



Local Government Performance Assessment

Kisoro Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 782)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	33%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	52%
Educational Performance Measures	72%
Health Performance Measures	52%
Water Performance Measures	0%

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 for FY 2018/2019 submitted on 3/8/2018 which is later than the timeline date.</p>	No
Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			

<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY by 30th June (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From MoFPED's inventory of LG budget submissions, check whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The LG budget is accompanied by a Procurement Plan or not. If a LG submission includes a Procurement Plan, the LG is compliant; otherwise it is not compliant. 	<p>Consolidated Procurement Plan was embedded in the performance contract 2018/2019 but was not submitted on time.</p>	<p>No</p>
--	--	--	-----------

Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports

<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted report to MoFPED in time, then it is compliant • If LG submitted late or did not submit, then it is not compliant 	<p>Annual Performance report submitted on 24/08/2018. This is later than the timeline date.</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>Q1 dated 16/3/18 Q2 dated 09/04/2018; Q3 dated 5/07/2018; Q4 dated 24/08/2018. This is later than the timeline date.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Audit</p>			

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and the Auditor General's findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action in 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 MC provided and submitted information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of both OAG findings for the financial year 2017/2018 in a letter REF KMC 23/18 dated 23RD March 2018 which received by the Directorate of Internal Audit on 26th March 2018 . The response for the Internal Auditor Generals findings were in a letter REF KMC23/18 dated 23rd march 2018 which was received by the MOFPED on 26th March 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 external audit report for the FY 2017/18 was unqualified.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a district/ municipality has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 1. 	<p>Kisoro MC has a functional Physical Planning Committee that was appointed on 1/02/2012. This is evidenced by the letter from the Town Clerk appointing members of urban physical Planning committee</p>	1
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that district/ MLG has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD score 1. 	<p>The assessment established that there was no evidence of submission of physical planning committee minutes 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>Physical Development plan 2008-2018 in place approved by the ministry of lands on 20th June 2008. However the Physical Development plan is expiring this year 2018 but plans are under way to have it reviewed. From the Registration Book where an entry dated 10/01/2018 under a one Mutesi John who had applied for approval of plans for a Commercial Building & Minutes of the Physical Planning Committee dated as follows: 23/2/2018, 1/8/2018 & supervision reports show consistence of approval plans with the Physical plan</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action area plan prepared for the previous FY: score 1 or else 0 	<p>There was no evidence availed</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>A review of the Budget conference report dated 28th November 2017, shows the following sampled priorities in the Works & Technical services department: Routine Road maintenance in all the municipal divisions; Periodic road maintenance; Procurement & Installation of culverts on MC roads; , construction of Pit Latrine at the municipality HQs which are quite well linked with the AWP.</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. <p>If differences appear, a justification has to be provided and evidence provided that it was approved by the Council. Score 1.</p>	<p>2 From the AWP 2018/19 the following capital investments: Resealing Bishop kivengere road and Bitumen surface shs 247,341,000 in AWP and pg 132 in Development.Plan,Pothole patching of paved roads shs 20,000,000 Bulding and construction of latrine at Gisoro PS shs 20,000,000, page 50 of AWP,Building and construction of classrom at Sesema,Kisoro Demo,Kisoro Hill Primary schools and page 142 of Development plan,Construction of Buildings at Zindiro HC 11 upgrading to HC111 shs 500,092,000</p> <p>It was all clear that the above investments were derived from the Deveolpment Plan availed which covers the period 2016/17-2020/2021</p>	
--	--	--	--

