



Local Government Performance Assessment

Kotido District

(Vote Code: 528)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	50%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	51%
Educational Performance Measures	28%
Health Performance Measures	88%
Water Performance Measures	61%

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>Kotido District Local Government submitted the Final Performance Contract on 16th July 2018 as per the submission schedule of MoFPED which was before the deadline of 1st August 2018.</p> <p>e 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>Kotido District Local Government submitted a Budget for FY 2018/2019; including a Procurement Plan for FY 2018/2019 on the 16th July 2018 as per the submission schedule of MoFPED. The District Council approved the Budget under Min. 3/COU/05/2018 during the meeting held on 28th 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 25th 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 Kotido DLG for FY 2017/2018 were submitted to MoFPED as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter One Report was submitted on 11th January 2018 to MoFPED and approved on 12th January 2018 (as per Submission Schedule of MoFPED). • Quarter Two Report was submitted on 24th February 2018 to MoFPED and approved on 25th February 2018 (as per Submission Schedule of MoFPED). • Quarter Three Report was submitted on 23rd April 2018 to MoFPED and thereafter approved on 2nd May 2018 (as per Submission Schedule of MoFPED). • Quarter Four Report was submitted on 25th August 2018 to MoFPED (as per computer-generated date on the Q4 report submitted to MoFPED). Kotido DLG was missing on the MoFPED Submission Schedule. <p>The reports for the first three quarters were submitted by the end of the FY; PFMA Act, 2015 – Section 21 (3). However, the Quarter Four Report was submitted on 25th 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</p>	<p>From MoFPED's Inventory/record of LG submissions of statements entitled "Actions to Address Internal Auditor General's findings",</p>	<p>The Accounting Officer submitted to the PS/ST information regarding the status of implementation of all the 2 findings raised by the Internal Auditor General in FY 2016/2017 on 24th /1/2018</p>	<p>No</p>

<p>actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action in line with applicable laws.</p>	<p>Check:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted a 'Response' (and provide details), then it is compliant • If LG did not submit a 'response', then it is non-compliant • If there is a response for all –LG is compliant • If there are partial or not all issues responded to – LG is not compliant. 	<p>Ref. CR/252/3 before the recommended deadline of 28th February 2018 as per the provisions of the PFMA 2018 section 11 2g .T ction 11 2g.</p> <p>These findings included: Unaccounted for funds amounting to Shs. 320,127,420 and doubtful expenditure of Shs. 99,125,400.</p> <p>In addition, the Accounting Officer submitted to PS/ST information regarding the status of implementation of 4 findings raised by the OAG for FY 2016/2017 on 24th/4/2018 Ref. CR/251/2 later than the recommended date of 28th February 2018 contrary to the provisions of the PFMA 2015 section 11 2g.</p> <p>However, the late submission to PS/ST was attributed to the late receipt of the OAG's report by the Accounting Officer which was on 9th/3/2018 as evidenced by the acknowledgement stamp of the LG Central Registry.</p> <p>The OAG's queries were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inadequate controls surrounding management of domestic arrears, - Failure to implement the budget as approved by Parliament, - Understaffing and - Abandoned construction works of a cattle dip at Nakapelimoru sub-county. 	
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>Kotido DLG obtained Qualified "Except for" Audit Opinion for FY 2017/18</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a district/ municipality has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The members of the District Physical Planning Committee – Kotido, were appointed by the CAO as per letter Ref: CR/214//18 dated 19th September 2016. • The committee had been holding regular meetings (as ascertained from the various sets of minutes of meetings on 14th July 2017, 14th December 2017, 28th December 2017, 22nd February 2018, 2nd March 2018, and 9th March 2018). • There was evidence of discussions of plans submitted (by private developers. The DPPC had not discussed any new infrastructure project of the district. • There was a Records Book where submitted plans were entered by the Physical Planner. 	1
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that district/ MLG has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD score 1. 	<p>Kotido District submitted minutes of the meetings held to MoLHUD as per letter (Ref: CR/214/18 dated 9th May 2018) from CAO / Kotido DLG to the Permanent Secretary /MoLHUD regarding 'Submission of Physical Planning Report and District Physical Planning Committee Minutes for Meetings held on 14th December 2017, 28th December 2017, 22nd February 2018, 2nd March 2018, 9th March 2018, and 28th March 2018'. The acknowledgement stamp of MoLHUD indicated 16th May as the date of receipt of the letter.</p>	1

<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All infrastructure investments are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan: score 1 or else 0 	<p>Kotido DLG 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 local area physical development plans prepared by Kotido DLG during FY 2017/2018.</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>Priorities in the Kotido District AWP for FY 2018/2019 were based on the outcomes of the budget conference conducted on 25th October 2017.</p> <p>For instance, the priorities in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education and sports: 'Classroom construction and rehabilitation' (in AWP - page 62) and Budget Conference Report - Presentation of education and sports Department: Proposed Activities for FY 2018/2019 - 'Rehabilitation of classroom block' - Page 3. • Works and Technical Services - Water: 'Drilling and rehabilitation of boreholes' (in AWP - page 75) and Budget Conference Report - Presentation of Works and Technical Services Department (page 4): Proposed Priorities for FY 2018/2019 - 'Drilling of 16 boreholes in the district', and 'Rehabilitation of 18 boreholes in the district'. 	<p>2</p>
<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If differences appear, a justification has to be provided and evidence provided that it was approved by the Council. Score 1. 	<p>The capital investments in the approved Annual work Plan for the FY 2018/2019 were derived from the approved Five-Year Development Plan (2015/16 – 2019/20).</p> <p>For example under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water: 'Drilling and rehabilitation of boreholes' in the AWP for FY 2018/2019 (Pages 75) and 'Drilling of Boreholes' ; and 'Rehabilitation of boreholes and piped water supply schemes' in the DDP (Chapter 3: LG Strategic Direction and Plan – Section 3.4: Summary of Sectoral Programmes / Projects – Page 122). • Education and Sports: 'Construction and rehabilitation of staff houses in Napumpum Primary School, Nakapelimolu Primary School, and Nakwakwa Primary School' in the AWP for FY 2018/2019 (Pages 63) and 'Drilling of Boreholes' ; and 'Rehabilitation of boreholes and piped water supply schemes' in the DDP (Chapter 3: LG Strategic Direction and Plan – Section 3.4: Summary of Sectoral Programmes / Projects – Page 121). 	<p>1</p>

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 2. 	<p>The project profiles were developed and discussed as part of the DDP (i.e. Annex C, Pages 369 -414), before its approval by the Kotido District Council. The Kotido DDP was approved on 10th March 2015 under Min.No.24/KDLG/COU/2015.</p> <p>However, the DTPC had never discussed profiles for any investments.</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 Annual Statistical Abstract was still being compiled at the time of the 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 by Kotido DLG in FY 2017/2018 (as indicated in LG Quarter Two Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 – Vote 528), were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the District Council.</p> <p>For example under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education: '10 Construction of lined pit latrine stances at Nakwakwa Primary School' (LG Quarter Two Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 – Vote 528 \Kotido - Page 69), and 'Construction of 10 line pit latrine stances with urinals at Nakwakwa Primary School (Kotido DLG AWP and Budget – page 50). 	2
<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100%: score 4 80-99%: score 2 Below 80%: 0 	<p>The Kotido DLG Contracts Register availed at the time of assessment lacked vital information on the completion status of each project by the 30th June 2018.</p> <p>Therefore, it was not possible to ascertain the completion status of investment projects implemented in FY 2017/2018 as per work plan.</p>	0
<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	<p>The Contracts Register availed at the time of assessment lacked vital information on the actual expenditure on each project by the 30th June 2018.</p> <p>Therefore, it was not possible to ascertain if completion of investment projects implemented in FY 2017/2018 was within approved budget -. Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget</p>	0

