/2017 to approve budget. • Lotim p/s had a meeting on 16/6/2018 Agenda 5-6 on Absenteeism of teachers and teachers’ reactions. • There was training for SMCs for Karenga p/s, Lobalangit P/S in Lokori sub-county from 12-13/10/2017 on school management. <p>The LG did not keep the files of all SMCs’ for the 52 schools so the assessment team was unable to verify how many schools actually had SMCs. However, all the 5 sampled schools had functional SMCs’. Thus 5/5 schools had functional SMCs’.</p>	<p>5</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 evidence on the notice board at the LG and in the files at the DEOs' office that the list of schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants was made public.</p> <p>The DEO explained that the Ministry of finance did not send details of the grants remitted directly to schools to his office and thus he did not have the information to publicise. His request was that a copy of the list would be sent to the DEOs' office for information when remittances are being made to schools.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The LG Education department has submitted input into the LG procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, 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>There was evidence that the LG submitted procurement input to PDU for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of 4 units of staff houses at Longrep P/S, Lopedo P/S, Lomorok P/S and Narengepak P/S. • Construction of 2 classroom blocks at Lowakuyil P/S, lomunyir P/S and Pajar P/S. • Construction of 2 stanza pit latrines at Kalapata P/S, Lomusian P/S • Supply of 40 wooden desks to Lobalngit P/S and • supply of 1 laptop computer and printer to department of Education <p>All the procurement input was submitted on 13/9/2018.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time

Maximum 3 for this performance measure

• Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3.

The LG Education department timely certified and recommended suppliers for payment as per sampled payments below:

- M/s Abrash Enterprises request for payment of Shs. 19,887,660 on 1st/3/2018 for construction of a 4 units staff house at Lokasangate P/S was certified under Certificate No. 01 dated 14th/3/2018, recommended for payment on the same day and paid on the same day vide PV- 07/03.
- M/s Deg Bedo Co. Ltd request for payment of Shs. 19,887,260 on 19th/2/2018 for construction of a staff house at Lomanok P/S in Kawalakol sub-county was certified under Certificate No. 01 dated 14th/3/2018 was recommended for payment on 14th/3/2018 and paid on the same day vide PV- 09/03.
- M/s Keke General Enterprise Ltd request for payment of Shs. 17,100,000 on 22nd/5/2018 for construction of a 2 classroom block at Lomunyen P/S was certified under Certificate No. 01 dated 12th/4/2018 was recommended for payment on 31st/5/2018 and paid on the same day vide PV- 26/05.
- M/s Sure Deal 2004 General Traders Ltd request for payment of Shs. 9,456,570 on 12th/4/2018 for construction of 2 stance lined latrine at Kakamar P/S was certified under Certificate No. 01 dated 24th/4/2018 was recommended for payment on 4th/5/2018 and paid on 15th/5/2018 vide PV- 12/05 within 23 days.

