



Local Government Performance Assessment

Kitgum District

(Vote Code: 527)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	50%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	47%
Educational Performance Measures	35%
Health Performance Measures	42%
Water Performance Measures	37%

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>Kitgum District LG submitted the Final Performance Contract on 27th July 2018 as per the submission schedule of MoFPED which was before the deadline of 1st August 2018.</p> <p>Note: The PFMAA LG Budget guidelines require the submission to be by 30th June. However, this date was changed to 1st August 2018 as per the request from MoFPED.</p>	Yes
Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			

<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY by 30th June (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From MoFPED’s inventory of LG budget submissions, check whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The LG budget is accompanied by a Procurement Plan or not. If a LG submission includes a Procurement Plan, the LG is compliant; otherwise it is not compliant. 	<p>Kitgum District Local Government submitted a Budget for FY 2018/2019; including a Procurement Plan for FY 2018/2019 as per the submission schedule of MoFPED. The District Council approved the Budget under Min. 07/24/5/2018 during the Council meeting held from 24th – 25th May 2018.</p> <p>The submission of the Budget for FY 2018/2019; including a Procurement Plan for FY 2018/2019 was done before the deadline of 1st August 2018 as required.</p> <p>Note: The PFMAA LG Budget guidelines require the submission to be by 30th June. However, this date was changed to 1st August 2018 as per the request from MoFPED.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
--	--	--	------------

Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports

<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>From MoFPED’s official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted report to MoFPED in time, then it is compliant • If LG submitted late or did not submit, then it is not compliant 	<p>The Annual Budget Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 was submitted on 6th August 2018.</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline of 31st July 2018.</p>	<p>No</p>
--	--	---	-----------

<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY by end of the FY; PFMA Act, 2015).</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/ inventory of LG submission of quarterly reports submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the quarterly performance reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted all four reports to MoFPED of the previous FY by July 31, then it is compliant (timely submission of each quarterly report, is not an accountability requirement, but by end of the FY, all quarterly reports should be available). • If LG submitted late or did not submit at all, then it is not compliant. 	<p>All the four Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for FY 2017/2018 were submitted to MoFPED as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Quarter One Report was submitted on 14th March 2018 to MoFPED and thereafter approved on 27th March 2018. It was noted that MoFPED Submission Schedule indicated date of Submission as 21st March 2018. o Quarter Two Report was submitted on 6th April 2018 to MoFPED and approved on the same date as per the submission schedule of MoFPED. o Quarter Three Report was submitted on 20th April 2018 to MoFPED and thereafter approved on 22nd April 2018 as per the submission schedule of MoFPED. o Quarter Four Report was submitted on 10th August 2018 to MoFPED, and approved on the same date. <p>The reports for the first three quarters were submitted by the end of the FY as required by the PFMA Act, 2015. However, the Quarter Four Report was submitted on 10th August 2018, which was after the end of FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>No</p>
---	--	---	-----------

<p>Audit</p>			
<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and the Auditor General's findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and the Auditor</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>	<p>(A) Internal Auditor General FY 2016/2017</p> <p>Number of queries raised Number of queries cleared Number of queries pending</p> <p>NOTE: Evidence showed that twelve (12) queries were</p>	<p>No</p>

General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action in lines with applicable laws.

- 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.

cleared in the absence of the actual number raised as illustrated above rendering it not possible to establish the number of queries pending.

See explanation as per bullets below:

- A copy of Internal Auditor General's report for FY

2016/2017 was not availed at the time of assessment to

enable establishment of number of queries raised thereof.

- Submission of status of implementation of Internal Auditor

General's findings for FY 2016/2017 was belatedly made to

PS/ST on 12th April 2018 contrary to the Recommended

time limit of by 28th February 2018 as provided for in the

PFMA 2015 Section 11 2g.

(B) Office of the Auditor General FY 2016/2017

Number of queries raised
Number of queries cleared
Number of queries pending

08 08 Nil

NOTE: Eight (08) queries were raised as illustrated above all of which were acted upon by the Accounting officer thus there was none pending.

Evidence of submission of Action taken by the Accounting Officer on queries raised by Office of the Auditor General was belatedly made to the PS/ST on 8th April 2018 contrary to the recommended time limit

		of by 28th February 2018 as provided for in the PFMA 2015 Section 11 2g.	
The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.		Kitgum DLG obtained Qualified "Except for" Audit Opinion for FY 2017/18	Yes

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>The CAO / Kitgum appointed 11 members to the District Physical Planning Committee during January 2018 as evidenced in the appointment letter reference CR/214/6 dated 19th January 2018. However, the committee was not yet functional at the time of the assessment.</p>	0
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that district/ MLG has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD score 1. 	<p>No minutes were submitted to the MoLHUD since the committee had never convened any meeting since its appointment.</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>Kitgum District did not have a Physical Development Plan. Therefore, it was not possible to ascertain whether all infrastructure investments were consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action area plan prepared for the previous FY: score 1 or else 0 	<p>There were no Action Area Plans prepared. However, there were Local Physical Development Plans for the trading centres of Lopur Teso Bar, and Apotoalor in Omiyanyima Sub-county.</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>The priorities in the AWP for FY 2018/2019 were based on the outcomes of the Budget Conference held on the 7th November 2017. Refer to the 'Report for FY 2017/18 District Budget Conference'– (i.e. Presentation of Education Department - Page 3; Presentation of Health Department – Page 4;and Water Sector – Page 2)'; and Kitgum 'Local Government AWP for 2018/2019 (eg. Page 80 – construction of teachers house in Akworo PS; Pages 81 – procurement and supply of 34 desks to Buluzi PS and Wigweng PS; Page 72 – construction of one block of staff house at Namukora HC IV and construction of OPD at Akuna Laber HC II; and Page 97 – construction of public latrine in Akwang Main Market)'. </p>	<p>2</p>
--	--	--	----------

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If differences appear, a justification has to be provided and evidence provided that it was approved by the Council. Score 1. 	<p>The Capital Investments in the approved Annual work plan for FY 2018/2019 were derived from the approved Five-Year Development Plan (2015/2016 – 2019/2020). For example, under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health: There was construction of 1 block of staff houses at Namukora HC IV (in AWP FY 2018/2019 – page 72) was derived from the Kitgum DDP (Chapter 3 – Sub-section 3.5.5 - Page 153). • Education: There was construction of 12 stances of VIP latrines in 3 schools (i.e. Gwokongwee -5 stances, Lajokogayo - 5 stances, and Oryang Primary School - 2 stances); and 2 blocks of 2-semi-detached teachers houses in Lodumoyere and Akworo Primary Schools (page 80 – AWP for FY 2018/2019). These were consistent with the Kitgum DDP (Chapter 3 – Sub-section 3.5.6 - Page 155). 	
--	---	---	--