<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	<p>Kotido DLG budgeted UGX 60,477,000 on O&M during FY 2017/2018, and spent UGX 53,727,885.</p> <p>This was 88.8% of the budget for O&M as per Draft Final Accounts for the Year Ended 30th June 2018 (NOT page numbered BUT coded - GL Account Nos. 228002 & GL Account Name: Maintenance – Vehicles; GL Account Nos. 228003 & GL Account Name: Maintenance – Machinery; GL Account Nos. 228004 & GL Account Name: Maintenance – Other).and Kotido DLG Budget, Vote 528 (Pages 5 -10, 12 – 16, 19, 23, 28, 31 – 35, and 37).</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 E salary scale in the approved establishment / organisation structure. However, only four (4) were substantively appointed as per their appointment letters</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> D/CAO – 1st July 2017 CFO – CR/156/7 dated 24th July 2017 D/NRO – CR/156/10 dated 28th September 2007 DHO - CR/156/1 dated 28th April 2017 <p>Six (6) were performing duties of HoD as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The duties of the District Engineer were being performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Civil Engineer (U3) as per the appointment letter HRM/156/171/01 dated 25th September 2013 The duties of the D/CDO were being performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Principal Community Development Officer U2 as per the appointment letter CR/156/7 dated 31st January 2018 The duties of the District Production Officer were being performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Agriculture Officer U3 as per the appointment letter CR/156/7 dated 24th May 2016 The Duties of the District Planner were being performed by an Officer whose substantive appointment was Population Officer (U4) as per the appointment letter CR/156/3 dated 17th July 2009. The Duties of the District Commercial Officer were being performed by an Officer whose substantive appointment was Commercial Officer U4, as per the appointment letter CR156/7 dated 128th April 2017 The Duties of the DEO were being performed by an Officer whose substantive appointment was a Senior Education Officer (Inspection) U3 as per the appointment letter of even reference dated 1st September 2004 	<p>0</p>
---	---	---	----------

<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>There was evidence that all HoD were appraised on the following dates as per appraisal reports seen:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. D/CAO – 9th August 2018 2. CFO - 20th August 2018 3. D/Planner – 1st August 2018 4. D/Engineer - 6th August 2018 5. DEO – 15th August 2018 6. D/CDO - 1st August 2018 7. D/NRO – 21st September 2018 8. D/PO - 31st August 2018 9. D/Commercial Officer - 25th July 018 10. DHO - 31st July 2018 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 % of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	<p>Fifty-two (52) new positions were submitted for recruitment of new employees as per the submission letter ARC 6/293/05 dated 29th November 2017 and received by the DSC on 7th December 2017.</p> <p>There was evidence that they were all considered during the DSC meeting held on 21st and 22nd December 2017 as per minutes reference DSC/KTD/212/238/2 and minute number 18/DSC/KTD/2018</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>Twenty eight (28) names of employees were submitted to the DSC for confirmation of their appointment as per the submission letter CR/159/2 dated 18th December 2017</p> <p>There was evidence that all the 28 were considered by the DSC during the meeting held on 21st and 22nd December 2017 as per the minutes reference number DSC/KTD/212/238/2 and minute number 31/DSC/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>There were no submissions for disciplinary action</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3 	<p>The district recruited forty-one (41) new employees during the month of January 2018 as per the extracted minutes of the DSC meeting DSC/KYD/212/2338/2 held on 29th January 2018. Minute number 18/DSC/KTD/2018</p> <p>They assumed duty between the months of February and March 2018 as per their respective “assumption of duty notices” seen.</p> <p>There was evidence that they accessed the payroll during the month of March 2018 as per the LG’s Payment Voucher Print-out dated 26th March 2018</p> <p>Names and designations of the newly recruited officers were sampled on payment voucher</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2 	<p>There were no names submitted for retirement</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Revenue Mobilization</p>			
<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets) from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10 %: score 4. If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 2. If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>OSR collected in FY 2016/2017 (excluding sale of assets) was Shs. 97,165,324 whereas OSR collected in FY 2017/2018 was Shs. 118,123,941 which resulted into an increase of Shs. 20, 958,617. Source: Final Accounts FY 2016/2017 page No.15 and Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/2018 page No. 12</p> <p>The percentage increase was: 21.6%</p> <p>Workings:</p> $20,958,617/97,165,324 \times 100 = 21.6\%$ <p>This increase which complied with the PFMA 2015 Section 45 (3) was attributed to the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The renovation of the District owned commercial buildings located along Moroto road attracted more tenants thus more revenue in FY 2017/2018. The quarantine on cattle market (District major revenue source) in FY 2016/2017 was lifted in FY 2017/2018 thus more revenue was collected. 	<p>4</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 <p>+/- 10 %: then score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0.</p>	<p>Original budget for local revenue in FY 2017/2018 was Shs. 181,560,000 against which Shs. 118,123,941 was collected representing a budget out-turn of 65%. Source: LG Budget estimates for FY 2017/2018-page No. 1 and Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/2018 page No.12.</p> <p>Therefore, the LG budget realization was 35% below the planned local revenue for FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>Workings:</p> $118,123,941/181,560,000 \times 100 = 65\%$ <p>Therefore, the Budget realization/ratio was:</p> $100\% - 65\% = 35\%$ <p>This budget realization which contravened the LGFAR 2007 section 32 was attributed to the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The creation of Kotido Municipal Council in FY 2017/2018 took away the District major cattle market of Kanawat market thus declining local revenue collection. The District lost all the Local Service Tax from both Panyangara P/S & SSS and Panyangara HC III to the newly created Kotido Municipal Council in FY 2017/2018. 	
---	--	--	--

<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	<p>The District collected Shs. 20,000,000 in FY 2017/2018 in respect of Local Service Tax.</p> <p>Source: Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/2018- page No. (Annex III: Trial Balance)</p> <p>However, the District retained all the LST and there was no transfer to LLGs contrary to LGA Cap 243 as amended, Regulation 85 (4).</p> <p>The only revenue collected by the District on behalf of Nakapelimoru sub-county in February 2018 was Shs. 5,000,000 in respect of Ground rent which was shared on the basis of 65% to 35% as recommended by the law. 65% equivalent to Shs. 3,250,000 was transferred to Nakapelimoru sub-county General Fund A/c on 15th/6/2018 vide PV-AD00298</p> <p>This contravention of the recommended sharing formula of 65% to 35% in the LGA Cap 243 as amended was largely attributed to the failure by the beneficiary LLGs to do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Untimely reconciliation between Kotido Municipal Council and Kotido District HRM of actual number of District Staff residing in Kotido Municipal Council. Sub-counties did not submit their actual number of District staff residing in their locations to enable the sharing allocations. 	<p>0</p>
---	---	---	----------