<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>The Education Department submitted the annual performance report for FY 2017/2018 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner on 2nd September 2018 (as per Email from the PBS – Re: Reg. Head of Department Validation' dated 2nd September 2018 alerting the Planner / Kaabong DLG about the submission by the DEO)</p> <p>However, the submission was made after the deadline of 15th July 2018.</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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 LG Education department had 6 internal audit findings in FY 2017/2018 but there was no evidence of information provided to the internal audit on the status of its implementation as at the time of this assessment.</p> <p>These internal audit queries raised in 2nd quarter FY 2017/2018 were as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Accounting Officer of Jubilee SSS Karenga spent Shs, 824,963,951 without any statutory books of accounts being maintained. 2. No monthly Bank reconciliations throughout 2014 and 2015 & 2016 were partially done. 3. The Accounting Officer of the above school opened up a fixed Deposit Account without authorization. 4. Students' contribution totaling to Shs. 3,520,000 towards purchase of a school bus was not accounted for. 5. Unaccounted for funds totaling to Shs. 167,636,266. 6. Procurement of goods & services. 	<p>0</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>There was no evidence that the LG department of Education in consultation with the gender focal person disseminated guidelines on how senior women and men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys.</p> <p>However, the LG with support from UNICEF - Government of Uganda, carried out community engagement on adolescent issues, child marriages, teenage pregnancies through radio talk shows between April - June 2018 according to a memo seen in the DEOs' office but there was not activity report to validate this action.</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 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>The was no evidence that the LG in collaboration with gender department issued and explained guidelines on sanitation for girls and PWD in P/S.</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 was no evidence that the LG in collaboration with gender department issued and explained guidelines on sanitation for girls and PWD in P/S.</p> <p>There was evidence that SMCs' met the gender requirement.</p> <p>The 5 sampled schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lomodoch P/S had 3 female members out of 10 • Kalongor P/S had 4 female mebers out of 10 • Kawalakol P/S had 4 female members out of 12 • Komukuny P/S had 4 female members out of 12 • Lotim P/S had 4 female members out of /13 	<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 no evidence at the DEOs' office that the education department in collaboration with environment officer issued guidelines on environment management in schools.</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"> • 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>There was no evidence of project screening forms for any on-going projects in the department of education.</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>There was evidence that education project sites were visited and site visit report written.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20/7/2018 report on Pajar & Kakamar- Construction of 2 classroom block. • 19/3/2018 report of 4 unit staff house at Lokajangate P/S, Lomanok P/S and Narengepak P/S 	<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 	<p>There was no evidence of any staff structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for FY 2018/2019.</p> <p>The reason advanced by DHO was that arising from the ban by Government on recruitment, they did not have a staff structure for FY 2018/2019 but used the one for FY 2017/2018 entitled "Vote 559 Kaabong District Staff Recruitment Plan FY 2017/2018".</p>	0								
<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>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG Health department had submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to HRM for FY 2018/2019.</p> <p>The reason advanced by DHO was that they did not plan for recruitment in FY 2018/2019 due to the current government ban on recruitment.</p>	0								
<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 	<p>The district had twenty six (26) health facilities as follows;</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="847 1675 1406 1921"> <tr> <td>Hospital</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Health Centre IV</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Health Centre IIIs</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Health Centre IIs</td> <td>19</td> </tr> </table> <p>There was evidence that only 20 Officers in Charge of Health Centres were appraised as per the appraisal reports seen, representing 77% compliance</p>	Hospital	1	Health Centre IV	1	Health Centre IIIs	5	Health Centre IIs	19	4
Hospital	1										
Health Centre IV	1										
Health Centre IIIs	5										
Health Centre IIs	19										

		<p>Twelve (12) appraisal reports of Officers in Charge were sampled to establish the dates of their appraisals as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lokeris Mathew, Senior Clinical Officer Kopoth HC III – 28th August 2018 2. Akol Ann Grace, Nursing Officer, Loyol HC II – 28th June 2018 3. Lokori John Bosco, Lokori John Bosco , Senior Clinical officer – 28th June 2018 4. Adong Sarah, Enrolled Nurse, Kakamar HC II – 28th June 2018 5. Lalam Helen, Enrolled Nurse Lomeris HC II – 28th June 2018 6. Akereat Immaculate, Enrolled Midwife, Usake HC II – 17th July 2018 7. Nalibe James, Enrolled Nurse, Lokerui HC II – 28th July 2018 8. Achayo Florence, Enrolled Nurse, Ladoko NG II – 28th February 2918 9. Nading Franchise, Enrolled Nurse, Kaimese HC II – 4th July 22018 10. Lokeel James, Enrolled Nurse, Lokwakaramoe HC II- 5th June 2018 11. Opio Emmanuel, Enrolled Nurse, Morukori HC II – 17th July 2018 12. Opio Kennedy Munu, Enrolled Nurse, Nangerepak HC II – 17th July 2018 	
<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>There was no evidence that the LG Health department had deployed health workers as per lists submitted with the budget for FY 2018/2019 as required.</p> <p>The deployment lists available were based on the budget for FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>Source: Health workers list on deployment and the LG budget of FY 2018/2019.</p>	0
Monitoring and Supervision			