<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>Minutes of the DTPC meeting held on the 16th March 2018 were availed to the assessment team as evidence of discussion of project profiles. The project profiles were purportedly discussed under Min. 5/2018 - Finalization of Work Plan and Budget for FY 2018/19. However, there was no mention of any discussion on project profiles for investments in AWP.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual statistical abstract, with gender-disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum score 1. 	<p>The Statistical Abstract for 2017/2018 was not available at the time of the assessment. The HoDs were yet to complete the respective sections at the time of assessment.</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>The infrastructure projects implemented during FY 2017/2018 were derived from the AWP and Budget for FY 2017/2018 approved by the District Council.</p> <p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of Technical Institute at Pajong Parish - in the Budget (page 26) and AWP (Page 60). • Construction of OPD - in the Budget (page 18) and AWP (Page 53). • Establishment of the District central Registry in the Administrative Block - in the Budget (page 6) and AWP (Page 32). • Renovation of the toilets and Strong Room in the Finance Block - in the Budget (page 6) and AWP (Page 32). • Major rehabilitation of toilet system in the Health Block and Administrative Block - in the Budget (page 6) and AWP (Page 32). 	<p>2</p>
<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>Not all investment projects implemented in FY 2017/2018 were completed as per work plan by end of the FY - 17 out of 18 projects (94.4%) were completed. The uncompleted district level project was 'Drilling and Construction of 4 deep Boreholes Lot 1'.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	<p>Not all investment projects were completed. There were eighteen district-level investment projects implemented during FY 2017/2018, and seventeen projects were completed. The project that was not completed was 'Drilling and Construction of 4 deep Boreholes Lot 1'.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	<p>Kitgum DLG budgeted UGX 52,745,000 on O&M during 2016/2017, and spent UGX 47,107,006.</p> <p>This was 89% of the budget for O&M as per Draft Final Accounts for the Year Ended 30th June 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Human Resource Management</p>			

<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3 	<p>There were 10 HoD at U1 salary scale in the approved organisation structure. Five (5) were not substantively appointed.</p> <p>? The duties of the District Commercial Officer, were being performed by a Senior Assistant Secretary U3 as per the letter . Reference: CR/156/5 of 18th Sept 2017.</p> <p>? The duties of the District Planner were being performed by the Population Officer as per the letter Reference: CR/160/2, CR/163/1 of 7th March 2017; minute 5/3/2/2016/2.</p> <p>? The duties of the District Natural Resources Officer were being performed by the Senior Environment Officer as per the letter. Reference: CR/160/2 of 24th May 2011, minute no. 5/2/2011(a) (i)</p> <p>? The duties of the District Production Coordinator were being performed by the Principal Agriculture Officer as per the letter. Ref: CR/161/1 of 25th April 2002</p> <p>? The duties of the District Engineer were being performed by a Works Supervisor as per the letter Ref. COU/152/5/of 31st Jan 2011, CR/159/1 of 27th April 2011.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>There was evidence that four HoD prepared performance agreements but there were no performance appraisal reports. There was therefore, no evidence that the HoD were appraised for the FY 2017/18.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 % of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	<p>It was decided in the TPC meeting of 15th March 2018 that there would be no recruitment for the FY 2017/18 due to budgetary constraints. Ref: Minutes of the TPC meeting held on 15th March 2018 and the budget wage bill analysis worksheet dated 18th December 2017. There was therefore no submission for recruitment to DSC.</p>	<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 	<p>169 names of staff members were submitted to the DSC for confirmation of their appointments. All 169 were confirmed in a meeting held between 27th June and 5th July 2017 Ref: DSC's 42nd meeting, 3rd meeting of 2017, minute serial no. 3/2017</p>	<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 	<p>No disciplinary action cases were submitted</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3 	<p>Fifteen (15) new employees were recruited during the months of July and August 2017. Ref.</p> <p>Minutes of DSC 42nd meeting, 3rd meeting of 2017, held between 27th June and 5th July 2017</p> <p>Fourteen (14) out of 15 employees recruited accessed the payroll within the stipulated timeframe. Representing 93% compliance Ref;</p> <p>List of employees recruited (seen)</p> <p>IPPS payroll for October (sampled)</p> <p>One employee did not access the payroll due to “miss-recorded” district code)</p>	<p>0</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>Fourteen (14) employees were retired. There was no evidence that they accessed the retirement payroll</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Revenue Mobilization</p>			