<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the total Council expenditures on allowances and emoluments- (including from all sources) is not higher than 20% of the OSR collected in the previous FY: score 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actual local revenue collected in FY 2016/2017 was Shs. 97,165,324 of which 20% equivalent to Shs. 19,433,065 was supposed to be the maximum expenditure for Council emoluments and allowances in FY 2017/2018. Source: Final Accounts for FY 2016/2017 page No.15 • However actual expenditure on Council emoluments and allowances in FY 2017/2018 was Shs.22,552,888 representing 23.2% above the recommended 20% as per 1st Schedule Regulation 4 of the LGA Cap 243 as amended. Source: Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/2018 page No. (Annexes to Financial Statements: Trial Balance Code 211103). • No evidence of written authority from the Minister of Local Government to spend beyond 20% was sought by the Accounting Officer contrary to 1st Schedule Regulation 4 (A) of the LGA Cap 243 as amended. • Workings: $22,552,888/97,165,324 \times 100 = 23.2\%$ 	<p>0</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2 	<p>The district had a substantive Senior Procurement Officer as per his appointment letter CR/156/7 dated 28th March 2017</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	<p>The Kotido LG TEC conducted the evaluation of I procurement items under both open and selective bidding on 7th November 2017 and submitted the report to the LG Contracts Committee. The evaluated projects included among others;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KOTI 528/Wrks/17-18/00017 Completion of a Central store at district headquarters, • KOTI 528/Wrks/17-18/00018 Rehabilitation of piped water supply scheme. • KOTI 528/Wrks/17-18/00016 Renovation of Commercial building (UWA office). • KOTI 528/Wrks/17-18/00016 Renovation of a commercial building (Stanbic bank). • KOTI 528/Wrks/17-18/00019 Rehabilitation of 18 boreholes- Panyangara sub-county 	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	<p>The LG Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provided justifications for any deviations. For example, it held a meeting on 9th November and approved the evaluated projects under minute number CC/4/7/2017. The Contracts Committee based its decisions to award contracts for projects on the recommendations of TEC</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2 	<p>The District procurement and Disposal plan for 2019/18 covered all the infrastructure projects as in the approved district annual work plan for example under the health department alone the following infrastructure projects were included; Construction of OPD block at Opalopus HCII, Completion of fencing at Napumpum HCII, Completion of OPD block at Losakucha, and Construction of 5 stance pit latrine at Apolopus HCII. The LG made procurements for 2017/18 FY in adherence to the procurement plan.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/ infrastructure by August 30: score 2 	<p>The district had not prepared any bid documents for infrastructure/investment projects for 2018/2019 FY.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2 	<p>The district did not have an updated Contract register as the provided Contract register book did not show detailed information about the executed contracts. There was no information on amount paid on the contracts, the amount outstanding and the remarks</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): <p>score 2.</p>	<p>The LG adhered to the procurement thresholds for the projects implemented in 2017/18 FY. There was no project worth 50 million and above and therefore all the projects were awarded through Selective domestic bidding. This was evidenced through the following awarded projects;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> KOTI 528/Wrks/17-18/00017 Completion of a Central store at district headquarters worth 29,505,749 (selective bidding). KOTI 528/Wrks/17-18/00018 Rehabilitation of piped water supply scheme worth 25,018,200(selective bidding). KOTI 528/Wrks/17-18/00016 Renovation of Commercial building (UWA office) worth 20,000,000. (selective bidding) KOTI 528/Wrks/17-18/00016 Renovation of a commercial building- Stanbic bank worth 38,724,000 (selective bidding) KOTI 528/Wrks/17-18/00019 Rehabilitation of 18 boreholes- Panyangara sub-county worth 50,315,430 (open bidding) 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates <p>for all projects based on technical supervision:</p> <p>score 2</p>	<p>The works projects implemented in 2017/18 did not have certificates of completion or interim certificates attached to their procurement files.</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>There were no projects under implementation in 2018/2019 as the bid documents were still under preparation.</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 LG had been rolled on IFMS. It operated 10 Cash books/ Bank Accounts namely: General Fund A/c, UNICEF, NUSAF 3 Operation A/c, Livelihood Resilience Project A/c, Global A/c, UWEP Ent. Fund A/c, NUSAF 3 sub-project A/c, Recovery Project A/c, YLP Project A/c, and Revolving Funds Recovery A/c.</p> <p>All the monthly bank reconciliations for FY 2017/2018 were prepared by the respective sector Accountants, reviewed by the District Accountant and approved by the CFO.</p> <p>However, July to August FY 2018/2019 had not been made due to delays by MoFPED to conduct hands on training to the LG accounts staff on tier 1 which includes monthly bank reconciliations.</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>There was evidence of timely payment of suppliers during FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M/s Makal Construction (U) Ltd request for payment of Shs. 40,417,275 on 7th /3/2018 for construction of a 2 classroom block at Lopuyo P/S was paid on 3rd /4/2018 vide Payment voucher number PV-ED00082 within 27 days. • M/s OSSTEVAN Company Ltd request for payment of Shs. 4,800,000 on 7th/6/2018 for supply of HP Elite Book Laptop & HP Color LaserJet PRO MFP M281fdw were taken on charge (GRN) on 7th/6/2018 recommended for payment on same day and was paid on 15th /6/2018 vide PV-ST00084 within 8 days. • M/s XTTRI - TRUST Ltd request for payment of Shs. 50,315,430 on 8th/6/2018 for rehabilitation of 18 boreholes was paid on 8th/6/2018 vide PV-WK00230 within 61 days. . 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor: 1 point. • LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2. 	<p>The District had a substantive Principal Internal Auditor (District Internal Auditor) by the names of Ochen David Aleper substantively appointed by the DSC on 1st/6/2015 under Min. 22/DSC/KTD/2015 (25)</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2. 	<p>The LG produced all the 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/2018 in accordance with the LGA Cap 243 as amended section 90 (2) as indicated below:</p> <p>Q1 on 30th/10/2017 not referenced, addressed to District Chairperson.</p> <p>Q2 on 28th /2/2018 Ref. CR/252/2 addressed to District Chairperson.</p> <p>Q3 on 27th/4/2018 not referenced, addressed to District Chairperson.</p> <p>Q4 on 23rd/7/2018 Ref. AUD/4th/2018, addressed to District Chairperson.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports: score 2.</p>	<p>No evidence was provided to the assessment team regarding information to the Council and LGPAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for FY 2017/2018</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1. 	<p>All the 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/2018 were submitted to the Accounting Officer and LGPAC as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAO & LGPAC on 30th/10/2017 but not referenced. • CAO & LGPAC on 28th /2/2018 Ref. CR/252/2. • CAO & LGPAC on 27th /4/2018 but not referenced. • CAO & LGPAC on 23th /7/2018 Ref. AUD/4th/2018. <p>However, LGPAC reviewed and followed-up only 1st and 2nd quarter internal audit reports for FY 2017/2018 and submitted reports to Council on 22nd/6/2018 and 29th/6/2018 respectively. The 3rd & 4th reports were not reviewed nor followed-up as required as at the time of this assessment.</p>	0