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 2. 	<p>No evidence availed</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>No statistical abstract was compiled in the financial year</p>	<p>0</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>From the AWP 2017/18 and budget the following capital investments: water tank construction at kisoro Hill primary school shs 10,000,000, pg 19, classroom rehabilitation at Gisoro Primary school shs 20,000,000 Classroom rehabilitation at seseme primary school shs 20,000,000, mechanized road maintenance of mosque road UGX15,551,200, mechanised road maintenance Nyagashinge road shs 22,704,00 were implemented in the previous FY and they are all reflected in the education sector Work plans as well as AWP page 19-21 and the budget page 19,23 .UGX 15,551,200, mechanised road maintenance Nyagashinge road shs 22,704,00 were implemented in the previous FY and they are all reflected in the education sector Work plans as well as AWP page 19-21 and the budget page 19,23.</p>	2
<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 Educatin and Works & Technical services;</p> <p>Renovation of classroom at Gisoro primary school shs 14,187,941, Construction of 10cm Ferro cement tank at Gisoro Hill primary school shs 6,994,029, Renovation of classroom at Seseme Primary school shs 15,551,120, Furniture provision to kisoro Demo primary school, Mechanised maitainace of mosque road 22,704,000, Maitainace of Nyagashinge road shs 25,018,865, Mechanised maitainance of Zindiro-Gase road 24,064,600</p> <p>All the projects were completed as per the workplan by the end of the financial year</p>	4
<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 Annual budget performance report, the following capital investments: Water tank construction at Kisoro Hill primary school UGX 10,000,000, pg 19, classroom rehabilitation at Gisoro Primary school UGX 20,000,000 Classroom rehabilitation at seseme primary school UGX 20,000,000, mechanized road maintenance mosque road UGX 15,551,200, mechanized road maintenance Nyagashinge road UGX 22,704,00 were implemented in the previous FY and they are all reflected in the education sector Work plans as well as AWP page 19-21 and the budget page 19,23 UGX 15,551,200, mechanized road maintenance Nyagashinge road UGX 22,704,00 were implemented in the previous FY and they are all reflected in the education sector Work plans as well as AWP page 19-21 and the budget page 19,23. This provides a clear indication that the investment projects were implemented within the approved budget.</p>	0

<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>From the Budget the assessment established there was provision of shs 2,173,000 on building maitainance but there was no any expenditure</p>	<p>0</p>
---	---	---	----------

Human Resource Management

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 Municipality of Kisoro during FY 2017/18. As per the staff structure, there are 11 HoDs and heads of units. In Kisoro Municipality, 10 HoDs and units are substantively filled. This represents 91% of positions filled. Broken down as follows:

? Chief Finance Officer – Substantively filled by Benon Rutongara as Chief Finance Officer by appointment letter dated 20.03.2018 under DSC min. 17/2018 signed by Town Clerk Peter Masiko.

? District Education Officer (by Nkurichiyimana Gerard) – position is filled substantively by appointment letter dated 04/06/2018 and minute DSC/71/2018.

? Principle HR Officer position – Not substantively appointed but position held by assigned staff (Doreen Rukundo) by letter dated 5/7/2018.

? District Internal Auditor position – filled (by Kamali Emmanuel) by appointment letter dated 27/06/2016 under minute DSC/167/2005.

? District Health Officer – position substantively filled as per appointment letter dated 2nd March 2017, minute DSC/27/2017 and letter signed by Benon Yiga.

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

? Senior Procurement Officer (Ahimbisibwe Gertrude) – position filled as per appointment letter 4/6/2018 under min 73/2018 and signed by Peter Masiko (TC).

? Dist Community Based Services Officer (Birungi Front) – position filled as per appointment letter dated 14th June 2018 under DSC min. 89/2018.

? Information Officer – This position is substantively appointed as per appointment letter signed by Peter Masiko, dated 14/05/2018 under DSC minute 56/2018.

? Probation & Welfare Officer – Not Substantively filled position.

? Natural Resources Officer – position substantively filled (by Nizeyimana Anklet) as per letter dated 14/5/2018 under min 54/2018 – signed by P Masiko.

