



Local Government Performance Assessment

Kisoro District

(Vote Code: 526)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	67%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	52%
Educational Performance Measures	52%
Health Performance Measures	46%
Water Performance Measures	59%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From MoFPED's inventory/schedule of LG submissions of performance contracts, check dates of submission and issuance of receipts and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If LG submitted before or by due date, then state 'compliant' o If LG had not submitted or submitted later than the due date, state 'non-compliant' • From the Uganda budget website: www.budget.go.ug, check and compare recorded date therein with date of LG submission to confirm. 	<p>Annual Performance Contract Submitted & received at MoFPED on 1/8/2018 which is within the timeline date of 1st August 2018.</p>	Yes
Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY by 30th June (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From MoFPED's inventory of LG budget submissions, check whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The LG budget is accompanied by a Procurement Plan or not. If a LG submission includes a Procurement Plan, the LG is compliant; otherwise it is not compliant. 	<p>Consolidated Procurement Plan was accompanied to the Budget.</p>	Yes

Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports

<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted report to MoFPED in time, then it is compliant • If LG submitted late or did not submit, then it is not compliant 	<p>Annual Performance report- Q4 was submitted to MoFPED and received on 23rd August 2018 which is outside the timeline</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY by end of the FY; PFMA Act, 2015).</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of quarterly reports submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the quarterly performance reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted all four reports to MoFPED of the previous FY by July 31, then it is compliant (timely submission of each quarterly report, is not an accountability requirement, but by end of the FY, all quarterly reports should be available). • If LG submitted late or did not submit at all, then it is not compliant. 	<p>Quarterly Budget performance report submitted as follows: Q1 dated 02/1/2018 Q2 dated 15/03/2018 Q3 dated 13/06/2018 Q4 dated 23/08/2018 which is outside the timeline</p>	<p>No</p>

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and the Auditor General's findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action in lines with applicable laws.</p>	<p>From MoFPED's Inventory/record of LG submissions of statements entitled "Actions to Address Internal Auditor General's findings",</p> <p>Check:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted a 'Response' (and provide details), then it is compliant • If LG did not submit a 'response', then it is non-compliant • If there is a response for all –LG is compliant • If there are partial or not all issues responded to – LG is not compliant. 	<p>Kisoro district provided and submitted information to the PS/ST on the of implementation of both OAG and Internal Auditor General findings for the financial year 2017/2018 in separate letters both referenced REF CR/251/1 dated 26th March 2018 both referenced and dated the same) which received by the Directorate of Internal Audit on 26th April 2018 . This was before the deadline of 30th April 2018 required by the PFMA.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>The auditor Generals report for the FY 2017/18 was unqualified.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a district/ municipality has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 1. 	<p>There was evidence that the District Physical Planning Committee was in place appointed by CAO as per the letter dated 5/6/2018. Members include Ms Judith Muja Senior Environment Officer, Mr Tusiime Joseph staff surveyor, Mr Karamira James District Engineer, Mr Munyarubanza Francis District Education Officer, Mr Basanza Solomon District Agriculture Officer, Mr Niyonzima Sam District Community Development Officer, Dr Nsabiyunva Stephen District Health Officer, Mr MUDanga Vicent District Natural Resource Officer, Ms Nyirakubanza Winfred Physical Planner. Mr Kasozi Sulaiman the Chief Administrative Officer is the Chair person. There was no evidence that the physical Planning Committee considered investments on time.</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"> • Evidence that district/ MLG has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD score 1. 	<p>There was no evidence that the District submitted the minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD</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>In the absence of a Physical Development plan, it was difficult to ascertain any consistency of planning with new infrastructure investments.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action area plan prepared for the previous FY: score 1 or else 0 	<p>The action area plans were not prepared for the previous financial year</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2. 	<p>AWP page 68 under Education sector has priorities such as: Procurement of furniture to primary schools, Construction of VIP Latrines, classroom construction in Primary Schools. Installation of power at Busanza HCIV, construction of piped water supply systems and springs which are based on the outcomes of the budget conference held on November 13th, 2017</p>	<p>2</p>
--	--	--	----------

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If differences appear, a justification has to be provided and evidence provided that it was approved by the Council. Score 1. 	<p>The Capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. These investments include; Classroom construction, , Construction VIP pit Latrine for primary school, Supply of furniture to primary schools on page 68 of the AWP as examples show linkage as proof of coherence & consistence with the 5 year Development plan (2015/2016-2019/2020) on pages 161- 187.</p>	<p>1</p>
--	---	---	----------