<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG maintains an up- dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	<p>The LG maintained both an IFMS and Manual assets register covering details on Land & Buildings, Motor Vehicles & Heavy Plants and General as per format in the Local Government Accounting Manual 2007 i.e. Form AC 33(a) Register of Fixed Assets – General, Form AC 33(b) Register of Fixed Assets – Motor Vehicles & Heavy Plants, Form AC 33(c) Register of Fixed Assets – Land & Buildings.</p> <p>However, the LG manual assets register was not maintained to date as required.</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>Kotido 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>The District Council met and discussed service delivery related issues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Min. 36/COU/05/2018 – Presentation, Reading, and Approval of the Draft Budget Estimates for the FY 2018/2019; and Min. 37/COU/05/2018 – Presentation of Recommendations of Standing Committees (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 28th May 2018). Min. 31/COU/03/2018 – Laying of the Draft Budget Estimates for the FY 2018/2019 Before Council (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 29th March 2018). Min. 17/COU/12/2017 – Presentation of Standing Committees Recommendations; and Laying of the Draft Bills for Final Reading (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 19th December 2017). Min. 12/COU/10/2017 – Laying of the Bills: ‘Environmental conservation and Charcoal Burning’; and ‘Protection of Trees and Rangelands’ (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 28th October 2017). 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/ complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 1. 	<p>The CAO / Kotido DLG designated Mr. Kapel Jonathan (HRO) as Client Charter Implementation Focal Person (as per letter Ref: CR/161/11 dated 31st May 2018).</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/ complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which should be displayed at LG offices and made publically available: score 1 	<p>There was a District Client Charter, 2017/18 – 2019 – 2020 for Kotido DLG, which clearly spelt out the system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances. The Client Charter was among the topical issues discussed on 'Voice of Karamoja' Radio by the Kotido District Officials.</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 Kotido District Payroll and Pensioner Schedule for August 2018 were displayed on public notice board in the Administration block at Kotido District headquarters. The indicated date of display was 27th August 2018.</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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The procurement plan was not displayed on any Notice Board at Kotido District Headquarters. There was no other procurement relevant information for FY 2018/2019 displayed on the notice board at Kotido District headquarters. 	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1. 	<p>There was no was evidence availed to show that the Kotido DLG performance assessment results and implications were published.</p> <p>The Annual Performance Assessment results were said to have been discussed in one of the DTPC meetings. However, the DTPC minutes were not availed to the assessor.</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 communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>For example, the letter from CAO (Ref: CR/214/15 dated 30th January 2018) to all Sub-counties regarding 'Formation of Sub-County NGO Monitoring Committees'. This was in line with the NGO Policy (2010).</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1. 	<p>Kotido DLG held radio talk shows every Friday (on 'Voice of Karamoja' from 4:00 pm – 5:00 pm) on various topical issues ranging from good governance, implementation of Government programmes (e.g. UWEP, SAGE, YLP, NUSAF), health, education, and dissemination of Government policies (as evidenced by the Radio Talk Show Schedule for Q3 FY 2017/2018. The schedule indicated: Department, Issues for Discussion, Responsible Person, Dates of for the Talk shows, and Remarks column).</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG gender focal person and CDO have provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion into their activities score 2. 	<p>The district Gender Focal Person provided guidance and support to sector departments on how to mainstream gender in their activities through a number of activities like backstopping the sub counties through training of sub county leaders on gender and equity budgeting evidenced by a report dated 28/6/2018, the Gender focal person also profiled gender based violence cases in the district as evidenced by an activity report dated 23rd September 2017</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the gender focal point and CDO have planned for minimum 2 activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and address vulnerability and social inclusions and that more than 90 % of previous year's budget for gender activities/ vulnerability/ social inclusion has been implemented: score 2. 	<p>The gender focal person and the CDO had planned a number of activities according to the 2018/19 work plan to mainstream gender and they include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mentoring staff on gender mainstreaming. Orientation of stakeholders on gender based violence. Orientation of community leaders on Gender based violence relevant laws and policies. <p>This was evidenced the availability of the above activities in the district AWP 2018/2019 page 84.</p> <p>However, the budget of 2,000, 000 allocated for gender mainstreaming activities in 2017/18 FY was not fully utilised as only 1,250,000 was used. This was less than 90% that should have been implemented. This was evidenced by payment vouchers number PV-S01679 and PV-S03007 worth 500,000 and 750,000 respectively</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 1 	<p>Environmental screening was not done for any of the five 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 the LG integrates environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	<p>There was no evidence that the LG integrated environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents as the bid documents for the sampled projects did not have a section addressing environmental and social management and health and safety issues</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1 	<p>The projects sampled were implemented on district owned land except the rehabilitated boreholes which are situated on community land.</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 any of the sampled completed projects</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance (new one): Score 1 	<p>The contract payments for sampled projects were effected without seeking for any environmental and social clearance as a requirement</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that environmental officer and CDO monthly report, includes a) completed checklists, b) deviations observed with pictures, c) corrective actions taken. Score: 1 	<p>The Environmental officer and the Community Development Officer did not write any monthly reports as they did not visit any of the sampled projects during their implementation by the lower local governments</p>	<p>0</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 	<p>The LG Department of Education had 14 P/S with 132 Teachers and Head Teachers.</p> <p>There was evidence that for FY 2018/19, under Vote 528, Wages for 132 was budgeted for totaling to 2,117,521 billion.</p>	4
<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 	<p>The Staff list obtained indicated that each of the schools had at least 7 teachers per school and 1 Head Teacher for all the 14 schools which were up to P7.</p>	4
<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100%: score 6 o If 80 - 99%: score 3 o If below 80%: score 0 	<p>There was no Wage Bill provision for FY 2018/19 to fill the structure for Primary Teachers.</p> <p>The assessment team was informed by the DEO Mr. Lowani Angelo Max that the Department is only recruiting on replacement basis.</p> <p>In March 2018, 22 Teachers were recruited on a replacement basis.</p> <p>The Staff list obtained did not indicate the LG gaps in positions for teachers. However, the DEO said the gap was 201. Thus if 132 out of 333 positions were filled, the percentage of filled structure is 39.6%, way below 80% rating=0</p>	0