<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: All 11 HoDs and Units were appraised during FY 2017/18 using standard guidelines from MoPS by various officers. This represents 100% of HoDs appraised. Appraisal dates for some of those HoDs were: 26/7/2017 signed by T/Clerk, 30.06.2018 signed by P Masiko, 6.7.2017 signed by P Masiko, 25.6.2017 signed by P Masiko, 3.7.2017 signed by P Masiko. Some HoDs were not yet eligible for appraisal and hence not applicable – eg Principal Educ Officer (recruited only on 4.6.2018) and Procurement Officer (recruited on 4.6.2018). 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 % of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to records viewed, 9 positions were submitted to DSC by Town Clerk's office via HR section for recruitment as per letter with referenced as Ref. KMC/151/1 and dated 8/11/2017. This was for positions such as Asst Town Clerk, Asst Librarian, Law Enforcement Asst, Environment Officer, Askaris etc. Advert via newspapers i.e New Vision of 20th Nov 2017 indicates that 8 of these positions were considered. For example, eventual appointments yielded DSC minute such as 56/2018 for IT officer, 54/2018 dated 14.5.2018 for Environment Officer, 57/2018 dated 14.5.2018 for Community based Services Officer etc. These submissions viewed indicate that all 9 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 at HR office at Kisoro Municipality indicate that 18 cases were submitted from Town Clerk's office to DSC. Three submission lists were verified and referenced as KMC/159/1 dated 24/4/2018, KMC/214/1 dated 25.9.2017 and KMC/214/1 un-dated. A list of confirmed staff during FY 2017/18 indicated that all 18 staff submitted were confirmed as per minute extracts such as min. 109/2017, min 110/2017, 111/2017, 112/2017, 113/2017, 114/2017 dated 29/9/2017 and 55/2018 dated 7/5/2018. Example of staff confirmed include: Musimira Damali (Stenographer), Ntirenganya Richard (Accountant), Kabasinguzi Carolyna (Town Agent), Habimugisha Julius (Askari) and Twahibwa John (Askari). Thus 18 out of 18 represents 100% of staff considered for confirmation 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 review of submission lists for disciplinary action for Kisoro Municipality, there is no evidence of any staff submitted to District Service Commission for disciplinary action during FY 2017/18. Absence of staff submitted for disciplinary action represents a consideration of 100%. 	<p>1</p>
<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Of the seven staff verified as recruited by Kisoro Municipal Council during FY 2017/18, all 7 new staff accessed payroll within the following month of recruitment i.e. within one month. This, for example, is indicated by details as follows: Benjamin Niyigibirwa, IT Officer recruited by letter of 14.5.2018 and paid on payroll of June 2018; Angella Nfitundida, Asst T/Clerk recruited on 14.5.2018 and appeared on payroll of June 2018; Anaclet Nizeimana (Environment Officer) recruited on 14.5.2018 and accessed payroll of June 2018; Iragaba Julius (Community Based Services Officer) recruited on 14.5.2018 and accessed payroll of June 2018. There was no other indication to show that none of the new recruits did not access the payroll beyond 2 months of recruitment. This therefore represents 100% since all the 7 new recruited staff accessed payroll before 2 months of recruitment. 	<p>3</p>
<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2 	<p>Kisoro Municipal Council submitted only 1 case who retired during FY 2017/18. The staff pension payroll list presented and verified indicated that this retired staff (Kabeera Emmanuel) retired on as per letter of retirement dated 2/11/2017 signed by Town Clerk also under min 108/2017. Pension Invoice payroll verified showed that this retired staff accessed his gratuity pension pay on 19/06/2018. This is 6 months from date of retirement. Therefore, no staff accessed pension payroll within 2 months of retirement in Kisoro Municipality i.e 0 out of 1 is 0%.</p>	<p>0</p>