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 2. 	<p>There was no evidence that the DLG developed project profiles for all the investments in the AWP</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual statistical abstract, with gender-disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum score 1. 	<p>A copy of the Annual Statistical Abstract with Gender aggregated data had been compiled by the DLG and was made available for assessment. Minutes of the TPC dated 4/10/2017 under minute 4/10/DTPC/2017/2018 do indicate that the Annual Statistical Abstract was discussed.</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>Using Education and water sectors as a case in point in the AWP and Budget Performance reports, infrastructure projects such as: Construction of 2 classroom blocks at mubuga primary school shs 49,609,796, Phased completion of 4 classroom and office at mugaza primary school shs 44,083,325, construction of 5 stance pit latrines at Rutare, Bitare, mukungu, Busengo, Mukibungu, Kabingo, Ruko, and Rutaka primary schools, Rehabilitation of kinanira Gravity flow scheme in Busanza sub county at shs 31,796,905, Repair of Busengo Bridge on mwaro Bujengo-Kinanira road were some of the infrastructure projects implemented that show linkage with the approved budget by the Council.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>From the review of payments certificates for the following investments in the department of Education, Works & Technical services i.e. Latrine Construction at the following Primary Schools in Rutare shs 18,549,748, Bitare at shs 18,737,515, Mukungu at shs 18,863,067, Busengo at shs 18,415,228, Mukibungu at shs 18,478,401, Kabingo at shs 18,446,055, Ruko at shs 18,733,031, Rutaka at shs 18,607,255, Rukoro at shs 19,445,220, Nyakisenyi at shs 18,733,031, Kasoni at shs 18,621,492, construction of 2 classroom blocks at mubuga primary school shs 49,609,796, Phased completion of 4 classroom and office at mugaza primary school shs 44,083,325, Rehabilitation of kinanira Gravity flow scheme in Busanza sub county at shs 31,796,905, Repair of Busengo Bridge on mwaro Bujengo-Kinanira road and construction of an onion store in kanaba sub county at shs 36,603,010, all these investments were completed as per work plan by end of FY. DLG has already issued Final certificates of completion indicating 100% execution</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	<p>From the District Annual budget performance report a number of projects have been reported completed within the budget and these include: Latrine Construction at the following Primary Schools in Rutare shs 18,549,748, Bitare at shs 18,737,515, Mukungu at shs 18,863,067, Busengo at shs 18,415,228, Mukibugo at shs 18,478,401, Kabingo at shs 18,446,055, Ruko at shs 18,733,031, Rutaka at shs 18,607,255, Rukoro at shs 19,445,220, Nyakisenyi at shs 18,733,031, Kasoni at shs 18,621,492, construction of 2 classroom blocks at mubuga primary school shs 49,609,796, Phased completion of 4 classroom and office at mugaza primary school shs 44,083,325, Rehabilitation of kinanira Gravity flow scheme in Busanza sub county at shs 31,796,905, Repair of Busengo Bridge on mwaro Bujengo-Kinanira road and construction of an onion store in kanaba sub county at shs 36,603,010</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>Sampled projects like Repair of Busengo Bridge on mwaro Bujengo-Kinanira road Budgeted shs 4,385,000 and spent 4,385,000 which translate to 100% On average the LG spent over 100% on O&M in the previous FY.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Human Resource Management</p>			

LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.

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

• Not all HoDs positions were substantively filled at the LG of Kisoro during FY 2017/18. As per the staff structure, there are 14 HoDs and heads of units. In Kisoro district, only 9 HoDs and units are substantively filled. This represents 64% of positions filled. Broken down as follows:

? Chief Finance Officer – Not substantively by appointed.

? Head Statutory Bodies (Clerk to Council) – position is not substantively appointed.

? District Education Officer – position filled by appointment letter dated 12/06/1997 and minute DSC/07/97.

? Principle HR Officer position – Not substantively appointed.

? District Internal Auditor position – filled by appointment letter dated 11/11/2005 under minute DSC/167/2005.

? District Health Officer – position substantively filled as per appointment letter dated 10th Oct 2001, minute DSC/102/2011 and letter signed by Lubuuka.

? District Production Officer – position is not substantively appointed but only acting staff assigned.

? Senior Procurement Officer – position filled as per appointment letter 6/6/2018 under min 76/2018 and signed by Kasozi Sulaiman.

? Dist Community Development Officer – position filed as per appointment letter dated 16th June 2015.

? Information Officer – This position is substantively appointed as per appointment letter dated 19/03/2018 under DSC minute 199/2016.

? Probation & Welfare Officer – Substantively appointed as per appointment letter 6/6/10/10/2005 under DSC minute 117/2005.

? Water Officer – position is substantively appointed with appointment letter dated 17/05/2018 under minute 43/2018 and signed by Kasozi Sulaiman.

? Natural Resources Officer – position substantively appointed as per letter dated 3/8/2007 under min 25/2007

? Community Based Officer – position is substantively appointed with letter dated 16/6/2015.under minute 116/2015