<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	<p>The LG Department of Education had filled only one position of Senior Inspector of Schools.</p> <p>The department structure provides for: One (1) Senior Inspector and one (1) Inspector of Schools. The local government thus filled only one position of Senior Inspector.</p> <p>Mr. Otim Carl Max was substantively appointed as Senior Inspector of Schools on 24/7/2018. Refer to appointment no. CR/561/7.</p> <p>Mr, Otim also care takes the DEOs' Office.</p> <p>However, During the data collection, the assessment team met and collected data from the outgoing DEO (not substantively appointed) Mr. Lowani Angelo Max.</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 that the LG submitted a recruitment plan fill positions for primary school teachers. The assessment team did review a recruitment form which was undated and unsigned and thus disregarded as authentic document.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Inspectors: score 2 	<p>The LG Filled one position for Senior Inspector of Schools. There was no evidence of submission of a recruitment plan for 1 inspector of schools. The assessment team did review a recruitment form which was undated and unsigned and thus disregarded as authentic document.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Monitoring and Inspection</p>			

<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% school inspectors: score 3 	<p>The district had one Inspector of Schools. There was evidence that he was appraised as per the appraisal report dated 3rd July 2018</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary school head teachers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 3 o 70% and 89%: score 2 o Below 70%: score 0 	<p>The district had fourteen (14) primary schools and therefore 14 Head Teachers as per the district staff list.</p> <p>There was evidence that all head teachers were appraised as per their appraisal reports seen, representing 100% compliance.</p> <p>Appraisal reports of six Head Teachers were sampled to establish the dates of their appraisals as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lookorok PS - 29th December 2017 2. Napumpum PS - 16th January 2018 3. Nakaporimori PS - 29th January 2018 4. Nakoreto PS – 26th February 2018 5. Lokitelaebu PS – 5th January 2018 6. Kalosarich PS 5th January 2018 	<p>3</p>

<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1 	<p>There was no evidence at the DEOs' office and at the sampled schools that circulars and guidelines were communicated in the previous financial year 2017/18</p> <p>The sampled and visited schools included:</p> <p>Napumpum P/S, Nakapelimoru P/S & Lookorok P/S. None of these three schools had received any circular and or guidelines in 2017/18.</p> <p>The assessment team was able to locate a Teachers Code of conduct, Education Act 2002, circular no. 33, 2009 on Improvement of service delivery with focus on increasing quality of Primary Education. No</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 2 	<p>There was no evidence that the LG department of Education held meetings with Head Teachers to explain and sensitize them on the guidelines and circulars issued by the national level.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all registered primary schools²</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59 % score 1 o Below 50% score 0. 	<p>There was evidence that the LG department of Education inspected all the 14 P/S at least twice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Term II inspection was done between 28/5-8/6/2018 and a monitoring report available for 16 schools including the 14 government P/S. • Term III inspection was done between 13/11-23/11/2017 for 16 schools including the 14 Government P/S. <p>Thus inspection was done only ? terms (66.6%) for some schools and there was inspection reports</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	<p>There was no evidence in form of minutes of meetings which indicated that the department discussed the school inspection reports.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 	<p>There was no evidence that the LG Department submitted School inspection report to DES.</p> <p>the matrix of submission obtained from DES indicated that the department had not submitted any report as the matrix form was blank for Kotido District 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 evidence that the recommendations of school inspection were being followed-up.</p> <p>For the two Inspection reports, the inspection identifies the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor sanitation at Napumpum P/S, Nakoreto P/S & Losakucha P/S. (November inspection report) • Need for Teachers houses in Nakoreto P/S & Losakucha P/S. (November inspection report) • Need for Desks in Napumpum P/S, Nakoreto P/S & Losakucha P/S. (November inspection report). <p>The responsibility for follow up was allocated to CAO, DEO and SMC for action.</p> <p>A requisition for 10 teachers houses, 43 classrooms,73 latrine stances, 8 stores, 9 kitchen, 17 staff rooms and 177 desks dated 27/8/2018 , for 874,455,890 million UGX was prepared for submission to PDU.</p>	<p>4</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 Department of Education submitted accurate and consistent data for list of schools consistent with EMIS and PBS.</p> <p>According to the DEO, the PBS generated list of Schools were not printed and thus the assessment team was not able to review it.</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>No enrollment data for all schools on PBS generated list was available for review at the time of assessment. There was thus no evidence that it existed and that it was consistent with EMIS report and PBS.</p>	<p>0</p>
---	--	---	----------

Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>The Social Services Committee, which is responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2017/2018 as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 13th - 14th February 2018 (under Min.009/SSC/02/2018 – Scrutiny of the Draft HIV and AIDS Strategic Plan; Min.10/SSC/02/2018 - Scrutiny of the Draft HIV and AIDS Work policy; and Min.11/SSC/02/2018 – Discussion of the Second Quarter Departmental Reports). • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 23rd – 24th November 2017 (under Min.04/SSC/11/2017 –Review of Quarter 2 Implementation Status FY 2017/2018). • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 17th – 18th August 2017 (under Min.04/SSC/08/2017 – Examination of Departmental Reports (Performance) Q4 – FY 2016/2017). 	<p>2</p>
--	---	---	----------

<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>The Social Services Committee presented issues that required approval to Council during FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Recommendations of SSC held on 17th – 18th August 2017 at the DSC Boardroom from 9:00 am each day’ • ‘Recommendations of SSC meeting held on 11th – 12th October 2017 at the DSC Boardroom’. • ‘Social Services Committee (SSC) Recommendations to Council as per Their Sitting held on 13th – 14th February 2018’. • ‘Social Services Committee Recommendations for Their Sitting held on 8th – 9th May 2018 at the DSC Boardroom from 9:00 am – 5:00pm each Day’. 	<p>2</p>
--	---	---	----------

<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO/ MEO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80 % schools: score 0 	<p>There was evidence that SMCs' in some schools were functional.</p> <p>Five (5) Schools were sampled and three physically visited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lapumpum P/S, with 11 SMC members met on 13/7/2018 to Approve the school budget. • Nakapelimoru P/s with 9 SMC members had a meeting on 12/6/2018 on School health clubs. The deputy head teachers also mentioned meetings to approve budgets and for mobilization, however, there was no evidence in form of minutes of the said meeting. • Lookorok P/S with 9 SMC members. There was no verifiable evidence that the SMC met as no meeting minutes was available both at school and at the district. • Kanari P/S with 15 members. There was minutes of a hand over report of SMCs' dated 5/2/2018. . • Kacheri P/S. there was no SMC list and no report since 2016. This was the same case with Rengen P/S, Kalosorich P/S where there was no report and no list of SMCs' in the general schools files at the DEOs' Office. <p>The Education officer Ms Beatrice informed the assessment team that the SMC list and reports were in the Schools but the sampled schools did not confirm this position.</p> <p>The assessment team concluded that only 2 out of 5 (40%) sampled SMC files had some evidence of functionality.</p>	<p>0</p>
---	--	---	----------