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 Kisoro Municipal Council OSR reduced by 17% from UGX 618,615,964 in the FY 2016/7 to UGX 512,706,040 in the FY 2017/18. This was less than 10% increment. (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 48% (UGX 248,067,261/513,007,660). This resulted in a budget variance of 52% 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>Except for the property tax which is not sharable with the divisions as per the LG Rating Act 2005, there was no revenue collected at the Municipal Council level to be shared with the Divisions. All the rest of the revenues were collected by the Divisions. Therefore there was no omission in the remission of revenues to the municipal divisions.</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 34,980,000 in the FY 2017/18 on Council allowances and emoluments compared to UGX 618,615,964 collected in the FY 2016/17. This constituted 6% of OSR for the FY 2016/17 (less than 20%) as per Section 4 of the Local Governments Act.</p>	<p>2</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 a substantively appointed procurement officer (Ahimbisibwe Getrude) in appointment letter dated 4th June 2018 under Minute No 73/2018 and signed by Town clerk (Peter Masiko) however there was no assistant.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	<p>There was evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the contracts committee (under minute number KMC11/2017/18) for three projects which are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rehabilitation of classroom at Seseme Primary School Construction of a terro cement water tank at Kisoro hill Renovation of 1 classroom at Gisoro Primary School 	<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 the contracts without any deviations for all the three projects under minute number 150/CC/2017/18.</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 FY 2018/2019 availed covers all Infrastructure projects in the approved AWP for the current FY 2018/2019.</p> <p>Considering the three projects which were done in the FY 2017/2018 there was adherence to the procurement plan in the previous FY 2017/18.</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>For all infrastructure projects in the procurement plan for the FY 2018/2019 no bid documents were availed. This showed that the percentage of bid documents prepared by August 30 2018 was 0%.</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 three awarded projects for the FY 2017/2018 ref. numbers KMC 782/WRKS/2017-18/00001-00003 and procurement activity files were all completed.</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 because for all the three projects that were awarded in the previous FY 2017/2018 the method of procurement which was used is selective and for all the projects the value was less than 50M. 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 projects implemented in the previous FY 2017/2018 namely;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehabilitation of classroom at Seseme Primary School • Construction of a ferro cement water tank at Kisoro hill and • Renovation of 1 classroom at Gisoro Primary School <p>The completion certificates were there 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 three projects awarded in the previous FY 2017/2018 only renovation of 1 classroom at Gisoro Primary School had a clearly labelled site board showing the project name, contractor, client/employer, source of funding, FY and the contract value but expected duration was not indicated. The other two rehabilitation of classroom at Seseme Primary School and construction of a ferro cement water tank at Kisoro hill had no site boards displayed.</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 not available. The LG was in the process of moving to a new IFMS system which the staff were not yet conversant with. They were still waiting for MOFPED to give them the final training.</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>It was not possible to determine if the LG paid suppliers on time because all the contracts examined did not indicate payment deadlines/ timelines.</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 Municipal Internal Auditor (Mr Kamari Emmanuel) was substantively appointed a Senior Internal Auditor (scale U3) by the District Service Commission under minute NO. 117/2016 as per appointment letter dated June 27, 2016 signed by the Ag Town Clerk (Mr Tumwesifgye Isaiah. 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 DIA produced 4 quarterly Internal Audit reports. First quarterly report was dated 30th October 2017. The Second quarter report was dated 30th January 2018. The 3rd quarter report was dated 14th April 2018 and the 4th quarter report was dated 30th July 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports: score 2.</p>	<p>There was evidence evidence that the LG provided information to Council and LGPAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The first quarter report was received was received by TC, LGPAC and Mayor on 3rd Nov 2017. 2. 2nd quarter report was received by TC on 9th February 2018, LG PAC and Mayor on 5th Feb 2018 3. 3rd quarter report was received by the Mayor and LGPAC on 18th April 2018 and by TC on 14th April 2018 4. 4th quarter report was received by TC, Mayor and LGPAC on 2nd August 2018. 	<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 the LG provided information to Council and LGPAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The first quarter report was received was received by TC, LGPAC and Mayor on 3rd Nov 2017. 2. 2nd quarter report was received by TC on 9th February 2018, LG PAC and Mayor on 5th Feb 2018 3. 3rd quarter report was received by the Mayor and LGPAC on 18th April 2018 and by TC on 14th April 2018 4. 4th quarter report was received by TC, Mayor and LGPAC on 2nd August 2018. 	<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 , the various institutions . 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 external audit report for the FY 2017/18 was unqualified.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</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>From the Minutes of Council meetings availed & dated as follows: 7/12/2017; 13/01/2018; 23/08/2017; it is clear proof that Kisoro MC meets to discuss service delivery issues that include collection of garbage,wellfare of teachers, and monitoring reports.</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>The assessment established that Mr Birungi Front is the designated person to coordinate Grievance/Complaints and feedback.</p> <p>Letter dated 4/7/2017 was availed .</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 clear 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>LG Payroll and pensioner schedules were displayed on the walls in the Office Block Corridor.</p>	<p>2</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>Consolidated Procurement & Contract Awards available on the Notice boards.</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>LG PA results for the previous FY were not published</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1 	<p>There was no evidence that the municipal council communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY:</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1. 	<p>There was no proof that the municipal council conducted Baraza or radio programmes to provide feed-back on the status of activity implementation</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>No proof of guidance was provided by the GFP and CDO to sector departments.</p>	<p>0</p>
---	--	--	----------