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

Maximum 6 for this performance measure

- Evidence that the DHO/MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3

There was evidence that the DHO had communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by MoH to lower health units during the support supervision visits as indicated in the 5 sampled health facilities below:

- Kapedo HCIII on 3rd/8/2017
- Kalapata HCIII on 3rd/8/2017
- Narengapak HCII on 5th/12/2017
- Kaimese HCII on 5th/12/2017
- Kaabong Hospital 26th /2/2018

The following were found in each of the above sampled health facilities notice boards/walls:

- Uganda clinical guidelines - 2016.
- National HIV and AIDs Medication Hand book – 2015/2016 – 2019/20120.
- Adolescent Health Policy Guideline and service standard.
- Uganda National Tuberculosis and Leprosy Control Programme – 3rd Edition March 2017.
- Cervical Cancer information, Education and Communication Book let for health workers – December 2017.
- Making medical injection safe – 2017
- National Communication strategy for malaria control in Uganda – MOH 2015.

<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 was evidence that the DHO held meetings with health in charges and explained among others the guidelines, policies and circulars issued by the national level as indicated below based on the above sampled health facilities:</p> <p>According to the supervisory reports, the meetings were held to give feedback after support supervision.</p> <p>The evidence was proved both in the supervisory reports and the specific supervisory log books at the health facilities as indicated below:</p> <p>Q1 3rd/8/2017</p> <p>Q2 5th/12/2017</p> <p>Q3 26th/2/2018</p> <p>Q4 17th/6/2018</p>	<p>3</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 evidence that the DHT had supervised 100% of HC IV and District Hospital, and PNFPs like St. Jude HCII, Lotim HCII, Kaabong Mission HCIII as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q1 supervision was on 3rd/8/2017. Q2 s supervision was on 5th-10th/12/2017. Q3 supervision was on 26th /2/2018. Q4 supervision was 17th /6/2018. 	<p>3</p>

<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DHT had ensured that HSD supervised HCIIIs and HCIIIs including PNFP within FY 2017/2018 as indicated in the 5 sampled lower health facilities below:</p>
<p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Kapedo HCIII, the recommendation was that the in charge mentors other staff on calculation of Body Mass Index (BMI) • In Kalapata HCIII, the recommendation was that the in charge gives Continuous Medical Education (CMI) to health facility staff. • In Kaimese HCIII, the recommendation was that the in charge engages VHT and PDCs to follow-up defaulters. • In Narengepak HCII, the recommendation was that the in charge ensures cleanliness in stores and prevents rodents from entry into stores. • Kaabong Hospital, the recommendation was that Medical Superintendent in charge ensures nutrition assessments in all entry points. <p>Source: Supervision log books, DHT minutes and facility records.</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>There was evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports were discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions in FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q1 supervision report dated 3rd/8/2017 recommended that the in charges of health facilities request for more job aids and display them on the notice boards. Q2 supervision report dated 5th-10th/12/2017 recommended the in charges of health facilities should compile data on nutrition and display it on notice board. Q3 supervision report dated 26th/2/2018 recommended that the Medical Superintendent of Kaabong Hospital should follow-up the encroachment on hospital land in Lowudukmak. Q4 supervision report dated 17th/6/2018 recommended that the attendance book should be well managed and the absconded staff should be warned on absenteeism. 	<p>4</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 evidence that the recommendations were followed-up and specific activities undertaken as detailed below:</p> <p>Q1: The job aids were acquired and displayed on the 5 sampled health facilities.</p> <p>Q2: Data on nutrition were compiled and displayed on the facility notice boards.</p> <p>Q3: The Medical Superintendent of Kaabong Hospital took up the issue of the hospital land encroachment and was reported to the District Land Surveyor.</p> <p>Q4: The attendance book was being well managed and reviewed on daily basis. The absentees were warned on individual basis.</p>	<p>6</p>