<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	<p>There was no evidence on the notice board at the LG and in the files at the DEOs' office that the list of schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants was made public</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The LG Education department has submitted input into the LG procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to the Procurement Unit that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	<p>There was no evidence that the LG department of Education submitted procurement input to PDU. There was a list of procurement items including recruitment of school inspector but the list was undated and unsigned. The assessment team thus disregarded it as authentic evidence</p>	<p>0</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>There was evidence that the LG Health department timely certified and recommended suppliers for payment as per sampled payments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M/s Miraculous Ltd request for payment of Shs. 20,250,000 on 6th/11/2017 for construction of a 5 stance line latrine Lot 1 for boys at Nakwakwa P/S in Rengen Sub-county was certified under Certificate number 01 dated 21st/11/2017 was paid on 21st/12/2017 vide PV-ED00060 within 45 days. • M/s Makal Construction (U) Ltd request for payment of Shs. 40,417,275 on 7th/3/2018 for construction of a 2 classroom block at Lopuyo P/S was certified under Certificate No. 02 and was paid on 3rd/4/2018 vide PV-ED00082 within 27 days. • M/s Worop Enterprise request for payment of Shs. 16,200,000 on 24th/6/2017 for construction of a 3- stance pit latrine & urinal at Kacheri P/S was certified under Certificate No. 01 and was paid on 10th/11/2017 vide PV-ED00053 within 55 days. 	<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>According to the DEO and Planner – Kotido DLG, the Department submitted the annual performance report for FY 2017/2018 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner. However, documentary evidence was not availed to the assessor.</p> <p>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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If sector has no audit query score 4 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 o If all queries are not responded to score 0 	<p>The LG Education department had only 1 internal audit finding in FY 2017/2018 but there was no evidence of information provided to the internal audit on the status of its implementation as at the time of this assessment.</p> <p>This internal audit finding in 1st quarter FY 2017/2018 was on financial management in Primary Schools.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills, etc.: Score 2 	<p>There was no evidence that the LG department of Education in consultation with the gender focal person disseminated guidelines on how senior women and men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2 	<p>The was no evidence that the LG in collaboration with gender department issued and explained guidelines on sanitation for girls and PWD in P/S</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	<p>There was evidence that some SMCs' met the 30% gender composition requirement.</p> <p>The 5 sampled schools:</p> <p>? Napumpum P/S had 5 female out of 12 members'</p> <p>? Nakapelimoru P/s had 4 female out of 13 members.</p> <p>? Lookorok P/S had 5 female had of 12 members.</p> <p>? The other 2 schools, sampled but not physically visited: Kacheri P/S and Rengen P/S had no SMC lists in the file and was not possible to verify the SMC presence, functionality and gender composition.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 1: 	<p>There was no evidence at the DEOs' office that the education department in collaboration with environment department issued guidelines on environment management in schools.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all school infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 1 	<p>There was no evidence of project screening forms for any ongoing projects in the department of education.</p> <p>In fact the DEO was not aware that the department should be ensuring that projects are screened and filing copies as evidence.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to check whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1 	<p>There was no evidence that the education project sites were visited and site visit report written. The DEO's office files and the environment officer files did not contain any education site visitation report although one classroom construction project was on going.</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>There was evidence that the LG Health department had filled the structure for health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage FY 2018/2019 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of 177 health staff establishment for Kotido LG as per the letter from DHO entitled” Recruitment of District Health Officers” dated 17th/5/2018 Ref. ADM-103/206/03, 124 had been filled representing 70% whereas 53 were not filled representing 30%. • The job advertisement to fill the 53 vacant posts was on 26th /5/2018 which were all applied for by 30th /6/2018 pending selection. Source: Performance Contract, Approved Staff structure, Advertisement and Wage IPFs for FY 2018/2019. 	4
<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 evidence that the LG Health department had submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to HRM for FY 2018/2019 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A letter from DHO to CAO entitled “Vacant Staff Positions for Possible Recruitment” dated 8th /3/2018 Ref. CR/H353/1. • The LG subsequently advertised the vacant 53 posts on 26th/ 5/2018 which were all applied for pending selection by the Health Service Commission. Source: Performance Contract, Recruitment Plan and Submission letter to CAO. 	6

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

Maximum 8 points for this performance measure

Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:

- o 100%: score 8
- o 70 – 99%: score 4
- o Below 70%: score 0

The district had fourteen (14) health facilities as follows;

Health Center IIIs 5

Health Center IIs 9

There was evidence that all 14 Officers in Charge of Health Centers were appraised as per their appraisal reports, representing 100% compliance

Seven (7) appraisal reports of Officers in Charge were sampled to establish the dates of their appraisals as follows;

1. Senior Clinical Officer in charge of Rengen HC III was appraised on 13th June 2018
2. Enrolled Nurse in charge of Lupuyo HC II as appraised on 15th June 2018
3. Nursing Officer in charge of Nakapelinoru HC III was appraised on 15th June 2018
4. Nursing Officer in charge of Losachuca HC II was appraised on 12th June 2018
5. Enrolled Nurse in charge of Rikitae HC II was appraised on 15th June 2018
6. Enrolled midwife Kamor HC II was appraised on 15th June 2018
7. Senior Clinical Officer in charge of Napumpum HC III was appraised on 30th June 2018

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.

Maximum 4 points for this performance measure

- 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

There was evidence that the LG Health department had deployed health workers as per lists submitted with the budget for FY 2018/2019 as indicated in the 5 sampled lower health facilities below:

i. Lokitaelebu HC III: Approved 19 and filled 18.

ii. Rengen HCIII: Approved 19 and filled 15.

iii. Lopuyo HC II: Approved 9 and filled 5.

iv. Nakwakwa HC II: Approved 9 and filled 4.

v. Lokoding HC II: Approved and filled 5.

Source: Health workers list on deployment and the LG budget of FY 2018/2019.

Monitoring and Supervision

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

Maximum 6 for this performance measure

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

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

- Lokitaelebu HCIII
- Rengen HCIII
- Lopuyo HCII
- Nakwakwa HCII
- Lokiding HCII

The following were found in each of the above sampled health facilities:

- Uganda Clinical Guidelines for management of common conditions 2016.
- Essential medicine and Health Supplies list for Uganda 2016.
- National Communication Strategy for Malaria Control in Uganda 2015.
- Childhood Cancer information booklet for health workers for 3rd Edition March 2017.
- Introduction of Rotavirus vaccine into routine immunization.

Source: Guidelines, policies, circulars, Minutes of meetings between DHO & in charges of lower health units held on 7th / 2/2018 and 15th/6/2018.

<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/MHO has held meetings with health facility in- charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	<p>There was evidence that the DHO held meetings with health in charges and explained among others the guidelines, policies and circulars issued by the national level as indicated below based on the above sampled health facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On 7th/2/2018, DHO disseminated guidelines on cancer prevention and management, guidelines on waste management, guidelines on health sector planning. On 15th/6/2018, DHO disseminated planning guidelines within health sector. He instructed the in charges to develop a comprehensive District Health Work plan putting in place sector priorities for FY 2018/2019. <p>Source: Guidelines, policies, circulars, meetings between DHO and in charges of lower health facilities.</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>The LG did not have a Health Centre IV or District Hospital. However, there was evidence that the DHT had supervised 100% Health Centre IIIs, Health Centre IIs and PNFPs like Kanawat HC III, Losilang HCII and KDDO HCIII as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q1 supervision was on 6th/7/2017. Q2 s supervision was on 5th/10/2017. Q3 supervision was on 3rd/1/2018. Q4 supervision was 15th/4/2018. 	<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 ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% supervised: score 3 • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60% - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0 	<p>The LG did not have a HSD. However, the DHT had ensured that they supervised HCIIIs and HCIIIs including PNFP within FY 2017/2018 as indicated in the 5 sampled lower health facilities below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Rengen HCIII, the supervision recommendations captured in the facility supervision log book included expired drugs to be returned to DHO'S office, upgrading HCIIIs to HCIII like Lopuyo HCII, Nakwakwa HCII. 	<p>3</p>
<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	<p>There was evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports were discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions in FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q1 supervisor report dated 6th/7/2017 recommended conducting performance review of health sector and renovation of Nakwakwa HCII and Lokorok HCII facilities. • Q2 supervision report dated 5th/10/2017 recommended withdrawal of expired drugs from the lower health facilities and private drug shops. • Q3 supervision report dated 3rd/1/2018 recommended construction of urinals in Kacheri HCIII. • Q4 supervision report dated 5th/4/2018 recommended selection of new HUMC members for Napumpum HCIII and Apalopus HCII as the tenure for the old ones had expired. 	<p>4</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

Maximum 10 points for this performance measure

- Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6

There was evidence that the recommendations were followed and specific activities undertaken such as the selection of new HUMC members for both Napumpum HCIII and Apalopus HCII, expired drugs were withdrawn and returned to NMS, continuous quality improvement in use of HMIS amongst others.