The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.

- 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.

The LG GFP and CDO had planned for seminars/workshops, trainings and monitoring of the projects as evidenced in the AWP for the FY 2018/2019 which was approved and signed by the town clerk.

The previous year's budget was 425,829,000Ushs and the implementation provided by the CDO was as below;

- Youth livelihood programme received 103,310,000ushs according to the letter signed by PS min. of GLSD on 21st June 2018.
- Older persons received 1,008,000ushs for sensitization on 31st may 2018 signed the chairman elderly council.
- Special grant for the PWDS amounting 5,440,000ushs signed the chairman council for PWDS
- Youth council received 220,000Ushs and 340,000Ushs on 18th may 2018 according to the requisitions signed by the CDO and town clerk.
- Women councils received 300,000Ushs according to the requisition signed by the CDO and deputy town clerk.
- 500,000Ushs was spent on functional adult literacy programme assessment requisition signed by CDO and town clerk.
- Projects monitoring by the sectoral committee on social services spent 264,000Ushs and 338,000Ushs by the council of PWDS.
- Mobilisation and sensitisation on OVC and child labor 880,000Ushs was spent.

The total expenditure approved as provided by the CDO amounts 112,600,000Ushs which is 26.44% of the previous year's budget.

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 1 	<p>No proof of environmental Screening or EIA for all the implemented projects in the previous FY 2017/2018 was provided.</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.</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 implemented projects there was no proof of land ownership.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO: score 1 	<p>For all the implemented projects none had a completed and signed certificate by the environmental officer and 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 therefore no completed 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 budget for salaries for FY2017/18 – Vote 782 reflected a budget for 15 teachers for Gisoro P.S, 20 for Kisoro Demonstration Primary School, 19 for Seseme Primary School and 7 for Kisoro Hill Primary and a head teacher for all these schools. thus meeting the minimum requirements of 7 teachers and a headteacher per school.</p>	4
<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>All schools had the minimum requirements: the school lists accessed at the Municipal Education Office, matched those submitted in the PBS and those found in the four municipal schools visited. Deployment matched the budgeted for teachers as presented in the section above</p>	4