The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding as per formats provided by MoH

Maximum 10 for this performance measure

- Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding:

- o List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10

The LG Health department submitted accurate / consistent data for all the 18 health facility lists which received PHC funding with both HIMS reports and PBS as per the 5 sampled lower health facilities and 3 PNFP health facilities indicated below:

Q1 FY 2018/2019 Kapedo HCIII non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs.18, 202,857.

Q1 FY 2018/2019 Kalapata HCIII non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs. 18, 202,857.

Q1 FY 2018/2019 Kaimese HCII non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs, Shs. 6,027,611.

Q1 FY 2018/2019 Narengepak HCII non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs.6,027,611.

Q1 FY 2018/2019 Kaabong Hospital non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs. 162,600,401.

PNFP Health facilities:

Q1 FY 2018/2019 Kapedo Mission Sub-dispensary HCII non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs. 3,915,323.

Q1 FY 2018/2019 Lotim Community Clinic COU HCII non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs. 3,915,323

Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<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>The Social Services Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2017/2018 as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 25th May 2018 (under Min. 5/SSC/28-5-2018 – Presentation of Departmental Work Plans for FY 2018/2019). Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 26th February 2018 (under Min. 5/SSC/2/2018 – Presentation of Departmental 2nd Quarter Report. Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 4th December 2017 (under Min. 6/12/2017 – Presentations from Heads of Department). Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 10th September 2017 (under Min. 4/SSC/9/2017 – Presentation of Departmental 4th Quarter Report). 	<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>The Social Services Committee presented issues that required approval to the District Council during FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Recommendations of the Committee of Social Services to the Council of 30th May 2018' 'Recommendations of the Standing Committee of Social Services to Council'. This was dated 26th February 2018. 'Recommendations of the Standing Committee of Social Services to Council'. This was dated 4th December 2017. 'Recommendations of the Standing Committee of Social Services to Council'. This was dated 10th September 2017. 	<p>2</p>

<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p>	<p>There was evidence that health facilities had functional HUMCs established, held meetings and discussed budget and resource issues on quarterly basis as per the 5 sampled health facilities indicated below:</p>
<p>Maximum 6 points</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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kapedo HCIII had 7 members of HUMC and held a meeting on 17/7th/6/2018 and discussed issues that included the inadequate health education carried out in OPD. • Kalapata HCIII had 5 members of HUMC and held a meeting on 5th/6/2018. The Committee discussed late reporting on duty and lack of water supply. • Kaimese HCII had 5 members of HUMC and held a meeting on 20th /8/2018. The Committee discussed poor hygiene and introduction of new HUMC to staff. • Narengapak HCII had only 5 members of HUMC and held a meeting on 7th/7/2018. The committee discussed Expanded Programme on Immunization (EPI). • Kaabong Hospital Management Committee had 9 members and held a meeting on 3rd/11/2017. The committee discussed matters to do with a stolen solar battery in the Laboratory.

The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants

Maximum 4 for this performance measure

- 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

The LG publicized all health facilities receiving that received PHC non-wage recurrent grants on facility notice boards as seen on the 5 sampled health facilities notice boards below:

1. Kapedo HCII:

- Q1: 18,202,857
- Q2: 18,202,857
- Q3: 18,202,857
- Q4: 18,202,857

2. Kalapata HCIII

- Q1: 18,202,857
- Q2: 18,202,857
- Q3: 18,202,857
- Q4: 18,202,857

3. Kaimese HCII

- Q1: 6,027,611
- Q2: 6,027,611
- Q3: 6,027,611
- Q4: 6,027,611

4. Narengepak HCII

- Q1: 6,027,611
- Q2: 6,027,611
- Q3: 6,027,611
- Q4: 6,027,611

5. Kaabong Hospital

- Q1: 162,600,401
- Q2: 162,600,401
- Q3: 162,600,401
- Q4: 162,600,401

<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>The LG Health department did not submit input to procurement plan of 2018/19 FY by 30th April 2018 as required as there was no submission available in PDU</p>	<p>0</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>The LG Health department submitted form PP1 for the construction of a 4 unit staff house at Timu HCII to the PDU ON 1st August 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>

The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time

Maximum 4 for this performance measure

- Evidence that the DHO/ MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4.

The LG Health department certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment as evidenced in the sampled payments below:

- M/s Sure Deal General Traders' request for payment (Invoice No. 479 dated 6th/2/2018) of Shs. 4,375,000 was recommended for payment on 28th/3/2018 and was paid on 29t /3/2018 vide PV- 13/3 within 50 days.
- M/s Karinga General Traders Ltd request for payment of Shs. 20,576,000 dated 28th/4/2018) for construction of staff house at Kakamar HCII in Kakamar sub-county was certified under Certificate No. 01 dated 27th/2/2018, recommended for payment on 27th/2/2018 and paid on 2nd/3/2018 vide PV- 07/2 within 8 days.
- M/s Sunami Enterprises request for payment of Shs. 5,968,050 dated 27th/6/2018 for completion of the Generator House at DHO was certified under Certificate No. "Final" dated 27th/6/2018 was recommended for payment on 27th/6/2018 and paid on 28th/6/2018 vide PV-24/6 within 1 day.
- M/s Caltex Service Kaabong Invoice No. 1193 dated 21st/9/2017 for Shs. 26,594,927 for supply of fuel to health department, was recommended for payment on 13th/11/2017 and was paid on 23rd/11/2017 vide PV- 04/11 within 52 days.

Financial management and reporting

<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	<p>The Health Department submitted the annual performance report for FY 2017/2018 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner on 2nd September 2018 (as per Email from the PBS – Re: Reg. Head of Department Validation’ dated 2nd September 2018 alerting the Planner / Kaabong DLG about the submission by the DHO)</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline of 15th July 2018.</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 	<p>The LG Health department had 2 internal audit findings in 2nd quarter FY 2017/2018 but there was no evidence that the sector had provided information to the internal audit on the status of their implementation as at the time of this assessment.</p> <p>These internal audit queries were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incomplete works on construction of staff house at Karenga HCIV. Poor sanitation & hygiene at Karenga HCIV. 	<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>There was evidence that the HUMC met the gender composition as per guidelines as seen in the 5 sampled lower health facilities below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kapedo HCIII HUMC had 7 members of whom 4 were men and 3 were female representing 43% Kalapata HCIII HUMC had 6 members of which 4 were male and 2 were female representing 30%. Kaimese HCII HUMC had 5 members of which 5 were male and 2 were female representing 40% Narengepak HCII HUMC had 5 members of which 3 were male and 2 were female representing 40% Kaabong Hospital Management Committee had 9 members of which 4 were male and 5 were female representing 56%. <p>Source: Lists of HUMC & members.</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>The LG issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities on 3rd /8/2017 during the support supervision visit by DHT.</p> <p>Guidelines on sanitation management included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Segregation of toilets (coo - men, mon - women) for staff, refuse banks amongst others. Sanitary posters on proper use of latrines written in vernacular (Ngakaramajong) and diagrams of a man and woman were displayed on the 5 sampled health facilities. Proper hand washing demonstrated on the health facilities notice boards. 	<p>2</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>There were was one Health facility infrastructure project implemented in 2017/18 FY (Construction of A 4 unit Staff house at Kakamar HCII) and environmental screening was not done for this project. The Environment Officer claimed that he was not facilitated to conduct environmental screening for the project before approval of 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 visits were conducted by the environmental officer because he did not consider it as part of his assignment.</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 is- sued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal2: score 4. 	<p>There was evidence that the LG had issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidelines on medical waste management were issued to lower health units 3rd/8/2017 during the supervision visits by DHT. Guidelines on use of colour coded bins were displayed on the 5 sampled health facilities. Guidelines on use of incinerator for burning highly infectious medical waste were issued to lower health units on 10th /12/2017. Safety boxes for used needles. 	<p>4</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>The review of the AWP 2018/19 and Uganda Water supply Atlas revealed that Kaabong District Local Government had safe water average of 86%. Out of 19 sub-counties, four were found to have safe water coverage below the district average. These were Kaabong West 63%, Kakamar 67%, Lodiko 63% and Lotim 46%.</p> <p>The review of AWP and budget 2018/19 revealed that, the Water department had planned 5 new boreholes.</p> <p>Amongst the sub counties with safe water coverage below district average, only two (Kakamar and Lotim) were planned for each to receive 1 new borehole. DWO revealed to the assessment team that the other two sub counties with safe water below district average (Kaabong west and Lodiko) were to be handled by NGOs. Kaabong west S/C had been handled by GOAI whereas Lodiko S/C was being handled by GIZ which was going to construct 2 boreholes and 1 valley tank in the sub county. Therefore out of a total of 5 boreholes planned for the current FY, only 2 boreholes were allocated to sub counties with safe water below district average. This brings the total budget for the sub counties below district average to 40%.</p>	0