<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appraisals during FY 2017/18: 4 HoDs and Units were appraised during FY 2017/18 using standard guidelines from MoPS by various officers. This represents 28.6% of HoDs appraised. Appraisal dates for those HoDs were: 4/7/2017 (District Engineer/Works), 15th July 2018 (Dist Education Officer), Senior Procurement Officer is not eligible for appraisal yet because she is recent recruited ie. 6/6/2018, Information Officer is not also eligible for appraisal because of being a recently recruited staff ie appointment dated 19th March 2018. 	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 % of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to DSC minutes and submission lists viewed (dated 16.10.17, 10.10.18, 18.03.2018) in Kisoro district, a total of 79 positions were submitted for recruitment at DSC during FY 2017/18. Submission lists were consulted and contained all the 79 candidates considered. Minute extracts that were used to consideration of these staff were as follows: DSC 05/2018 of 26th Feb 2018, DSC/04/2018 of 26th Feb 2018, DSC 66/2018 dated 4th May 2018, DSC65/2018. Adverts run in New Vision also verified as dated 20th Nov 2017, Monitor newspaper dated 2nd March 2018, another Monitor newspaper dated 25th May 2018. Each one of them signed by CAO, These submissions viewed indicate that all the 79 positions were considered for recruitment. That is 100% 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission lists for confirmation viewed (dated 22.07.2017, 10.08.2017 and 14.05.2018) at DSC indicate that 34 cases were submitted from CAO's office. A list of confirmed staff during FY 2017/18 indicated that all 34 staff submitted were confirmed as per minute extract of DSC of 13th November 2017. Other DSC minutes for confirmation meetings were: DSC min 19/2017 of 13/09/2017, DSC min 25/2018, DSC min 28/2018, CR/D/12811 min 93/2018 of 6/6/2018. Thus 34 out of 34 represents 100% of staff confirmed during FY 2017/18. 	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the submission list (dated 02/8/2017) looked into for Kisoro district, 19 cases were submitted for disciplinary action – disciplinary meeting of 27th Sept 2017 under minute 104/2017, min 107/2017, min 105/2017, 127/2017 dated 4th Dec 2017 were verified as minute extracts of the same FY 2017/18. They confirm that all the 19 cases were considered and handled. 	1
<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Of the seven staff verified as recruited during FY 2017/18, only 2 staff were presented as having entered salary payroll within one month and the other within 2 months of recruitment in Kisoro district. This indicated by a pay slip presented and dated 28/7/2018 for Mukwshimana Meridah (recruited in May 2018 and accessed salary payroll in July 2018), There was no other evidence in form of staff pay slip presented to prove that staff recruited accessed salary payroll within the first two months of recruitment. 	0
<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>Kisoro district LG submitted 7 cases of staff who retired during FY 2017/18. The staff pension payroll list presented and verified did not categorise staff by year of retirement and so could not be taken as evidence of retired staff for FY 2017/18 Therefore, no staff accessed pension payroll within 2 months of retirement in Kisoro district. I.e 0 out of 7 is 0%.</p>	0
Revenue Mobilization			

<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •• If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets) from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10 %: score 4. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 2. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>The district LG increased its OSR by 4% from UGX 292,156,729 in the FY 2016/17 to UGX 303,823,530 in the FY 2017/18. This is less than 5%. (Source: financial statements for FY 2016/17 and 2017/18)</p>	0
<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0. 	<p>The actual/budget revenue collection ratio for the FY 2017/18 was 76% (UGX 303,823,530/399670,000). This resulted into a budget variance of 24% which is higher than 10%.(Source: budget and financial statements for FY2016/17)</p>	0
<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	<p>The financial statements for the FY 2017/18 indicated that Local Service Tax amounting to UGX 78,002,048 out of which the UGX 53,205,921 was collected by the LG. The rest was collected by the LLGs. UGX 35,866,745 (67.4%) were remitted to Lower Local Governments (Source: Kisoro DLG accounts for the FY 2016/17). This was higher than the statutory remission requirement (source: financial statements for FY 2017/18).</p>	2

<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the total Council expenditures on allowances and emoluments- (including from all sources) is not higher than 20% of the OSR collected in the previous FY: score 2 	<p>The LG spent UGX 61,780,522 (UGX 196,882,000 out of which UGX 135,101,478 was from CG grants) in the FY 2017/18 on Council allowances and emoluments compared to UGX 292,156,729 collected in the FY 2016/17. This constituted 21.2% of OSR for the FY 2016/17 (more than 20%) as per Section 4 of the Local Governments Act.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2 	<p>The district had substantively appointed senior procurement officer (Nyiratunga Magret) appointed on 6th June 2018 under DSC minute 76/2018 and procurement officer (Nyanzi Ashraf) appointed on 17th May 2018 under DSC minute 43/2018 both appointment letters were signed by CAO.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	<p>For the 5 sampled projects there was evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the contracts committee for one Kinanira gravity water scheme TEC submitted the evaluation report on 26th October 2017 and it was approved on the same day by the contracts committee, for 2 classroom block at Mubuga P/S and 4 classroom block at Muganza P/S TEC submitted the evaluation report on 14th Feb. 2018 and it was approved on the same day by the contracts committee, the other two 2 stance VIP toilet at Nyarusinza sub county and Busengo bridge repair TEC submitted the evaluation report on 18th January and it was approved on the same day by the contracts committee.</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 contracts committee considered the recommendations of the TEC and approved the award of contracts without any deviations for the five sampled projects.</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>There was evidence that the procurement and disposal plan for the current FY 2018/2019 availed which was received on 25th July 2018 and approved by the CAO covers all Infrastructure projects in the approved AWP for the current FY 2018/2019. Considering the sampled projects there was adherence to the procurement plan in the previous FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/ infrastructure by August 30: score 2 	<p>According to the procurement plan for the current FY 2018/2019 which was received on 25th July 2018 from PPDA and approved by CAO there were 70 Infrastructure projects and out of them only 6 (9%) had approved bid documents by the contracts committee on 3rd September 2018. This was proof that less than 80% of bid documents were prepared by August 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2 	<p>The LG had an up dated contracts register containing all awarded projects for the previous FY 2017/2018 and all the sampled projects were registered too.</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 previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	<p>According to PPDA guidelines 2008 LG adhered to procurement thresholds, all the five sampled projects of Kinanira gravity water scheme, Mubuga and Muganza P/S, 2 stance VIP toilet at Nyarusinza sub county and Busengo bridge repair the method of procurement which was used is selective and for all the projects the value was less than 50 million. The guidelines require that for all works projects below 50 million selective bidding should be used.</p>	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>For all the sampled projects of Kinanira gravity water scheme, Mubuga and Muganza P/S, 2 stance VIP toilet at Nyarusinza sub county and Busengo bridge repair the completion certificates were available but no interim certificates were availed.</p>	0
<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>For all the sampled projects of Kinanira gravity water scheme, Mubuga and Muganza P/S, 2 stance VIP toilet at Nyarusinza sub county and Busengo bridge repair the site boards showed the project name, contractor, client/employer, source of funding and FY but the contract value and expected duration were not indicated.</p>	0
Financial management			