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

Maximum 10 for this performance measure

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

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

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

Q1 FY 2018/2019 Lokiding HCII non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs.1,091,553.

Q1 FY 2018/2019 Lokitaelebu HCIII non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs. 1,765,743.

Q1 FY 2018/2019 Rengen HCIII non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs. 1,765,743.

Q1 FY 2018/2019 Nakwakwa HCII non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs.1,091,553.

Q1 FY 2018/2019 Lopuyo HCII non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs. 1,091,553.

PNFP Health facilities:

Q1 FY 2018/2019 Kanawat HCIII non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs. 5,831,436.

Q1 FY 2018/2019 Losilang HCIII non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs. 5,831,436.

Q1 FY 2018/2019 KDDO HCIII non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs. 5,831,436.

Source: Lists of health facilities, Kotido District Non-wage PHC Grant Allocations for FY 2018/2019, HMIS reports.

<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>The Social Services Committee, which was responsible for Health met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2017/2018 as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 13th - 14th February 2018 (under Min.009/SSC/02/2018 –Scrutiny of the Draft HIV and AIDS Strategic Plan; Min.10/SSC/02/2018 - Scrutiny of the Draft HIV and AIDS Work policy; and Min.11/SSC/02/2018 – Discussion of the Second Quarter Departmental Reports). Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 23rd – 24th November 2017 (under Min.04/SSC/11/2017 –Review of Quarter 2 Implementation Status FY 2017/2018). Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 17th – 18th August 2017 (under Min.04/SSC/08/2017 –Examination of Departmental Reports (Performance) Q4 – FY 2016/2017). 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>The Social Services Committee presented issues that required approval to Council during FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ‘Recommendations of SSC held on 17th – 18th August 2017 at the DSC Boardroom from 9:00 am each day’ ‘Recommendations of SSC meeting held on 11th – 12th October 2017 at the DSC Boardroom’. ‘Social Services Committee (SSC) Recommendations to Council as per Their Sitting held on 13th – 14th February 2018’. ‘Social Services Committee Recommendations for Their Sitting held on 8th – 9th May 2018 at the DSC Boardroom from 9:00 am – 5:00pm each Day’. 	<p>2</p>

<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p>	<p>There was evidence that health facilities had functional HUMCs established, meetings held and discussion of budget and resource issues on quarterly basis as per the 5 sampled health facilities indicated below:</p>
<p>Maximum 6 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 6 • If 80-99 %: score 4 • If 70-79: %: score 2 • If less than 70%: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lokiding HCII had 5 members of HUMC and held their meetings on 20th/9/2017, 12th/3/2018, 28th/5/2018, and 29th/6/2018. They discussed poor environmental health like bushy compound, collapsed patients' pit latrine, lack of placenta pit, PHC budget and quarterly releases amongst others. • Rengen HCIII had 7 members of HUMC and held their meetings on 29th/6/2018 and 7th//4/2018. They discussed lack of lighting system at the facility, irregular attendance of the night guard. • Lokitaelebu HCIII had 7 members of HUMC and held their meetings on 7th/4/2018 and 28th/5/2018. They discussed PHC budget and quarterly releases, absenteeism of night askari from duty, poor sanitation like lack of maintenance of bathroom shelter. • Lopuyo HCII had only 5 members of HUMC and held their meetings on 24th/2/2018 and 30th/4/2018. They discussed irregular attendance of meetings by members, failure to prioritize maintenance of health facility resulting into poor environmental health and sanitation. • Nakwakwa HCII had 5 members of HUMC and held their meeting on 2nd/6/2018. They discussed lack of transport for referred patients to Moroto Hospital.

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

Maximum 4 for this performance measure

- Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non- wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 4

There was evidence that the LG publicized all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants on facility notice boards as see on the 5 sampled health facilities below:

1. Lokiding HCII: Q1:1,091,553

Q2: 800,000

Q3: 800,000

Q4: 800,000

2. Lokitaelebu HCIII

Q1: 1765,743

Q2: 4,004,550

Q3 4,004,550

Q4: 4,004,550

3. Rengen HCIII

Q1: 1,765,743

Q2: 2,002,550

Q3: 2,002,550

Q4: 2,002,550

4. Nakwakwa HCII

Q1: 1,091,553

Q2: 1,001,000

Q3: 1,001,000

Q4: 1,001,000

5. Lopuyo HCII

Q1: 5,091,553

Q2: 1,001,000

Q3: 1,001,000

Q4: 1,001,000

<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has submitted input to procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2 	<p>The LG Health department submitted input to procurement plan to the PDU on 27th April 2018. The investment items included in the submitted input were; Construction of OPD block at Opalopus HCII, Completion of fencing at Napumpum HCII, Completion of OPD block at Losakucha, and Construction of 5 stance pit latrine at Apolopus HCII.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2. 	<p>The LG Health department submitted form PP1 to the PDU on 12th September 2018 for the following projects; Construction of OPD block at Opalopus HCII, Completion of fencing at Napumpum HCII, Completion of OPD block at Losakucha, and Construction of 5 stance pit latrine at Apolopus HCII.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/ MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4. 	<p>The LG Health department certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment as evidenced in the sampled payments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M/s OSSTEVAN Co. Ltd request for payment (Invoice No. 773 dated 7th/6/2018) of Shs. 4,800,000 for supply of HP Elite Book Laptop & HP Color LaserJet PRO MFP M281fdw were taken on charge (GRN) on 7th/6/2018, recommended for payment on 7th/6/2017 and was paid on 15th/6/2018 vide PV-ST00084 within 8 days. M/s MURYAGAZ request for payment (Invoice No. 565 dated 28th/4/2018) for supply of fuel to Health sector was recommended for payment on 8th/6/2018 and was paid on 14th/6/2018 vide PV-HE001459 within 6 days. M/s MURYAGAZ request for payment of Shs. 3,352,000 (Invoice No. 318 dated 6th/3/2018 for fuel to the Health sector was recommended for payment on 6th/4/2018 and was paid on 18th/4/2018 vide PV-HE00145 within 12 days. 	<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>According to the DHO and Planner – Kotido DLG, the Department submitted the annual performance report for FY 2017/2018 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner. However, documentary evidence was not availed to the assessor.</p> <p>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 LG Health department had 4 internal audit findings in FY 2017/2018 but there was no evidence that the sector had provided information to the internal audit on the status of their implementation as at the time of this assessment.</p> <p>These internal audit findings were: Dressing code in Health facilities, Use of PHC funding in Health facilities, Absenteeism by Emuron Robert - a Clinical Officer at Kachen HC III who had last attended duty on 22nd/1/2018 and unaccounted for funds.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30 % women: score 2 	<p>There was evidence that the HUMC met the gender composition as per guidelines as seen in the 5 sampled lower health facilities below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lokitaelebu HCIII HUMC had 7 members of which 3 were men and 4 were female representing 57.1% • Lopuyo HCII HUMC had 5 members of which 3 were male and 2 were female representing 40%. • Lokiding HCII HUMC had 5 members of which 2 were male and 3 were female representing 60%. • Nakwakwa HCII HUMC had 5 members of which 3 were male and 2 were female representing 40% • Rengen HCIII HUMC had 7 members of which 4 were male and 3 were female representing 43%. 	<p>2</p>