<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets) from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10 %: score 4. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 2. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>Total of OSR for FY 2016/2017 Shs. 303,587,046 (Excluding disposal of Assets)</p> <p>Total of OSR for FY 2017/2018 Shs. 216,810 749 (Excluding disposal of Assets) Decrease Shs. -86,776,297</p> <p>Percentage – 29%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The District LG OSR decreased by -29% from Shs 303,587,046 in FY 2016/2017 to Shs. 216,810,749 in FY 2017/2018 excluding disposal of Assets. • The District had planned to dispose off assets worth Shs. 489,214,000 which did not materialise. 	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0. 	<p>Total Local Revenue Planned/Budgeted (Original not Revised budget) for FY 2017/2018 Shs. 27,921,501,481 (As per original budget for FY 2017/2018)</p> <p>Total Local Revenue collected during FY 2017/2018 Shs. 27,798,035,985</p> <p>Performance 0.4% below what had been planned in the original budget for FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	<p>Local Revenue collections subjected to sharing with LLGs Shs. 63,886,250 (As at 30/06/2018).</p> <p>Status of compliance:</p> <p>There was evidence that the DLG collected Shs. 63,886,250 in Local Service Tax which was noticeably deducted from staff salaries at the District as at 30/06/2018 BUT remitted only 40.6% to LLGs equivalent to Shs, 25,400,000 and retained 59.4% for the District allocation as at 28/2/2018 contrary to the provisions in the LGA Cap 243 as amended section 85 (4) which requires the districts to remit at least 65%.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the total Council expenditures on allowances and emoluments- (including from all sources) is not higher than 20% of the OSR collected in the previous FY: score 2 	<p>Total expenditure on Council allowances during FY 2017/2018 was Shs. 181,756,000 instead of Shs. 60,717,409 which was 20% of OSR collected in FY 2016/2017.</p> <p>This represented 60% three times higher than the recommended maximum of 20%.</p> <p>The District LG spent Shs. 181,756,000 in the FY 2017/2018 on Council allowances and emoluments compared to Shs. 303,587,046 collected in the FY 2016/2017.</p> <p>This was equivalent to 60% of OSR for FY 2016/2017 over and above the 20% recommended contrary to the LGA Cap 243 as amended First Schedule 4.</p> <p>However, the District Chairperson wrote to the Minister of Local Government on 18th December 2017 Ref. COU/214/2 seeking permission for authority to spend beyond 20% worth 42,772,591.</p> <p>The Minister granted the authority to spend more than 20% of the local revenue on councillors' emoluments and allowances totalling to Shs. 42,722,591 as per his letter to the District Chairperson dated 10th January, 2018 Ref. MC.22.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2 	<p>The position of Senior Procurement Officer was not substantively filled at the time of the assessment. Duties of that office were performed by the Assistant Procurement Officer scale U5. As per The Appointment letter dated 12th February 2014. Ref; 9/12/2014.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	<p>The TEC reviewed all projects and made recommendations to the Contracts Committee as indicated in the reviewed minutes of the TEC for all projects</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	<p>The Contracts Committee based its decisions to award contracts on the recommendations of TEC as every awarded contract was duly assessed by TEC</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2 	<p>The District procurement and Disposal Plan covered infrastructure activities in the AWP and all the procurements for 2017/18 FY were done as per plan. (procurement plans for 2017/18 and 18/19 were reviewed to ascertain the above evidence),</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/ infrastructure by August 30: score 2 	<p>The bid documents for all infrastructure/investment were prepared by August 30th 2018</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2 	<p>The district had an updated contract register and complete procurement files for all projects executed in 2017/2018 FY.</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>All the 5 sampled projects complied with the thresholds with projects worth 50 and above millions awarded through Open National bidding and those below 50 millions awarded through Selective National bidding. (The sampled projects were ; Awuch Lanyadyand Road 1.5km worth 498,210,278, Motorised water solar system at Loborom HC III Layamo subcounty wprth 151,755,198, OPD Construction at Gwendcoo HCII Tai Ocot worth 147,549,088, Cattle Crush at Langi village,Oryang B parish , Kitgum Matidi SC worth 16,031,244 and 5 Stances pitlatrine at Loborom HCIII, Layamo sub county worth 20,570,438. The first 3 projects were under open National bidding and the later 2 under Selective National bidding.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2 	<p>The works projects implemented in 2017/18 were not appropriately certified with interim certificates and of the sampled 5 projects only one, OPD construction at Gwengcoo health centre II had an interim certificate .</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2 	<p>Only one of the sampled projects (Awuch Lanyadyang Road) had a site board which was also lacking a contract value. The rest of the projects lacked proper labelling and 3 out of the five for example Motorised water solar system at Loborom HC III Layamo subcounty, Cattle Crush at Langi village,Oryang B parish , Kitgum Matidi SC (16,031,244), and 5 Stances pitlatrine at Loborom HCIII, Layamo sub county did not have site boards at all.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management</p>			

<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4 	<p>The District operated 9 bank accounts namely: General Fund Collection A/c, TSA A/c, Projects A/c: - UNICEF A/c, Global Fund A/c, Nodding Disease A/c, UWEP A/c, YLP A/c, NUSAF A/c, and Prelnor A/c. which were monthly reconciled as at 30/06/2018, prepared by the respective sector Accountants, reviewed by the District Accountant and approved by the Head of Finance.</p> <p>However, Kitgum District LG had a challenge emanating from MoFPED resulting into failure to produce monthly bank reconciliation since July 2018/2019 to date.</p> <p>Bank of Uganda had introduced charges on bank transactions like EFTs, Bank statements etc payable by the district but which the District could not afford to meet because they were not budgeted for.</p> <p>As a result MoFPED had not uploaded the District monthly bank reconciliation since July 2018 to date thus making their bank reconciliations incomplete.</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 – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2. 	<p>A sample of three transactions from Education, Health and Water Sectors showed that the payments to suppliers were within the 2 months' timeline in the absence of the timing clause in their signed contracts.</p> <p>Education Sector (Sample):</p> <p>Contractor's (M/S Abayo Foundation Store Ltd) request for final payment dated 16/05/2018 was paid on 30/05/2018 (within only 14 days)</p> <p>Health Sector (Sample):</p> <p>Contractor's (M/s Giant Plum Enterprises (U) Ltd request for payment for construction of OPD at Gwengoo Health Centre II TAI OCOT in Amida Sub-county dated 25/01/2018 was paid on 07/03/2018 (within 1 month 7 10 days).</p> <p>Water Sector (Sample):</p> <p>Contractor's (M/s Kitgum District Hand Pump Mechanics Association request for payment for rehabilitation of 40 deep bore holes dated 28/5/2018 was paid on 07/06/2018 (within 10 days)</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor: 1 point. • LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2. 	<p>The District did not have a substantive Principal Internal Auditor at the time of the assessment but an Ag. Principal Internal Auditor by the names of Ms Aero Julice Kilama.</p> <p>The District advertised in the print media for the post of Principal Internal Auditor in May 2013 but did not attract any applicant (photocopy of advert missed out name of print media and date of advert)</p> <p>Ms Aero Julice Kilama officially appointed as Internal Auditor was assigned to perform the duties of the District Internal Auditor by the Chief Administrative Officer as per the letter dated 07th July 2014 Ref. CR/156/9</p>	<p>0</p>															
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2. 	<p>The District produced all the Quarterly Internal Audit Reports for FY 2017/2018 as illustrated below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="630 884 1204 1187"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Date of Report</th> <th>Reference</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Quarter 1</td> <td>31/10/2017</td> <td>CR/0010</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Quarter 2</td> <td>31/01/2018</td> <td>CR/0010</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Quarter 3</td> <td>31/04/2018</td> <td>CR/0010</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Quarter 4</td> <td>31/07/2018</td> <td>CR/0010</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>NOTE: The illustration above showed the four (4) quarterly internal audit produced for FY 2017/2018 with their respective dates and reference numbers.</p> <p>They were addressed to the District Speaker in accordance with the LGA Cap 243 as amended Section 90 (2).</p>	Quarter	Date of Report	Reference	Quarter 1	31/10/2017	CR/0010	Quarter 2	31/01/2018	CR/0010	Quarter 3	31/04/2018	CR/0010	Quarter 4	31/07/2018	CR/0010	<p>2</p>
Quarter	Date of Report	Reference																
Quarter 1	31/10/2017	CR/0010																
Quarter 2	31/01/2018	CR/0010																
Quarter 3	31/04/2018	CR/0010																
Quarter 4	31/07/2018	CR/0010																