<p>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)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>The review of the AWP and budget for FY 2017/18 submitted by the District Water Department and MIS reports from MoWE revealed that 7 new boreholes, rehabilitation of 18 boreholes, rehabilitation of 2 piped water supply schemes, design of 1 piped water scheme and construction of 1 drainable latrine were planned for in FY 2017/18.</p> <p>The review of Annual progress reports submitted to MoWE for instance Quarter 3 and Quarter 4 report dated 07th may 2018 and 10th August 2018 respectively and site visits made to sampled projects confirmed that all projects were implemented. However 25 boreholes were rehabilitated instead of the planned 18boreholes. The sample projects visited by the Assessment team included Borehole at Lokoli S/C, 2 production wells at Kawalakol S/C, 1 borehole at Sidok S/C and a Drainable latrine at Kaabong T/C. All planned projects in the FY 2017/18 were implemented with and extra of more 7 rehabilitated boreholes making the percentage of planned against implemented to 126%.</p>	<p>15</p>
<p>Monitoring and Supervision</p>			
<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 District Water department had a monitoring plan included in the AWP and Budget 2017/18. The monitoring plan outlined the activities for monitoring and supervision of the planned projects that included construction supervision visits, Inspection of water points after construction and regular data collection and analysis. For instance the DWO presented to the Assessment team various supervision and monitoring reports that included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Report on validation of previous works and collection of coordinates for all water points dated 15th November 2017. 2. Report on the functionality of water points in the district dated 21st October 2017. 3. Report on the assessment of all valley tanks and individual sites dated 16th December 2017. <p>In addition, the DWO Provided Form 1 which was used for monitoring all water sources in the district.</p>	<p>15</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 data contained in the District Annual Work Plan was similar to the information obtained from the Ministry of Water and Environment</p>	<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>The water facilities listed in the MIS report provided by the MoWE reflected 7 New Deep boreholes, 18 borehole rehabilitations, 1 Drainable latrine, and 1 design for piped water scheme were planned. This was consistent with the list in the AWP, PBS and Performance contract 2018/19.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<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 DWO did not provide any evidence to prove that the Water department had submitted procurement plan that covered all investment items in the approved sector AWP and budget to PDU.</p> <p>The only document presented to the assessment was an insertion into the PDU procurement plan showing a lump sum figure for Drilling and rehabilitation of boreholes amounting to Ushs 120,000,000 signed on 03rd August 2018.</p>	<p>0</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 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>The district CAO had appointed Mr. Ibrahim Akorio as the contract manager for WSS projects in the district in an appointment letter dated 1st July 2017.</p> <p>A contract management plan which involved monitoring and supervision plan was included in the AWP 2018/19. Monthly site visits were conducted and site issues reported in the site supervision and progress reports.</p> <p>For instance Supervision report on Rehabilitation of boreholes dated 25th June 2018, progress report for the drilling of 5 deep boreholes and 2 production wells dated 25th April 2018.</p> <p>BoQ for drilling of 5 boreholes and 2 production wells were reviewed by the assessment team and found that the projects were constructed as per design.</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 water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	<p>The following completed facilities were sampled and inspected. They were all found to be functioning and well maintained, and the visible elements were confirmed to have been constructed as per design.