<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision <p>o If 100%: score 6</p> <p>o If 80 - 99%: score 3</p> <p>o If below 80%: score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the structure for primary teachers is filled in accordance to the wage bill provision. In fact the Municipal council has surpassed their primary school wage provision for primary schools and leveraged funds from the Primary School Teacher's college and one secondary school</p>	<p>6</p>
<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	<p>The Municipal Council is supposed to have 1 senior inspector and 3 officers with inspectorate roles, however, due to the current wage bill provisions; the office has no inspector substantively appointed. The staff assigned inspectorate roles in a letter dated 11/07/2018, is substantively appointed as the Education officer for special needs, as in the letter of appointment dated 04/06/2018 under minute number 72/2018.</p>	<p>6</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary Teachers: score 2 	<p>The education department in the municipal council submitted a recruitment plan for FY 2018/19, under vote 782 to the HR with positions for teachers. The plan was received and an acknowledgement receipt signed on 19th April, 2018 was seen.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Inspectors: score 2 	<p>The education department in the municipal council submitted a recruitment plan for FY 2018/19, under vote 782 to the HR with positions school inspectors. The plan was received and an acknowledgement receipt signed on 19th April, 2018 was seen.</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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There exists only 1 School Inspector in Kisoro Municipality, This staff is not substantively appointed but only assigned duties of Inspector of schools by letter dated 11/07/2018 signed by P. Masiko and referenced as KMC/305/1. This staff is not eligible for appraisal and hence not applicable. This therefore represents a percentage of 100%. 	<p>3</p>

<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary school head teachers o 90 - 100%: score 3 o 70% and 89%: score 2 o Below 70%: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kisoro Municipality has only 4 Primary Schools. Head Teachers of all these 4 P/Schools were found to be appraised as per verified documentation as follows: Kisoro Dem School with Hd Teacher Habyeremye Stephen appraised by Yiga Benard with performance agreement dated 2/3/2017; Kisoro Hill P/School with Hd Teacher Tumusabe Emannuel appraised by Gerard Kurichimana with performance agreement dated 27/3/2017; Sesame P/School with Hd Teacher Munyantwale Samuel Baker appraised by Gerard Kurichimana with performance agreement dated 2/2/2017; and Kisoro P/School with Hd Teacher Mbonye Emmanuel appraised by Gerard Kurichimana with performance agreement dated 2/3/2017. <p>This list of Head Teachers and appraisal performance agreements shows that 4 out of 4 is a percentage of 100%.</p>	<p>3</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>The circulars were received in the schools around 18th April 2017, circular number 05/2017, and adherence to school calendar May 9th 2017 and circulated it on November 8th 2017.</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 Municipal Education Officer's office had minutes of a meeting where circulars were discussed with head teachers, in a meeting held on 18/06/2018 under minute 11/June/2018</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG Education De- partment 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: o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59 % score 1 o Below 50% score 0. 	<p>The evidence available in form of inspection reports was for only two schools (Little Rose Pre and Primary School and Kisoro Hill Baptist Primary School) out of the 12 licensed and registered schools whose files were found in the Municipal Education Officer's office.</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>The evidence in relation to school inspection was for only two schools, as explained in 7, however, there were two sets of minutes (18/06/2018- Minute 11/June, communication from the Principal Education Officer (PEO); inspection of schools, and 09/08/2018, Minute 20/August 2018- Briefing from Inspection Reports) where the PEO raised issues that were affecting the schools inspected in meetings with head teachers.</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 	<p>Evidence was found of submission of school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES. This was in form of acknowledgement notes dated: 18/09/2017, signed by Okwi Patrick, 29/02/2018, signed by Kirenda Winnie and 09/07/2018, signed by RB, ACI/PPE DES.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed- up: score 4. 	<p>No evidence was available for following up the recommendations for the schools that had evidence of inspection.</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: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>The list of schools in the PBS matched that provided by the MoES and the lists found in the Municipal Council Office.</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 lists submitted in the PBS had a bigger number compared to what was in the data obtained from the Ministry and the data in the Municipal Council Office. Enrollment data for Kisoro Demonstration School was 1300 in the generated PBS list as compared to 645 MoES list, and Seseme P.S had 1781 in the generated PBS list as compared to 834</p>	<p>0</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>Minutes dated 12/04/2017 show proof that Council Committee responsible for education met and discussed issues like provision of Lunch for pupils, Promotion of Umuganda, and inspection of schools</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 council held on 7/12/2017 under minute 15/kmc/2017/2018 the following issues were discussed & recommended for approval by the full council sitting: Recruitment of education officer and monitoring reports</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 all the schools had functional SMCs appointed as per the letters in their files dated 3rd December 2015 signed by Munyarubanza Francis, DEO Kisoro District. Copies of their minutes showed they all discussed budgets and other resource issues; the minutes for the four schools under the MEO were dated as follows:</p> <p>Kisoro Demonstration P.S: 20/06/2018 27/03/2018 & 30/05/2017</p> <p>Kisoro Hill P.S: 28/03/2018, 21/07/2017</p> <p>Seseme P.S: 21/06/2018, 20/10/2017, 16/03/2018</p> <p>Gisoro P.S: 23/08/2018, 16/03/2018, 20/10/2017</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non- wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants <p>e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</p>	<p>There were lists on the Municipal Education Officer's notice board and on the main Council notice board. All the four schools under the municipal council had the record of the funds received displayed on their staff room walls. The head teachers in the different schools said they could not display outside because of: lack of notice boards and because when displayed on the walls, the papers are plucked off or destroyed by rain and dew.</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,</p> <p>to the Procurement Unit that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	<p>The education sector prepared and submitted their procurement plan to the Procurement Unit and received an acknowledgement on 18th April 2018, by Nyanzi Ashraf.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<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>It was not possible to establish whether the DEO certified and recommended suppliers on time because the contracts did not have provisions for payment deadlines.</p>	<p>0</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>From the planning unit,it was established that the annual report from education department was received on 14/7/2018 for consolidation.</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 one internal audit finding on Seseme S.S in the 2nd quarter report which the school responded to by the Head teacher in the letter dated 12th March 2018 which was received by the Head of Internal Audit on 14th March 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
---	--	---	----------