<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4 	<p>The monthly Bank Reconciliation Statements (BRS) for the FY 2017/18 were all produced although always late eg the BRS for June 2018 were done on 28th August 2018. The BRS for the FY 2018/19 have not been produced. The Ag CFO said that they have been preparing to move from Tier 2 to tier one of IFMS system and as a result, they have not been able to reconcile under the new system.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2. 	<p>Only in the education sector, all the 5 sampled payments were cleared on time. In water sector only 2 payments out of the sampled 12 were made on time. In the health sector it was not possible to establish if there were overdue payments because all contracts (only LPOs were available) with suppliers did not have delivery and payment deadlines.</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 the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor: 1 point. • LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2. 	<p>The District Internal Auditor (Mr Gabriel Nkuriye) was substantively appointed a District Internal Auditor (scale U2) by the District Service Commission under minute NO. 167/2005 as per appointment letter dated November 11, 2005 signed by the Chief Administrative Officer. This position is higher than a Senior Internal Auditor position as per the LGPA Manual.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2. 	<p>The District Internal Auditor produced 4 quarterly Internal Audit reports as follows: First quaterly report was dated 27th Ocotber 2017. The Second quarter report was dated 30th January 2018. The 3rd quarter report was dated 30th Appril 2018 and the 4th quarter report was dated 28th July 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports: score 2.</p>	<p>The LG provided information to Council and LGPAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings. The four quarter reports were submitted to Clerk to Council who is the administrator of both LGPAC and Council the following dates :</p> <p>1st quarter report on 30th /10/2017</p> <p>2nd quarter report on 2nd /02/2018</p> <p>3rd quarter report on 23rd /04/2018</p> <p>4th quarter report on 30th /07/2018</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1. 	<p>There was evidence that internal audit reports for the FY 2017/18 were submitted to both AO and LGPAC on the following dates:1st quarter report on 30th /10/2017</p> <p>2nd quarter report on 2nd /02/2018</p> <p>3rd quarter report on 23rd /04/2018</p> <p>4th quarter report on 30th /07/2018</p> <p>The availed evidence of discussion of IA reports by the LGPAC was given as per the minutes dated 23rd May 2018 and 24th July 2018. Only 4th quarter report had not been discussed.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG maintains an up- dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	<p>The LG maintains updated assets register per department and on works and vehicles both in physical and electronic form. The assets register was comprehensive and included assets of all other government institutions in the district including; land for Primary Schools, Sub-counties, primary schools and health centres among others. They are well updated and were in an approved format as per the LGFARs.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unqualified audit opinion: score 4 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0 	<p>The Audit report for the FY 2017/18 was unqualified.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</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 availed a set of minutes for the FY 2017/18 as follows: 28/09/2017; 19/10/2017; 21/12/2017; 29/03/2018; 31/05/2018; and all the sets of minutes provide proof that Council met and discussed service delivery related issues including TPC reports, quarterly review reports, monitoring reports & challenges of project implementation</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/ complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 1. 	<p>Ms Nyiramahoro Molly Senior Records officer is the designated person to coordinate response to feed-back & responded to feedback and complaints.</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>There was no specified system for recording ,Investigating and responding to grievances</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 LG Payroll & Pensioner Schedule were not displayed on the public notice board.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1. 	<p>Procurement Plan was available on the Notice Board and some copies of the awarded contracts and amounts were displayed.</p>	<p>1</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 LG performance assessment for the previous financial year were displayed on the public notice board as evidenced by CAO'S letter dated 2/7/2018 ref CR/103/1</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>A letter from the District planner dated 25/5/2018 ref CR/134/1 containing communications to LLGs from was availed for assessment. It contained Guidelines on DDEG from OPM and a copy of the disseminated DDEG guideline was availed for assessment</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1. 	<p>No proof provided for this activity.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			

<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG gender focal person and CDO have provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion into their activities score 2. 	<p>The GFP and CDO provided guidance to sector departments as evidenced in the minutes of the meeting of the district technical planning committee held on 15th September 2017 under MIN3/09/DTPC/2017/18 approved and signed by CAO.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the gender focal point and CDO have planned for minimum 2 activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and address vulnerability and social inclusions and that more than 90 % of previous year's budget for gender activities/ vulnerability/ social inclusion has been implemented: score 2. 	<p>The GFP and CDO had planned for seminars/workshops and donations as evidenced in the AWP for the current FY 2018/2019 which was approved and signed by CAO however there was no proof that more than 90% of previous year's budget was implemented because most of the activities that were supposedly done had no approved supporting documents.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 1 	<p>For all the sampled projects Kinanira gravity water scheme, Mubuga and Muganza P/S, 2 stance VIP toilet at Nyarusinza sub county and Busengo bridge repair the only available proof of environmental screening was for the 4 classroom block at Muganza P/S and no proof of budget for the mitigation measures.</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>No proof of integration of environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents for all the sampled projects.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1 	<p>For all the sampled projects there was no proof of ownership except a list of land inventory containing all public land in the district.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO: score 1 	<p>Out of five sampled projects only one had a completed and signed certificate by the environmental officer but there was no signature of the CDO.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance (new one): Score 1 	<p>No evidence that environmental and social clearance was done for projects before payment certification.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that environmental officer and CDO monthly report, includes a) completed checklists, b) deviations observed with pictures, c) corrective actions taken. Score: 1 	<p>There was no evidence that the environmental officer and CDO report monthly and therefore no check lists and observed deviations for the sampled projects.</p>	<p>0</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>The LG education de- partment has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<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 teachers lists and the budget presented showed that this minimum standard of budgeting for a head teacher and a minimum of seven teachers for all the primary schools with seven classes in was not complied with in Kisoro District. Some Primary seven schools had less than seven teachers as seen on the list generated from the PBS on 19072018110608 by fmunyarubanza.</p>	0
<p>The LG education de- partment has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<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>Evidence from the PBS lists showed several schools with seven classrooms, which had less than seven teachers deployed; for example, Mubuyemeru & Mukungu P.S etc had 6 teachers even if they are P.7 schools. The DEO's office said even if the District had advertised for vacant positions, they could not recruit sufficient staff because of the inadequate wage. On a positive note, verification of staff lists in the five sampled schools confirmed the same names displayed in the staff rooms as those on the list accessed from the DEO's office.</p>	0
<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100%: score 6 o If 80 - 99%: score 3 o If below 80%: score 0 	<p>Basing on the Kisoro LG structure for primary teachers and the wage bill provisions, the district is supposed to have 1357 teachers, but some of these teachers were transferred to the District Education Office and have not been replaced. Therefore falling slightly below the 100% for the teachers in the schools.</p>	3