</p> <p>Hand pump boreholes at</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Longorian (Sidok S/C), 2. 2 production wells at Kawalakol (Kawalakol S/C) 3. Hand pump borehole at Lomodoch (Lolelia S/C) 4. Drainable Latrine at Kaabong Abattoir(Kaabong T/C) 	<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>The contractors handed over the completed WSS facilities and completion reports were found at DWO file. For instance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion report by Icon Projects Ltd for the drilling, test pumping, water quality analysis and installation of 7 boreholes 2. Completion report by Lemukoroi Enterprises for the construction of 3-stance Latrine at Kaabong T/C. <p>No completion certificates were issued by the DWO since the projects were still under defects liability period and also retention money had not yet been paid to the contractor</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>The DWO had appropriately certified all WSS projects.</p> <p>For instance interim certificates were certified by DWO included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Payment request from Icon Projects Ltd dated 05th April 2018 of Ush 153,540,000 for the drilling of boreholes Contract ref No; Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00008 was certified form payment on 25th April 2018. 2. Payment request from Lemukoroi Enterprises Ltd dated 23rd April 2018 of Ush 20,250,000 for construction of 3stance VIP latrine at kaabong T/C Contract Ref No: Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00023 was certified 25th April 2018. 	<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 	<p>The District Water department certified and recommended for payment as evidenced by the sampled payments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M/s ICON PROJECTS Ltd request for payment of Shs. 85,776,000 dated 5th/4/2018 for Drilling & Installation of 2 Production Wells & 5 bore holes in Kaabong District were certified under Certificate No. 01 dated 25th/4/2018, recommended for payment on 25th/4/2018 and paid on the same day vide PV-32/4 within 20 days. M/s Village Energy & Electronic Services request for payment (Invoice No. 096 for Shs. 2,703,000) dated 30th/8/2017 was recommended for payment on 13th/9/2017 was paid on 15th/9/2017 vide PV-18/9 within 15 days. M/s PMP Holdings Ltd request for payment of Shs. 52,237,542 on 31st/8/2018 for Drilling of 6 bore holes in Kaabong District was certified for payment under Certificate No. 01 dated 18th/10/2017, recommended for payment on 26th/10/2017 and paid on 1st/11/2018 vide PV-5/11 within 60 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 Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	<p>The Water Department submitted the annual performance report for FY 2017/2018 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner on 31st August 2018 (as per Email from the PBS – Re: Reg. Head of Department Validation' dated 31st August 2018 alerting the Planner / Kaabong DLG about the submission by the DWO)</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline of 15th July 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The District Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 5 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 If queries are not responded to score 0 	<p>The District Water department had no internal audit finding in FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>5</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 Works and Technical Services Committee was said to have met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2017/2018. According to the Clerk to Council (at the time of Assessment), he delegated the task of writing minutes of the standing committees to the respective HoD falling under each committee. The minute secretary to the Works and Technical Services Committee had only captured recommendations (and not minutes) during the meetings that were conducted</p> <p>Therefore, there were no minutes of meetings to confirm when the meetings took place and the issues deliberated upon.</p>	<p>0</p>