<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports: score 2.</p>	<p>The LG did not provide Information to Council on the status of implementation of Internal audit findings for FY 2017/18 as shown below;</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="630 246 1117 672"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Raised</th> <th>Cleared</th> <th>Pending</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Qtr 1</td> <td>9</td> <td>9</td> <td>Nil</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Qtr 2</td> <td>7</td> <td>7</td> <td>Nil</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Qtr 3</td> <td>6</td> <td>6</td> <td>Nil</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Qtr 4</td> <td>9</td> <td>9</td> <td>Nil</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>31</td> <td>31</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>NOTE: Although the Accounting Officer acted on all the quarterly internal audit queries (31) for FY 2017/2018 as illustrated above, there was no evidence of submission to Council and LGPAC and follow up as required.</p>	Quarter	Raised	Cleared	Pending	Qtr 1	9	9	Nil	Qtr 2	7	7	Nil	Qtr 3	6	6	Nil	Qtr 4	9	9	Nil	Total	31	31		<p>0</p>
Quarter	Raised	Cleared	Pending																								
Qtr 1	9	9	Nil																								
Qtr 2	7	7	Nil																								
Qtr 3	6	6	Nil																								
Qtr 4	9	9	Nil																								
Total	31	31																									
<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>Action by the Accounting Officer, LGPAC on Internal Audit Queries raised during FY 2017/2018 was as in the table below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="630 1075 1228 1366"> <thead> <tr> <th>Qtr</th> <th>Date of submission</th> <th>Ref for report review</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Qtr 1</td> <td>31/10/2017</td> <td>No evidence seen</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Qtr 2</td> <td>31/01/2018</td> <td>No evidence seen</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Qtr 3</td> <td>30/04/2018</td> <td>No evidence seen</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Qtr 4</td> <td>31/07/2018</td> <td>No evidence seen</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Accounting Officer and the LGPAC received all the four Quarterly Internal Audit reports for FY 2017/2018 BUT no evidence of review by LGPAC (Minutes & Reports to Council) were availed to the assessment Team.</p>	Qtr	Date of submission	Ref for report review	Qtr 1	31/10/2017	No evidence seen	Qtr 2	31/01/2018	No evidence seen	Qtr 3	30/04/2018	No evidence seen	Qtr 4	31/07/2018	No evidence seen	<p>0</p>									
Qtr	Date of submission	Ref for report review																									
Qtr 1	31/10/2017	No evidence seen																									
Qtr 2	31/01/2018	No evidence seen																									
Qtr 3	30/04/2018	No evidence seen																									
Qtr 4	31/07/2018	No evidence seen																									

<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 DLG maintained an assets register for Machinery & Equipment, Furniture & Fittings, Land & Buildings and Motor Vehicles & Heavy Plant both manually and on IFMS.</p> <p>The section of Motor Vehicles & Heavy Plants was maintained in accordance with the recommended format in the Local Government Accounting Manual 2007. However, it was not up-dated at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>The following sections of the assets register (Machinery & Equipment, Furniture & Fittings and Land & Buildings) were maintained in total contravention of the recommended format and were not up-dated at the time of the assessment.</p>	0
<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>Kitgum DLG obtained Qualified "Except for" Audit Opinion for FY 2017/18</p>	2
<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>Service delivery related issues were discussed by the Kitgum District Council during FY 2017/2018 during the meetings held on 24th and 25th May 2018; 1st and 14th March 2018; Examples of service delivery related issues discussed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of Annual Work Plan and Budget Estimates for FY 2018/2019 under Min. 07/24/5/2018 (24th – 25th May 2018) • Discussion of Reports from Committees under Min. 07/01/04/2018 (1st and 14th March 2018). 	2

<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/ complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 1. 	<p>The district designated Mr. Oola Allan Courage to perform duties of Complaint Desk Officer as per appointment letter Ref: CR/156/9 dated 23rd November 2017.</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>The complaints reported to the office were recorded, studied and thereafter referred to the most appropriate office to handle. For each complaint reported a file was opened. The sample of files availed during assessment were mostly land, labor and probation related in nature.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2 	<p>The LG Payroll for July 2018 was displayed on the wall (in the corridor) of the Finance and Production Block at Kitgum District Headquarters; and the Pensioners' Schedule was displayed on the Notice Board in the same building.</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>The 'Procurement Plan' and 'Invitation to Bid for Open Domestic Bidding for Annual Procurement for FY 2018/2019' were displayed on the Notice Board located in the Finance and Production Block at Kitgum District headquarters.</p> <p>Information obtained from the Procurement Unit was that Pre-qualification of bids for FY 2018/2019 was under technical evaluation. Thereafter, the evaluation report is to be submitted to PDU for onward submission to the Contracts Committee for review and award to successful bidders.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1. 	<p>The Annual Performance Assessment results for FY 2016/2017 were displayed on the Notice Boards in the Education Block, and Finance and Production Block at Kitgum District Headquarters.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1 	<p>The district utilized various methods to communicate and explain guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during FY 2017/2018, which included written communication. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A letter to all Sub-county Chiefs (Ref: CR/358/1 dated 18th May 2018) 'Construction and Maintenance of Public Sanitary Facilities for Community Use in Rural Growth Centres'. • A letter to all Sub-county Chairpersons (Ref: CR/212/2 dated 15th January 2018) 'Presentation of Designs of Proposed Lakongera Valley Tank'. 	<p>1</p>