<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	<p>Kisoro District had one inspector of schools substantively appointed, with a letter dated 13th January 2017; under the DSC minute 192/2016, signed by Tibigyenda W, who acts as a senior inspector. It also had special needs and sports officers acting as inspectors of schools. The DEO said the positions are filled by acting officers because of the wage bill provision.</p>	<p>6</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary Teachers: score 2 	<p>A recruitment plan dated 02/05/2018 was presented with positions for teachers and school inspectors, but the central registry stamp was dated 4th September 2018</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Inspectors: score 2 	<p>A recruitment plan dated 02/05/2018 was presented with positions for teachers and school inspectors, but the central registry stamp was dated 4th September 2018</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>Out of the two School Inspectors in Kisoro district, as shown by the list of inspectors and personnel files. only 1 out of 2 school inspectors is appraised.. The appraised school inspector is Mwunvaneza Emmabuel – date of appraisal is 26/07/2014 and report signed by Birinyi R.E. The school inspector was appraised as per appraisal indicated and verified report. Therefore 1 out of three eligible inspectors for appraisal represents a percentage of 50%.</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 o 90 - 100%: score 3 o 70% and 89%: score 2 o Below 70%: score 0 	<p>A sample of 10% of 137 schools was made i.e. 14 Primary Schools. Thus personal files of 14 Head Teachers of these schools were presented and analysed. Reviewing these personal H/Teachers' files, 8 appraisal reports were found.. This list of Head Teachers and appraisal reports and agreements shows that 8 out of 14 is a percentage of 57%. And those head teachers not appraised represent 43%.</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>In the sampled schools, there was evidence that the circulars had been circulated, although some the dates when the circulars were received were early this FY.</p> <p>e.g. Nyakabande P.S, a Circular about school closure was received on 13th December 2017, MDD- 10th August 2018, Mosquito nets – no date was seen. Mabuga has circulars received on 01/06/2018</p>	<p>1</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>The DEO's office had minutes of a meeting where circulars were discussed with head teachers, in a meeting held on 01/February/2018.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all registered primary schools²</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>There was no evidence of inspection, for any of the licensed schools, whose files were available. In total 33 licenses were produced by the education team, 11 of them in respective school's file while the others were copies of licenses kept in one file.</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 of meetings to discuss inspection reports since even the evidence for inspection was missing.</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>No evidence was found of submission of school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES).</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 inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4. 	<p>No evidence of meetings held in this respect, since there weren't recommendations to follow 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>There was evidence of data that corresponded with the lists of schools in the PBS generated on 19072018110608 by fmunyarubanza.</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>The EMIS data copy obtained from the Ministry showed enrollment of 7164, similar to what was presented in the PBS</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG committee re- sponsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>Council Committee responsible for Community and Education which met on the following days: 25/09/2017; 20/02/2018; 28/11/2017; 30/11/2017,05/09/2017 where Supervision of water infrastructure,support supervision of health facilities,inspection of schools;, PLE mock results, mushrooming schools without standards issues were discussed</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG committee re- sponsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>From the minutes of 28/9/2017 there is proof that the education sector committee presented issues that required approval of Council</p>	<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 majority of the schools had functional SMCs. The five sampled schools, had copies of minutes from meetings they held as per the dates below. These minutes were also found in the DEO's office:</p> <p>Nyakabande: 02/04/2018, 16/001/2018 & 19/10/2017</p> <p>Gisorora: 04/06/2018, 15/02/2018, 30/06/2017</p> <p>Kitarara: 11/05/2018, 29/08/2017</p> <p>Gasave: 20/04/2018, 20/10/2017</p> <p>Mubuga: 03/03/2018, 15,12/2017, 23/06/2017</p>	<p>3</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 e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	<p>There was a list on the wall in the hall way to the DEO's office, with a list of schools and the amounts that each of the schools received as non-wage recurrent grants.</p>	<p>3</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>The education sector prepared and submitted their procurement plan to the Procurement Unit and received an acknowledgement on 10th April 2018.</p>	<p>4</p>