The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council

Maximum 6 for this performance measure

- Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3

There were no minutes of the meetings of the Works and Technical Services Committee during FY 2017/2018.

Nonetheless, the following recommendation of issues presented to Council by the Works and Technical Services Committee were availed to the assessor:

- 'Recommendations for Works and Technical Services Committee of Council held on 25th May 2018'.
- 'Recommendations for Works and Technical Standing Committee of Council held on 23/3/2018'.
- 'Recommendations for Works and Technical Services Committee of Council held on 23rd of February 2018'.
- 'Works and Technical Services Committee Recommendations to Council for Adoption on the 12th December 2017'.
- 'Works and Technical Services Committee Recommendations to Council for Adoption on the 29th September 2017'.

There was further evidence of presentation of the committee reports to council as indicated below:

- Min. 82/8th of June 2018 –Standing Committees Reports (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 8th June 2018).
- Min. 63/12th December 2017 & 14th February 2018 – Reading of the Committee Recommendations (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 12th December 2017 & 14th February 2018).
- Min. 54/09/2017 – Reading of Committee Recommendations (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 29th September 2017).

<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>There was no proof of any display of AWP, Budget and Water development grant expenditures on the notice board and no file copy was presented to the assessment team.</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>Out of 5 WSS projects visited, only 2 were clearly labelled. The labelled projects were Drainable Latrine at Kaabong T/C and Borehole at Longorian Village Sidok S/C.</p> <p>The other projects that is 2 production wells at Kawalakol (Kawalakol S/C) and Hand pump borehole at Lomodoch (Lolelia were not labeled at all.</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"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	<p>There was no information on tenders and contract awards displayed on the district notice boards and no file copy was presented to the Assessment team for review.</p> <p>The Procurement officer told the assessment team that the information on tenders and contract awards had been displayed on the noticeboard and later removed during the renovation of the district buildings but not even a single filed copy was presented to the assessment team in the office.</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"> 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 for WSS facilities from communities represented by sub counties together with the minutes of the meetings held by communities were submitted to the District Water Office as per sector critical requirements for action and were properly filed.</p> <p>For instance there were application forms for borehole by the following sub counties.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Dukole Village Lokori S/C dated 10th October 2017 Lochom Village Sidok S/C dated 23rd March 2017 Kawalakol village Kawalakol S/C which didn't have date but signed by LC1 chairperson. 	<p>1</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>From the sampled and visited facilities, the assessment team found out that the facilities were not fenced, not well maintained and no proof for the collection of O&M funds was presented to the assessment team.</p> <p>DWO explained to the assessment team that the community collects O&M funds only when the facility has broken down but no evidence was presented to confirm the statement.</p>	<p>0</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>The environment Officer revealed to the assessment team that there were no environmental screening carried out for the WSS facilities. Therefore no environmental screening forms and reports were presented to the assessment team. This assessment team advised the DWO and Environmental Officer to always carry out environmental screening for all the WSS projects before implementation as required.</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>There were no screening reports as per templates hence the assessment team could not verify whether there were any unacceptable environmental concerns that had not be addressed or any mitigation measures put in place.</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>There was no clause about Environmental protection and mitigation measures in the contract documents sampled. For instance construction of a classroom block at Pajar Primary School Contract ref; Kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00002 and Fencing of Lopedo Airstrip Contact Ref; kaab559/Wrks/17-18/00001.</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 1 did not include the number of WSC members and no detailed formation of WSCs per water source was presented to the Assessment team.</p>	<p>0</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>The District water Department had budgeted for construction of 1 3-stance drainable latrine at Kaabong T/C.</p> <p>The facility was visited by the Assessment team and found out that, it had provision for separate stance of women, men and PWDs. A ramp for PWDs was provided for but no Support handles were installed in the PWD stance.</p>	<p>3</p>
--	--	--	----------