Social and environmental safeguards

<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 Municipal Education Officer's office conducted a meeting with head teachers of Primary Schools and other participants on 18/06/2018 in which he disseminated the guideline as documented in Min. 11/June/2018</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 were found in the 4 municipal schools which were 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 says the committee should have at least 2 females on the team. All the schools under the Municipal Education Office adhered to this guideline: All the schools; Kisoro Demonstration P.S, Kisoro Hill P.S, Seseme P.S, and Gisoro P.S: have four female representatives on committees of 12 members.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide- lines 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>At the District Municipal Officer's (MEO) office, there was a circular dated 14th March 2018 which was shared with the four schools under this office and received by the schools on 14th April 2018. this was done by the MEO, because the environment officer had not yet been recruited</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide- lines on environmental management are dissemi- nated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all school infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 1 	<p>No evidence was provided, the environmental officer said he was new</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide- lines on environmental management are dissemi- nated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1 	<p>No evidence was provided, the environmental officer said he was new</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 wage IPFs revealed that there are 8 positions of health worker with a wage bill provision for the year 2018/19 • Review of the performance contract 2018/19 and approved structure revealed that there are 8 established position of primary health workers filled. • 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"> • There is no staff recruitment plan for the year 2018/19 nor a submission letter from the DHO to the Principle Human Resource officer 	0
<p>The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital In- charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no Health Centre 4s in Kisoro Municipal Council and therefore there is no In-charge who could have been appraised. Appraisal in the Kisoro Municipality is therefore not applicable. This represents 100% score. 	8