<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1. 	<p>A baraza was held in Mucwini Sub-county on 10th November 2017. A handwritten and stamped copy of minutes of the baraza was availed (i.e. CAO's Stamp dated 10 November 2017).</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG gender focal person and CDO have provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion into their activities score 2. 	<p>The district Gender Focal Person provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender in their activities. This was done through presentations made in the departmental meetings and guidance notes were availed to the assessor as evidence to that effect</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the gender focal point and CDO have planned for minimum 2 activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and address vulnerability and social inclusions and that more than 90 % of previous year's budget for gender activities/ vulnerability/ social inclusion has been implement-ted: score 2. 	<p>The gender person planned more than 2 activities according to the workplan and all the budget allocated for gender activities in 2017/18 to the tune ug shs. 300,000 was fully utilised</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 1 	<p>Environmental screening was carried out for all projects; mitigation measures planned and budgeted for. This information was contained in the environmental screening file with duly signed forms for all projects</p>	<p>1</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>The integration of environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the bid documents was not yet emphasised by the district as a requirement in the preparation of the bid documents according to the Senior Environmental Officer. The reviewed bid documents for the 5 sampled projects did not specifically contain sections on the environmental and social management and health and safety</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>Projects implemented on land that did not belong to government were done after entering into agreement with the owners of land for example, the motorised water solar system at Loborom, an agreement was signed between the government and the land owner for 15 metre by 15 metre piece of land to effect that the owner has surrendered the piece of land willingly for the construction of the water system for the community.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO: score 1 	<p>The Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form was not completed for district completed projects, the one form seen by the Assessment team was for a national project. For example all the sampled 5 complete projects none had an environmental and social mitigation certificate.</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 environmental and social clearance was provided for contract payment and there were no attachments on the payment vouchers for the sampled projects</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that environmental officer and CDO monthly report, includes a) completed checklists, b) deviations observed with pictures, c) corrective actions taken. Score: 1 	<p>There are no monthly reports written on projects either by the environment officer or CDO.</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>For FY 2018/19 the LG Performance Contract page 31-37, under education vote 527 covering education sector indicate a budget for 91 Primary Schools. All the 91 schools have 1 head teacher and at least 7 teachers. Only 2 schools did not have P7 class: Locomo P/S & Locom P/S both in Orom Sub county had 6 teachers. List of 91 schools and list of teachers per school were reviewed and confirmed. The total number of teachers was 829 for all the 91 schools at the time of the assessment.</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>From the list of staff obtained for all the Schools, all the schools had one (1) Head Teacher and at least 7 Teachers. Overall, schools with P7 had between 7 to 19 teachers per school. Five schools were sampled: Akobi Labworomor P/S, Lajokogayo P/s, Odunglee P/S, Lupur P/S and Layamo P/S and visited. The Assessment team confirmed that teachers deployed at the sampled schools were in place by reviewing the staff list from the District Senior Education Officer and matching it with what was on ground for all 5 schools sampled (roll-call done at the school). However, at Lajokogayo, the head teacher Angee Florence who appears on the list was replaced in June by Obala Kiwat Alfred who is now the substantially appointed Head teacher but the list of staff had not been updated to include the latest deployment.</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 o If 100%: score 6 o If 80 - 99%: score 3 o If below 80%: score 0 	<p>There was no wage bill provision for 2018/19 for Primary school teachers. There was no structure for primary school teachers. There was however a wage bill provision for 15 head teachers and 10 deputy head teachers (total is 25 on the wage bill). Evidence of submission of proposal to HRM for recruitment of 25 staff (15 Heads + 10 Deputy heads) was available and duly received by HRM on 14/2/2018. However, there was no evidence of progress with this recruitment.</p>	<p>0</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 approved staff structure provides for Two (2) School Inspectors; The Senior Inspector & Inspector of schools. Evidence from approved staff structure for the LG and staffing position indicated that one (1) Senior Inspector of Schools position was filled. The Senior Inspector of Schools is Okwnzuo Hellen Torach. Thus the second position of Inspector of School was still vacant. However, the staff file for education was not available and so the assessment team could not verify the dates of appointment and the minutes.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary Teachers: score 2 	<p>There was no evidence of a Recruitment Plan from Education Department submitted to HRM for recruitment. There was however a letter originating from CAO to Education Department to notify it of the need for recruitment on replacement basis for 9 teachers who are retired/left/passed on. It was not exactly a recruitment plan</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Inspectors: score 2 	<p>There was no evidence of a Recruitment Plan from Education Department submitted to HRM for one (1) Inspector of Schools recruitment. The approved LG structure provides for two (2) Inspectors of schools: The Senior Inspector & Inspector of Schools positions. The latter position was still vacant. The Senior Inspector of Schools position was substantially filled at the time of LG assessment.</p>	<p>0</p>
--	---	--	----------

Monitoring and Inspection

<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% school inspectors: score 3 	<p>There was only one Senior Inspector of Schools for a total of 91 schools. There was no evidence that the Inspector of Schools was appraised</p>	<p>0</p>
---	--	--	----------