Financial management and reporting			
<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3. 	<p>The LG education department certified and recommended payments to suppliers on time because the 5 sampled contracts (agreements) were paid for within 30 days stipulated in the contracts.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15th of July for consolidation: score 4 	<p>Q1 report submitted on 07/10/2017; Q2 report Not availed; Q3 report submitted on 26/4/2018 and Q4 report submitted on 2/08/2018 which is later than the timeline of mid-July</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 4 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 o If all queries are not responded to score 0 	<p>The education department had 4 queries in the 1st quarter report and 2 queries in the 2nd quarter report but there was no evidence of any responses from the education department. The District Internal auditor had a complaint that the heads of department were adamant on responding to audit findings.</p>	<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>The DEO presented a training report dated 03/01/2018, numbered CR/213/4 whose major content was about Menstrual Hygiene in schools. Participants of this training event were head teachers from schools in Kisoro District. The event took place on the 16th & 17th November 2017.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2 	<p>Guidelines were issued and during the training, mentioned in (i) above, and guidelines were also seen in the schools visited</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	<p>The Guidelines on gender composition for the SMCs say that the committee should have at least 2 females on the SMC team. Of the schools visited, Nyakabande, Mubuga and Katarara had two females while Gasave had 3 and Gisorora had 4 females, thus complying with the guidelines.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated 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>No evidence existed that guidelines on environmental management were disseminated and complied with.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all school infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 1 	<p>No evidence was provided</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1 	<p>No evidence was provided</p>	<p>0</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health care workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health care with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 80% filled: score 8 • 60 – 80% - score 4 • Less than 60% filled: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the performance contract 2018/19 and approved structure revealed that there are 604 established position filled. • Review of wage IPFs for the current year revealed that there 604 positions of health worker with a wage bill provision for the year 2018/19 • Hence 100% of the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY has been filled 	8
<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan for primary health care workers to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/re- quest to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of primary health care workers: score 6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The staff recruitment plan for the year 2018/10 was reviewed and it was established that 89 vacant positions of health workers had been included. • There is also communication from the DHO to the Principle Human Resource officer with copy to the CAO dated 15th May 2018 reiterating the same. Letter was received by HRM on the 15th May 2018 	6

<p>The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital In-charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 3 Health Centre 4s in Kisoro district with In-charges as follows: <p>In-charge of Busanza HC4 has no appraisal report or agreement found in his personal file. This indicates that the in-charge of this health C 4 was not appraised during FY 2017/18.</p> <p>Dr. Ruhunda Benon (In-charge of Chahafi HC4) – not appraised.</p> <p>In-charge of Ruhunguri HC4 – no evidence of appraisal found in his personal file.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therefore, out of 3 HC4s, none of In-charges was appraised during FY 2017/18, that is 0%. 	<p>0</p>
<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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of midwives and enrolled nurses deployed in Chahafi HC IV, Nyarusiza HC III, Nyabihuniko HC III, Nyakinama HC III and Kisoro Hospital as counted on the respective duty rosters are consistent with the staff lists submitted together with the budget 2018/19 	<p>4</p>
<p>Monitoring and Supervision</p>			