<p>The Local Government Health department has deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY, and if not provided justification for deviations: score 4 	<p>During the visit to Zindiro HC II (the only health facility managed by Kisoro Municipa Council) it was confirmed that there are 2 nursing assistants and 2 enrolled nurses deployed there, this is consistent with the staff lists submitted together with the budget 2018/19</p>	4
Monitoring and Supervision			
<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 	<p>There was no evidence (a communication letter) to indicate that the MHO communicated ALL of the following guidelines issued by the national level in the FY 2017/18:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Health Guidelines for Local Government Planning Process Health Sector Supplement – 2017 Ministry of Health, Sector Grant and Budget Guidelines to Local Governments FY 2018/19 Ministry of Health, Policy Strategies for Improving Health Service Delivery 2016-2021 	0
<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/MHO has held meetings with health facility in- charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	<p>There were no Municipal health committee team meeting minutes for FY 2017/18 provided to indicate discussions with the health facility in-charge at Zindiro HC II and among others explaining the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level for FY 2017/18</p>	0

<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>No evidence, not applicable as the only health facility managed by Kisoro Municipal Council is Zindiro HC II</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>This is not applicable as there is no HSD set up at Kisoro municipal council. The municipality has only one health facility (Zindiro HC II)</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	<p>The office of the Municipal Health Office did not have Municipal health committee team meeting minutes to indicate discussions of quarterly support supervision and monitoring visit reports for FY 2017/18.</p> <p>In addition there were no quarterly support supervision and monitoring visit reports of Zindiro HC II for 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>The office of the Municipal Health Office did not have quarterly support supervision and monitoring visit reports of Zindiro HC II for FY 2017/18. Hence no recommendations to be followed upon</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10 	<p>There is only one health facility (Zindiro HC II) receiving PHC funding (in PBS) is consistent with the list received from MoH (health facilities reporting 2018/19).</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>Based on the Standing Committee meetings held as follows;12/04/2017 under minute 3/2017/18/CDS/KMC; the issues presented included among others were: Support supervision reports, Procurement of a dumping site for garbage, Drainage channel, Regulating private schools, Health departmental reports</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 7/12/2017 there were bye laws on sanitation and hygiene,Planned garbage disposal site at Nyakabungo all 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>Zindiro HC II did not have all the mandatory quarterly HUMC meeting minutes as the health facility in-charge reported that 1st quarter HUMC meeting did not take place as the HUMC had not been instated.</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 MH office of Zindiro HC II receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grant and the corresponding amount received. At Zindiro HC II there was a posting on the public notice board of the amount of PHC non-wage recurrent grant received for 2018/19</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>The MHO did not have or submit to the assessor a copy of the letter of submission from the MHO to the DPU to indicate that the sector 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 – Kisoro M.C /782, Subject of procurement – Supply of computer and printer) was submitted by DHO to the PDU. It confirmed by PMO in August 2017 and was not signed for confirmation of funding.</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 10/09/2017; Q2 report submitted January 10, 2018, Q3 report availed for assessment and dated 04/04/2018 and the annual performance report Q4 submitted July 16, 2018 after the deadline 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 did not have any internal audit findings in the FY 2017/18 	<p>4</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30 % women: score 2 	<p>The Health Unit Management Committees (HUMCs) at Zindiro HC II met the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. more than one females on the HUMC).</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>Toilets facilities at Zindiro 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 MHO 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>0</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 2 	<p>No site visit reports by the district EO or CDO were availed as no health facility infrastructure projects during FY 2017/18 were implemented by the PHO</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has is- sued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal2: score 4. 	<p>Zindiro HC II had a chat on medical waste management guidelines pinned in treatment room</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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</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: Score 15 o If 80-99%: Score 10 o If 60-79: Score 5 o If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	0
Monitoring and Supervision			

<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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the contract manager prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2 	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2 	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has certified and initiated payment for works and supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<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 Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</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 <p>If queries are not responded to score 0</p>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3 	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</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"> 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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water and Sanitation Committees that are functioning evidenced by either: i) collection of O&M funds, ii) carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, iii) facility fenced/protected, or iv) they an M&E plan for the previous FY: score 2 <p>Note: One of parameters above is sufficient for the score.</p>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/ 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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Kisoro Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>