<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary school head teachers o 90 - 100%: score 3 o 70% and 89%: score 2 o Below 70%: score 0 	<p>There were ninety-one (91) schools and ninety one Head Teachers. There was evidence that only 22 out of the 91 were appraised. Representing 24% compliance</p> <p>Ten (10) personal performance appraisal files containing Performance Reports were sampled and found to have certified Appraisal Reports duly signed by – Chairpersons SMC, Sub-County Chiefs and the DEO</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1 	<p>For the FY 2017/18, there was evidence that guidelines on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School charges from the MoES were received on 24th/10/18, 2. Advert on staffing gaps which appeared on the New Vision of 13th /8/18 was received and noted. 3. School feeding guidelines Manuel were received and, 4. Enforcing of illegal schools circular ADM/104/212/01 was received and filed. <p>However, there was no evidence on the notice boards, minutes of meetings and in files of sampled schools that all the above circulars were communicated to schools. There was no evidence of sharing the communicated guidelines on noticeboards at the district as well.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 2 	<p>There was evidence of one (1) meeting with school heads in duly signed minutes of a meeting dated 30th/1/2018 to explain and sensitize them on the guidelines on school feeding.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all registered primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: 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>School inspection was at 39.5% Approximately 40%, and below 50-59 lowest score.</p> <p>Out of 91 schools, inspection was done for a total of 36 schools in term 1 (39.5%), the sampled schools indicate the inspection took place and reported on 27th/2/2018. In 2017 October 29 schools were inspected and reported on 28th/11/2017 for term III of the previous year.</p> <p>Overall, there was inspection of some schools per term, but not all the schools in each inspection. The inspection reports seen were very scanty, bulleted and shallow reporting was done on those schools that were actually inspected.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	<p>There was evidence of Education department meeting held to discuss 3rd term school inspection report for 2017 on 28th /11/2017. However, there was no evidence that the recommendations of the meeting were considered/ followed up for corrective actions.</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>2 reports were submitted to DES & MoES but not on school inspection.</p> <p>The 1st report was on learning achievement monitoring in schools was seen but it was originating from education department to CAO, and not to DES.</p> <p>The 2nd report was submitted to DES & MoES on 15th/2/17, but it was not on School inspection</p> <p>The 3rd report was submitted MoES on 18th/7/2017 acknowledging inspection of grants & copies vouchers of payments.</p> <p>Matrix for submission of monitoring, work plans, reports & accountability from DES was blank for Kitgum LG.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed- up: score 4. 	<p>There was no evidence that the inspection report was submitted to DES and that the recommendations were followed-up.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>There was no evidence that the education department had a copy of the EMIS Statistical Form and that it was used to submit accurate /consistent data to MoES.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS: score 5 	<p>There was evidence that the Enrolment data for all 91 primary schools was submitted. However, there was no records and evidence of enrolment submission consistent with EMIS</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>The Health, Education, and Community Based Services Committee sat to discuss service delivery issues. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of the Education Budget during a meeting held on 16th May 2018 under Min. 05/16/05/2018. It was noted that the 'Minutes' had only been signed by Clerk to Council. The chairperson of the Committee had not signed. • Discussion of Report from Sectors – Education Sub-sector during a meeting held on 26th January 2018 under Min. 05/16/01/2018. It was noted that the 'Minutes' were not signed by Clerk to Council and Chairperson of the Committee. • Discussion of Report from Sectors – Education Sub-sector during a meeting held on 17th November 2017 under Min. 05/10/2017. It was noted that the 'Minutes' were not signed by Clerk to Council and Chairperson of the Committee. 	<p>0</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>The Chairperson of the committee responsible for Health, Education, and Community Based Services presented a report during a meeting of the \Kitgum District Council held during 1st and 14th March 2018 under Min. 07/01/04/2018</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>The 91 School Management Committees files availed at DEOs office had copies of minutes of meetings, which indicated that all 91 schools have functional SMCs. The five sampled schools (i.e. Odunglee PS, Okobi Labworomor PS, Lupur PS, Lajokogayo PS and Larakaraka PS) had evidence of Functional SMCs that meet at least twice in the last term.</p> <p>It was noted, however, that some of the minutes filed were not duly signed by the Senior Education Officer though the respective SMC Chairpersons had signed.</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>Evidence of publicized list of schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants for April-June FY 2017/18 was available and was viewed on the public notice board at the education building at the entrance.</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 submitted input to the procurement plan under vote 527 on 18th/8/2018 to PDU. The procurement input included scholastic materials, construction of class rooms and desks among others.</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>The payments sampled showed that there was timely certification and recommendation for the contractors to be paid. For example;</p> <p>M/s Abayo Foundation Stores Ltd who was contracted for construction of a Technical School at Pajong Parish in Mucwini Sub-county for Shs. 317,280,170 submitted their payment request for final payment on 16/5/2018 and the works were certified on 24/5/2018 and within only 6 days payment was effected on 30/5/2018.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15th of July for consolidation: score 4 	<p>The DEO submitted all the four quarterly reports electronically to DPU. But the submission process was not completed. The HoD did not click the 'Validate and Notify' button under 'Consistency Check in PBS to generate formal notice of successful submission to the District Planner. Therefore, there was no way of ascertaining the date of submission of performance reports by the 15th July 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year 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>Action on queries raised by the District Internal Auditor during FY 2017/2018 were as illustrated below:</p> <p>Number of queries raised: 4</p> <p>Number of queries cleared: 4</p> <p>Number of queries pending: None</p> <p>There were four queries raised namely: Failure to transfer Teachers within the recommended timeframe, Non-approval of PTA funds by SMCs & PTAs, Non – accountability for PTA funds and Non- accountability for advances by sector staff.</p> <p>All the four queries were acted upon by the Accounting Officer as per his letter to the District Internal Auditor dated 5th April 2018 Ref. CR/251/1 and letters to individual District staff dated 16th and 27th November 2017.</p>	2
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>There was no evidence of disseminated guidelines by senior women/men teachers to girls and boys on hygiene, Reproductive health and life skills. The DEO informed the assessment team that the Gender Focal Person did not have any activities in the FY 2017/18 as there was no budget for this. The last related activity was done in November, 2016</p> <p>It was clear this activity was not prioritized and as such not budgeted for.</p>	0

<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>There was no evidence that the Gender Focal Person issued and explained guidelines on managing sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools because as in bullet I above, the Gender Focal Person had no activities due to lack of a budget allocation.</p> <p>There was no evidence on files in the DEOs office of any meetings to that effect.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	<p>There was evidence that the SMCs exists and were constituted according to the guidelines of 1/3 female/male. The sampled schools: Odunglee had a functional SMC with 3/13 members being female, Lajokogayo 3/13 female, and so was Akobi Labowromor, Layamo and Lupur P/S.</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>There was no evidence that the Education department, issued any guidelines on Environmental management (on tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education). The Environment Officer informed the assessment team that he was not aware of any existing guidelines and or circulars on environmental management for schools.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide- lines on environmental management are dissemi- nated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all school infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 1 	<p>There was evidence (in Environment officer files) that all school projects were screened before approval of all projects: For example; 4 stances pit latrines in Layamo P/S (Procurement no. Kitg527/Wrks/17-18/00010), 2 Stances Drainable Latrine at Lopur Primary School (Procurement no. Kitg525/Works/17-18/00012) were screened.</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"> • The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1 	<p>There was no evidence that the Environmental officer & CDO visited project sites to check compliance with mitigation plans.</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 	<p>The LG staff structure provided was for 2015/16, which could not be relied on as the structure for the current FY 2018/19. Thus there was no basis for assessing whether the filled positions for PHC workers at the LG were still the same.</p>	0
<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan for primary health care workers to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/re- quest to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of primary health care workers: score 6</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the Health department prepared a comprehensive recruitment plan and submitted it to HRM for consideration</p>	0

<p>The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital In-charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0 	<p>There were twenty (20) Health facilities and twenty, (20) Officers In-Charge. There was evidence that only four (4) out of the 20 Officers In-Charge were appraised, representing 20% compliance.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The Local Government Health department has deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY, and if not provided justification for deviations: score 4 	<p>There was evidence that the LG department deployed health workers as per the staff /facility deployment list. Five Health Facilities were sampled: Muchwini H/C III, Orom H/C III, Loboromo HC III, Gwengco H/C II and Namukora. At Muchuini HC III, 15 staff were deployed, however only 11 were were on ground when the assessment team cross checked. 3 staff were on study leave (Acaye Alfred, Akello Paska & Laker) and 1 was transfered (Adokorac Evelyn was transferred to Kitgum Hospital.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Monitoring and Supervision</p>			
<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DHO/ MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 	<p>There was evidence that the DHO communicated guidelines on Health Unit management Committees for HCIIIs and HCIIIIs 2003 and Approaches to Health Care Waste Management. 2013. These guidelines were available in all the sampled HFs</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/ MHO has held meetings with health facility in- charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	<p>Meeting minutes dated 21/08/2018 indicated that DHO had a meeting with health facility in-charges to disseminate the guidelines on Approaches to Health Care Waste Management 2013.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: score 3</p>	<p>There was no evidence that DHT supervised the HC IVs and the district hospital and no supervisory report was available.</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>Support supervisory reports HEA/113/1 dated 11/10/2017, HEA 113/1 dated 18/1/2018, HEA113/1 dated 11/4/2018, and HEA113/1 dated 19/06/2018 indicated that out of 20 HCIIIs and HCIIIs only 8 were supervised. This represents 40% of the the total HCIIIs and HCIIIs.</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>There was no evidence that the 4 quarterly reports were discussed and used to make recommendations.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 	<p>There was no evidence that the recommendations were followed- up and specific activities undertaken since the reports had not been discussed.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10 	<p>The list of Health Facilities Receiving PHC funding available at the district is consistent with the list from that of the MoH. LG has 20 HF receiving PHC funding.</p>	<p>10</p>

Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability			
<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>The Health, Education, and Community Based Services Committee sat to discuss service delivery issues. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion of the Health Sector Budget during a meeting held on 16th May 2018 under Min. 05/16/05/2018. It was noted that the 'Minutes' had only been signed by Clerk to Council. The chairperson of the Committee had not signed. Discussion of Report from Sectors – Education Sub-sector during a meeting held on 17th November 2017 under Min. 05/10/2017. It was noted that the 'Minutes' were not signed by Clerk to Council and Chairperson of the Committee. 	0
<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>The Chairperson of the committee for Health, Education, and Community Based Services presented a report during a meeting of the Kitgum District Council held during 1st and 14th March 2018 under Min. 07/01/04/2018</p>	2
<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>Sampled HFs of Mucwin and Lorom plus the 5 files sampled in the DHOs Office proved that meetings for HUMCs took place on monthly basis duly signed by all members. -</p>	6

<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 a list on notice board indicating all the specific Health Facilities and specific amounts.</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>There was evidence that the DHO submitted input to procurement plan to PDU as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of a ward at Mucwin HC 111. Purchase of furniture at Namukora HC IV Purchase of furniture Agwengcoo HC 11. 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2. 	<p>Although the health sector procurement requirements were incorporated in the District Procurement Plan for FY 2018/2019, there was no documentary evidence of submission of the health sector procurement plan to the PDU. Therefore, the assessment team could not establish the date of submission.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/ MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4. 	<p>The payments sampled showed that there was timely certification and recommendation for the contractor to be paid. For example;</p> <p>M/s Giant Enterprises (U) Ltd who was contracted to construct an OPD at Gwengoo Health Centre II TAI OCOT in Amida Sub-county for Shs. 147,549,088 VAT inclusive, submitted their request for payment on 25/01/2018 and the works were certified on 31/01/2018 and within 1 month & 6 days payment was effected on 07/03/2018.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	<p>The DHO submitted all the four quarterly reports electronically to DPU (and also provided printed copies of the reports). However, the HoD did not click the 'Validate and Notify' button under 'Consistency Checks' in PBS to generate formal notice of successful submission to the District Planner. Therefore, there was no way of ascertaining the date of submission of performance reports by the 15th July 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If sector has no audit query: Score 4 If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: Score 2 points If all queries are not responded to Score 0 	<p>The sector provided information on the actions taken on queries raised by the District Internal Auditor during FY 2017/2018 as follows;</p> <p>Number of queries raised: 2</p> <p>Number of queries cleared: 2</p> <p>Number of queries pending: Nil</p> <p>There were two queries raised namely: Unaccounted for funds and Failure to appraise sector staff.</p> <p>They were all responded to by the Accounting Officer as illustrated above in his letter to the District Internal Auditor dated 5th April 2018 Ref. CR/251/1</p>	<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 <p>% women: score 2</p>	<p>Evidence from the DHOs' office indicates that all the 20 HF have HUMC. The assessment team sampled 5 HF but visited 3: Loborom HCIII, Okidi HC III, Muchuini HC III, Gwengco HC II, & Lagot HC II. For instance Loborom has 3 out of 7 females, Muchuini has 3 out of five female and Okidi has 2 out 5 are female..</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2. 	<p>There was evidence in only 1 HF (Loborom HC III) that the guidelines on sanitation management was issued. There was no evidence of issued guidelines at the DHOs' office.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 2 	<p>Evidence of project screening for all projects including health were available on screening forms in the environmental officer files. The assessment team did see screening forms for pit latrines i done incinerators.</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"> The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 2 	<p>The environment officer did not have any reports of field visit to project sites. Thus there was no evidence that the site visits were done.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal: score 4.	<p>The DHOs Office has files for guidelines received and issued. The assessment team was able to see one guideline on Medical Waste Management</p>	<p>0</p>
---	--	--	----------

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the district Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below average coverage: score 10 o If 80-99%: Score 7 o If 60-79: Score 4 o If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>The District safe water coverage was at 95% and all the sub counties were also at 95% coverage.</p> <p>Therefore the target to any sub county means compliancy.</p> <p>This was verified from the following documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AWP 2018/2019 • Budget 2018/2019 • Online Uganda Water Supply Atlas(Water Supply Data Base) http://wateruganda.com/index.php/current/district_key_facts 	10

<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>All the WSS projects were implemented though one of the Boreholes was not successful, another location for the failed borehole had been identified and it was to be implemented in the current financial year.</p> <p>The implemented projects were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kubogo Borehole in Mucwini Sub county 2. Labworomor P/S borehole in Chua East Sub county 3. Ikor Borehole in Lagoro Subcounty <p>Unsuccessful project was Akuna Borehole in Lagoro Sub county.</p>	
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>There was no evidence of monitoring plan by the DWO and the reports presented were actually the supervision reports during the implementation but also not signed by the DWO.</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>There were no MIS reports presented to the Assessor to verify whether there was any submission made.</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>The performance contract provided did not have a list of water facilities but had a lump sum figure for the whole sector; therefore it was not easy to verify the facilities.</p> <p>The MIS report from MoWE indicated that the planned water facilities for FY 2017/18 were: 5 (No.) Deep Boreholes, 1 Design PWS, 1 Construction of PWS, 2 RWH and 7 Borehole Rehabilitations. However, the DWO did not present the list of water facilities (in PBS) and Sector MIS reports for verification.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Performance contract indicated that the District Engineer would manage all water and Sanitation facilities; but no list of the facilities was mentioned in the contract.</p>	<p>0</p>
---	---	---	----------

Procurement and contract management

<p>The district Water department has submitted input for district's procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted input for the district procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	<p>The DWO submitted input for the district procurement plan to PDU on 30th June 2018 beyond the deadline of 30th April 2018 as required.</p> <p>The date of submission was verified from Sector AWP and Budget 2018/19 submitted by the PDU on 30th June 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
--	--	---	----------