<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/ MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 	<p>There was no evidence (a communication letter) to indicate that the DHO communicated ALL of the following guidelines issued by the national level in the FY 2017/18:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Health Guidelines for Local Government Planning Process Health Sector Supplement – 2017 Ministry of Health, Sector Grant and Budget Guidelines to Local Governments FY 2018/19 Ministry of Health, Policy Strategies for Improving Health Service Delivery 2016-2021 	<p>0</p>
<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/ MHO has held meetings with health facility in- charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	<p>DHT meetings held on the 13th November 2017, 2nd January 2018, 8th February 2018, 2nd March 2018 and 15th May 2018 did not indicate discussions with health facility in-charges and among others explaining the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: score 3</p>	<p>The district availed 4 integrated support supervision reports by the DHT for the FY 2017/18. Quarter 1 report submitted to the CAO on the 2/11/2017, quarter 2 report submitted to the CAO on the 2/1/2018. Quarter 3 report submitted to CAO on the 18thMay 2018 and Quarter 4 report submitted to CAO on the 12th July 2018. However all support supervision reports did not have evidence that Mutolere PNFP hospital that received PHC grant was supervised.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% supervised: score 3 • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60% - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0 	<p>The DHT provided no evidence (copies of support supervision reports) for Bufumbira South HSD. It was reported that since there is no HC IV in Bufumbira South HSD, the HSD supposed to be supervised by Kisoro Hospital. Which did not carry out that mandate during 2017/18</p> <p>Four support supervision reports for Bufumbira North HSD were provided, however these were not signed off by the HSD in-charge or received officially by the DHO's office.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	<p>Minutes of DHT meetings held on the 13th November 2017, 2nd January, 8th February 2018, 2nd March 2018 and on 15th May 2018 did not have content in them to indicate that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions</p> <p>The office of the DHO did not have on file or provide minutes of HSD meetings for both Bufumbira South and Bufumbira North HSDs</p> <p>Kisoro Hospital did not provide HSD meeting minutes for the FY 2017/18</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 	<p>DHT meeting minutes for the FY 2016/17 did not indicate discussions regarding all the mandatory quarterly DHT support supervision reports</p> <p>Bufumbira North HSDs did not avail HSD meeting minutes for the FY 2017/18</p> <p>Bufumbira South HSDs was not supervised and Kisoro Hospital did not avail HSD meeting minutes for the FY 2017/18</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10 	<p>The lists of health facilities receiving PHC funding (in PBS) is consistent with the list received from MoH (health facilities reporting 2018/19).</p> <p>All 37 health facilities in PBS are also on the list from MOH.</p>	<p>10</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>Council Committee responsible for health met under the Social Services Standing Committee on the following days: 13/2/2018, ,28/11/2017; where supervision of Health facilities; monitoring reports & recommendations to Council on service delivery issues were discussed.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>From the minutes dated 21/11/2017; there were workplans, supervision of Health facilities programmes; monitoring reports & recommendations to Council for approval.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 6 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 6 If 80-99 %: score 4 If 70-79 %: score 2 If less than 70%: score 0 	<p>ALL 5 sampled HFs (Chahafi HC IV, Nyarusiza HC III, Nyabihuniko HC III, Nyakinama HC III and Kisoro Hospital) did not avail all the mandatory quarterly HUMC meeting minutes.</p> <p>Nyarusiza HC III presented only minutes for the meeting held on the 22/12/2017</p> <p>Nyabihuniko HC III presented only minutes for meetings held on the 27/01/2018, 1/03/2018 and on 1/05/2018</p> <p>Chahafi HC IV presented only minutes for meetings held on the 13/02/2018</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 4 	<p>There was posting on the public notice board at the DHOs office of a list of all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>The amount received by each Health facility was also indicate.</p> <p>All 5 Health facilities visited had displayed on their notice boards what they had received as PHC non-wage.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has submitted input to procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2 	<p>A copy of the AWP that was submitted to PDU was availed however there was no corresponding letter of submission from the DHO to the DPU to indicate that the AWP was submitted on time by April 30.</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>There was a copy of form PP1 (PD Entry code – 520, Subject of procurement – Stationary) was submitted by DHO to the PDU. It was confirmed by DHO in August 2017</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/ MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4. 	<p>It was not possible to determine whether the LG health department certified and recommended payments to suppliers on time because the sampled 10 contracts (all of them LPOs) did not specify delivery and payment deadlines.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the 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>Q1 report submitted on 27/10/2017; Q2 report submitted on 29/01/2018; Q3 report submitted on 26/4/2018 and Q4 report submitted on 25/08/2018 which is later than the timeline of mid-July.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If sector has no audit query: Score 4 If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: Score 2 points If all queries are not responded to Score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG health department had not responded to the audit findings in the 3rd quarterly report where 17 Health Centers were queried for not producing books of accounts and other records. There was no evidence of responses from the Health department. 	<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 <p>% women: score 2</p>	<p>Health Unit Management Committees (HUMCs) at the sampled health facilities (Chahafi HC IV, Nyarusiza HC III, Nyabihuniko HC III, Nyakinama HC III and Kisoro Hospital) met the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30% females on the HUMC).</p> <p>Nyarusiza HC III had 3 female and 4 male members and as per the minutes for the meeting held on the 22/12/2017</p> <p>Nyabihuniko HC III had 2 female and 5 male members as per minutes for meetings held on the 27/01/2018, 1/03/2018 and on 1/05/2018</p> <p>Chahafi HC IV had 2 female and 7 members as per minutes for meeting held on the 13/02/2018</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>Site visits at the sampled health facilities (Chahafi HC IV, Nyarusiza HC III, Nyabihuniko HC III, Nyakinama HC III and Kisoro Hospital) revealed that toilets facilities were separated for men and women</p>	<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>The health department did not implement any health facility infrastructure projects during FY 2017/18 hence no evidence to indicated that health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects and that risk mitigation plans were developed.</p> <p>Health facility infrastructure projects at Chahafi HC IV during FY 2017/18 were implemented MoH and not the district</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 check whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 2 	<p>No site visit reports by the district EO or CDO were availed for the Health facility infrastructure projects at Chahafi HC IV. Reason given was that this infrastructure project was implemented MoH and not the district</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal: score 4. 	<p>ALL 5 sampled HFs (Chahafi HC IV, Nyarusiza HC III, Nyabihuniko HC III, Nyakinama HC III and Kisoro Hospital) had a chart on medical waste management guidelines pinned in either the laboratory or maternity.</p>	<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>Data from MIS reports at the Ministry of Water and Environment revealed that the average safe water coverage for Kisoro District for FY 2017/18 was 43%. The Sub-counties with safe water coverage below the District average were; Bukimbiri (16%), Chahi (14%), Muramba (8%), Nyakabande (11%), Nyakinama (30%) and Nyarusiza (11%).</p> <p>From the Annual Work plans and PBS for FY 2018/19, out of the total Sector Development Grant of UGX 468,580,000/=, the total budget allocation to Sub-counties below the District average was UGX 125,973,000/= representing 27% of the total Sector Development Grant and was distributed as follows:-</p> <p>Bukimbiri S/C: UGX 0</p> <p>Chahi S/C: UGX 36,393,000/=</p> <p>Muramba S/C: UGX 55,790,000/=</p> <p>Nyakabande S/C: UGX 0</p> <p>Nyakimana S/C: UGX 9,396,000/=</p> <p>Nyarusiza S/C: UGX 24,394,000/=</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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: <p>Score 15</p> o If 80-99%: Score 10 o If 60-79: Score 5 o If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>The review of the Budget and Annual Progress Report for FY 2017/18 submitted by the District Water Department revealed that the budgeted water projects in the targeted Sub-counties of Bukimbi, Chahi and Muramba were fully implemented.</p> <p>During the field inspection, the recently constructed Rain Water Harvesting facilities in Chahi and Muramba Sub-Counties were confirmed to be in place and functioning satisfactorily..</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 review of the annual progress report revealed that the District Water Department implemented 17 water projects and the filed inspection reports clearly indicated that all the water projects were regularly supervised and monitored. Data from MIS reports at the Ministry of Water and Environment indicated that there were functional 391 springs, one deep borehole, 409 Rain Harvesting Tanks and 244 Public Kiosks. Monitoring reports on the files showed that 240 monitoring and supervision visits were conducted during the FY 2017/18. During each monitoring visit, 2 -4 point sources would be inspected. It is therefore estimated that about 720 out of the total 1045 functioning water supply points were monitored i.e about 69%..</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"> 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>FORM 1 (Data Collection Form for Point Water Sources) and FORM 4 (Source Functionality, Management and Gender) were submitted to the In-charge of Management Information System at the Ministry of Water and Environment on 13th April 2018 and 14th August 2018 respectively,</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>List of water facilities presented in the Management Information System reports at the Ministry of Water and Environment were consistent with those in PBS.</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>On 30th April 2018 the District Water Department submitted to PDU input for the District Procurement Plan that covered all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget .</p>	<p>4</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 Contract Management Plans were available in the files and site visits were conducted to supervise the construction of Karenganyambi Gravity Flow Scheme on 20th November 2017 and 4th December 2017 and 18th December 2017.</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>Water and Sanitation facilities approved by the District Engineer were availed to the Assessor. Construction progress reports were prepared and were made available for review. The Assessor inspected Communal Water Harvesting facilities at Gatsibo village in Bunagana Parish and Nyamigendo village in Chahi Sub-county, Kinanira Gravity Flow Scheme in Busanza Sub-county and protected springs at Gisasa village in Kanaba Sub-county and Gwatembe village in Nyundo Sub-county. All the five water supply facilities were found functioning satisfactorily as per design specifications..</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	<p>The Contractors handed over all completed WSS facilities as evidenced by Certificates of Substantial Completion of works and Hand-over reports duly signed by all parties which were available for review on files.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2 	<p>Sampled Interim Payment Certificates showed that the District Water Officer had duly certified the Interim Payment Certificates. E.g. Under Procurement Reference No. KISO 526/WRKS/2017 – 2018/00002 for the protection of Gisasa Spring in Kanaba Sub-county, Interim Payment Certificate No.1 was duly certified by the District Water Officer on 19th December 2017. Under Procurement Reference No. KISO 526/SUPPLY/2016 – 2017/00033 for the construction of 10 m3 ferro cement Rain Water Harvesting Tank at Rutare, Interim Payment Certificate No.1 was duly certified by the District Water Officer on 22nd February 2018.</p> <p>Projection Completion Reports were prepared, certified and filed appropriately.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district Water department has certified and initiated payment for works and supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG Water department did not certify and recommend payments to suppliers on timely basis as provided for in the contracts A sample of 12 payment vouchers and contracts showed that only 2 payments were certified and paid within a maximum of 30 days provided for in the contract. 	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<p>The district Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Plan- ning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	<p>The District Water Department submitted to the District Planner the annual performance report for the FY 2017/18 on 22nd August 2018. The Quarter 1 performance report was submitted on 27th October 2017, the Quarter 2 performance report was submitted on 29th January 2018, Quarter 3 performance report was submitted on 26th April 2018 and Quarter 4 including annual performance report was submitted on 22nd August 2018. Therefore the annual performance report was submitted later than the stipulated date.</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 LG Water department did not have any internal audit findings for the FY 2017/18.</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 assessment established that Q1 report was submitted on 27/10/2017; Q2 report submitted on 27/01/2018; Q3 report submitted on 27/4/2018 and Q4 report submitted on 22/08/2018 which is later than the timeline of mid-July.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	<p>Standing Committee for Works & Technical services where water sector belongs met on 30/11/2017, 22/2/2018 based on the availed minutes and discussed supervision reports</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2. 	<p>The was no evidence that the AWP, Budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures were displayed on the District notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2 	<p>The sampled water supply projects were the Communal Water Harvesting Tank at Gatsibo village in Bunagana Parish, Communal Water Harvesting Tank at Nyamigendo village in Chahi Sub-county, Kinanira Gravity Fjow Scheme in Busanza Sub-county and protected springs at Gisasa village in Kanaba Sub-county and at Gwatembe village in Nyundo Sub-county. All the above projects were clearly labeled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	<p>Due to limited sizes of the District Notice Boards, information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) earlier displayed on the District notice boards had been removed to give space to other information displays. Unfortunately the removed information displays were not properly filed. The District Water Officer was advised to always file the removed information displays for future reference</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 water supply facilities from communities 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>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>There was evidence that O & M funds were being collected by Water and Sanitation Committees and the sampled water supply facilities were properly maintained and functioning satisfactorily.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			

<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	<p>Environmental screening reports were not available.</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>Every Interim Payment Certificate had as an attachment duly certified Environmental and Social Mitigation Certificate Form clearly indicating the required mitigation measures and whether they were executed or not.</p>	<p>1</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>Five sampled construction and supervision contracts did not have any clauses on environmental protection.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The district Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If at least 50% WSCs are women and at least one occupying a key position (chairperson, secretary or Treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements: score 3 	<p>Review of information contained in FORM 4 (Source Functionality, Management & Gender) and the Annual Progress Reports revealed that at least 50% WSCs are women and at least one occupied a key position (chairperson, secretary or treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/</p> <p>RGCs provided by the Water Department.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3 	<p>The District Water Department did not provide sanitation facilities in public places/RGCs.and therefore there was none for inspection.</p>	<p>0</p>