<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the contract manager prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2 	<p>There was no evidence of preparation of a Contract Management Plan.</p> <p>The DWO could not provide any site meeting minutes for the site visits made, and claimed the project periods for the projects were small and could not allow him to hold site meetings.</p> <p>5 boreholes were implemented in the FY2017/18 by Water Department, These were Kubogo BH (Muchwini S/C), Labworomor P/s BH (Chua East S/C), Ikor BH (Lagoro S/C), Loboromo BH (Orom S/C) and Akuna BH (Lagoro S/C).</p> <p>However out of the 5 boreholes, 4 boreholes which are Kubogo BH (Muchwini S/C), Labworomor P/s BH (Chua East S/C), Ikor BH (Lagoro S/C) and Loboromo BH (Orom S/C) were completed and only one which is Akuna Borehole in Lagoro S/C was not completed.</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>There was no file of approved drawings and specifications for particular projects. DWO only had the drawings, BOQs and specifications in softcopy on his computer so the assessment team could not verify whether they were the actual drawings and specification used because they were not authentic.</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>For the completed projects, there were no hand over reports, nor completion certificates issued.</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>There were no completion reports and certificates issued because some projects were not completed.</p> <p>5 boreholes were implemented in the FY2017/18. These were Kubogo BH (Muchwini S/C), Labworomor P/s BH (Chua East S/C), Ikor BH (Lagoro S/C), Loporomo BH (Orom S/C) and Akuna BH (Lagoro S/C).</p> <p>Out of the 5 boreholes, 4 were implemented and only one, which was Akuna Borehole in Lagoro S/C, was not completed.</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>The payment sampled showed that there was timely certification and recommendation for payment to the contractor. For example;</p> <p>M/s Kitgum District Hand Pump Mechanics Association who was contracted to Rehabilitate (04) deep bore holes for Shs. 18,480,000 submitted their request for payment of Shs. 18,480,000 on 28/05/2018 and the works were certified on 31/05/2018 and within only 7 days payment was effected on 7/06/2018</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<p>The district Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	<p>DWO submitted all the four quarterly reports electronically to DPU. However, the HoD did not click the 'Validate and Notify' button under 'Consistency Checks' in PBS to generate formal notice of successful submission to the District Planner. Therefore, there was no way of ascertaining date of submission of performance reports by the 15th July 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The District Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 5 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 If queries are not responded to score 0 	<p>The sector provided information on action taken on queries raised by the District Internal Auditor during FY 2017/2018 as illustrated below:</p> <p>Number of queries raised:1</p> <p>Number of queries cleared: 1</p> <p>Number of queries pending: None</p> <p>There was one query raised which was unaccounted for funds which was responded to by the Accounting Officer in a letter to the District Internal Auditor dated 5th April 2018 Ref. CR/251/1</p>	
Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability			

<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>Minutes of one meeting of the Committee responsible for Works, Water, and Technical Services were reviewed and indicated that the meeting was held on 2nd October 2017, and discussed Sector Reports (including water) under Min. 03/10/2017. However, It was noted that the 'Minutes' were not signed by Clerk to Council and Chairperson of the Committee.</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>The committee for Works, Water, and Technical Services presented a report during a meeting of the Kitgum District Council held during 1st and 14th March 2018 under Min. 07/01/04/2018.</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2. 	<p>There was no evidence of any information regarding the AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures displayed on the notice boards.</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>All the three WSS projects visited were labelled as required. They included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deep Borehole at Labworomor Primary School Omiya Onyima sub county 2. Deep Borehole at Ikor (Ekoo) Lagoro Subcounty 3. At Motorized water solar system in Loborom HCIII 	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	<p>There was display of the Invitation to Bid for the previous FY. but contract awards were not displayed since the contacts had not been awarded yet.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If communities apply for water/ public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	<p>There were files for the community applications at DWO's office and also agreements that show some members of community offering free land for the construction of WSS facilities. this was verified from the Community application files at DWO's office.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water and Sanitation Committees that are functioning evidenced by either: i) collection of O&M funds, ii) carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, iii) facility fenced/protected, or iv) they an M&E plan for the previous FY: score 2 <p>Note: One of parameters above is sufficient for the score.</p>	<p>The WSCs were functional as evidenced by Community meeting held on 9th May 2018 at labworomor primary School Borehole for the election of the WSC members and another meeting held on the same venue on 14th August 2018 about the collection of community contribution of O&M funds.</p> <p>Meeting minutes for the meeting at Ikor deep borehole held on 14/07/2018</p> <p>Sample WSS projects;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ikor Deep Borehole WSC meeting held on 14/07/2018 Labworomor P/S Borehole WSC meeting minutes held on 14/08/2018 with O&M funds collection register Motorised solar water system at Loborom HCIII 	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	<p>All the projects had Environmental Screening reports as per templates. For example the Environmental screening for Drilling of deep bore hole at Ikor Lagoro sub county which was done on 03/07/2017</p>	<p>2</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>According to the Senior Environmental Officer, the District has not put much emphasis on the issues of environment and therefore no follow up support had been done.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	<p>There was no clause on Environmental protection in the Construction and supervision contracts. For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Kitg527/Wrks/17-18/00001- Drilling and Construction of 4No deep boreholes). Kitg527/Wrks/17-18/00007- Construction of Motorized water solar system in Loborom HCIII Labongo Layamo Sub county 	<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>Gender Equity in WSCs had been followed eg 50% of the WSC members are specifically women.</p> <p>The roles are interchangeably shared from the top to bottom.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ikor Borehole WSC, out of 10 members 5 are female with Female holding the key positions of Vice Chairperson, Care taker and Treasurer Labworomor P/S borehole WSC, out of 9 members 5 are female holding key positions of Vice Chairperson, Treasurer, caretaker and Mobiliser, Motorised soalr water system at loborom HCIII WSC, out of 10 members 5 were female holding key positions of Vice chairperson, treasurer and mobiliser. 	<p>3</p>

<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/</p> <p>RGCs provided by the Water Department.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3 	<p>The public sanitation facilities have separate stances for women and men, also provision for PWDs.</p> <p>The sampled Sanitation facilities include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 5 Stance Drainable Latrine at Loborom HCIII Layamo Sub county 2. 5 Stance Drainable Latrine at Mucwini HCIII staff Quarters 3. 4 Stance VIP Latrine at Layamo Primary School Kitgum Matidi Subcounty 	<p>3</p>
--	--	---	----------