<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2. 	<p>The LG issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities on 15th/4/2018 during the supervision visits by DHT.</p> <p>Guidelines on sanitation management included segregation of toilets (coo-men, mon-women) for staff, placenta pits, bin liners for the color coded bins, incinerators amongst others.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 2 	<p>There were no Health facility infrastructure projects implemented and therefore no environmental screening was required.</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>No site visits were conducted by the environmental officer as there were no sites to visit.</p>	<p>2</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>There was evidence that the LG had issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines on medical waste management were issued to lower health units 5th/10/2017 during the supervision visits by DHT. • Guidelines on use of color coded bins were displayed on the 5 sampled health facilities. • Guidelines on use of incinerator for burning highly infectious medical waste were issued to lower health units on 3rd/1/2018. • Sanitary posters on proper use of latrines written in vernacular (Ngakaramajong) were displayed on the 5 sampled health facilities. <p>Source: Guidelines on medical waste management.</p>	<p>4</p>
---	--	---	----------

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the district Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below average coverage: score 10 o If 80-99%: Score 7 o If 60-79: Score 4 o If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>The review of the District Atlas report of MoWE revealed that Kotido District Local Government had safe water average of 81%. Three sub-counties were found to have safe water coverage below the district average. These were Rengen 64%, Kacheri 66% and Nakapelirom 81%.</p> <p>The review of AWP and budget 2018/19 revealed that, the Water department had planned 7 new boreholes (Hand pump), 2 Deep boreholes (production pumps) and 1 Design of new mini piped water supply scheme and 9 boreholes for rehabilitation all totaling to Ushs277,538,795.</p> <p>One new borehole costing Ushs 23,263,000 and one borehole rehabilitation costing Ushs 2,795,302 were planned in each of the sub counties with safe water below district average and the design of mini piped water supply scheme costing Ushs 19,540,080 at Napeikar Kacheri S/C. This brings the total budget for the sub counties below district average to Ushs 97,714,985 which was 35.21% of the total budget for FY 2018/19.</p>	0

<p>The district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY. o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: <p>Score 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 80-99%: Score 10 o If 60-79: Score 5 o If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>The review of the Budget and Annual Progress Report for FY 2017/18 submitted by the District Water Department revealed that 16 new boreholes, 16 boreholes for rehabilitation and rehabilitation of piped water supply scheme at Panyangara S/C were budgeted for.</p> <p>However after site visit and reviewing the Annual progress reports especially the Fourth Quarter report received by MoWE on 14th August 2018, the assessment team found out that only 10 new boreholes were implemented, 18 boreholes rehabilitated and Panyangara piped water supply scheme which was partially completed since one of the production boreholes was filled up with stones which could not allow the installation to be completed. Therefore only 62.5% of planned projects were implemented.</p>	<p>5</p>
---	---	--	----------

<p>Monitoring and Supervision</p>			
<p>The district Water department carries out monthly monitoring of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the district Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15 • 80% - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10 • 70 - 79%: score 7 • 60% - 69% monitored: score 5 • 50% - 59%: score 3 • Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored: score 0 	<p>The District Water department had a monitoring plan included in the AWP and Budget 2017/18 approved on 22nd August 2017. The monitoring plan outlined the activities for monitoring and supervision of the planned projects that included construction supervision visits, Inspection of water points after construction and regular data collection and analysis. For instance, Site monitoring and supervision report on the rehabilitation of Panyangara piped water supply scheme dated 24th April 2018 and Inspection report for drilling of 10 boreholes dated 21st July 2018. In addition, the DWO Provided Form 1 which was used for monitoring all water sources in the district.</p>	<p>15</p>

<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the district has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: Score 5 List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>The data contained in the District Annual Work Plan was similar to the information obtained from the Ministry of Water and Environment</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>The water facilities listed in the MIS report provided by the MoWE reflected 16 New Deep boreholes planned and only 6 were achieved, 19 boreholes planned for rehabilitation and all were achieved. This was consistent with the performance contract 2018/19.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The district Water department has submitted input for district's procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted input for the district procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	<p>The DWO informed the assessment team that he had submitted the Water department procurement plan that covered all investment items in the approved sector AWP and budget to PDU. However, he could not provide any copy of the submission which he said it was with the procurement officer who was not available in the office to provide a copy for verification. The absence of the procurement officer from the time of assessment was made clear to the district administration during the debriefing meeting.</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>A contract management plan which involved monitoring and supervision plan was included in the AWP 2018/19. Site issues were discussed and reported in the site inspection reports for particular projects. However, no proof for appointment of contract manager for WSS projects by the district was presented to assessment team as DWO claimed that the copy was kept by Procurement officer who was not available at the time of assessment.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	<p>The following completed facilities were sampled and inspected. They were all found to be functional and well maintained, and the visible elements were confirmed to have been constructed as per design.</p> <p>Hand pump boreholes at Naatabaabur (Kotido S/C), Nakinenes (Nakapelimoru S/C) and Nakirioni (Panyangara S/C)</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	<p>The contractor had not handed over the completed WSS facilities and no completion certificates had been 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>DWO had appropriately certified all WSS projects. The interim certificates for the new boreholes and rehabilitations were certified in time. For instance M/s East Africa Boreholes Ltd request for payment of Shs. 104,196,265 on 13th/3/2018 for Drilling & Installation of 12 bore holes in Kotido District under Lot 1 was certified under Certificate No. 2 and was paid on 23rd/3/2018 and M/s XTRI – TRUST Ltd request for payment of Shs. 47,799,659 on 8th/3/2018 for rehabilitation of 18 bore holes was certified for payment under Certificate No. 1 and was paid on 8th/5/2018</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district Water department has certified and initiated payment for works and supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<p>The District Water department certified and recommended for payment as evidenced by the sampled payments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M/s East Africa Boreholes Ltd request for payment of Shs. 104,196,265 on 13th/3/2018 for Drilling & Installation of 12 bore holes in Kotido District under Lot 1 was certified under Certificate No. 2 was paid on 23rd/3/2018 vide PV- WK00180 within 10 days. M/s Kal Bros. Co. Ltd request for payment of Shs. 9,218,160 on 10th/4/2018 for rehabilitation of Panyangira Water Supply Scheme was certified under Certificate No. 1 and was paid on 13th/6/2018 vide PV-WK00600 within 54 days. M/s XTRI – TRUST Ltd request for payment of Shs. 47,799,659 on 8th/3/2018 for rehabilitation of 18 bore holes was certified for payment under Certificate No. 1 and was paid on 8th/5/2018 vide PV-WK00230 within 61 days. 	<p>3</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

<p>The district Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Plan- ning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	<p>The Water Department submitted the annual performance report for FY 2017/2018 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner on 6th August 2018 (as per Email from the PBS – Re: Reg. Head of Department Validation' dated 6th August 2018 alerting the Planner / Kotido DLG about the submission by the DWO)</p> <p>However, the submission was made after the deadline of 15th July 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The District Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If sector has no audit query score 5 If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 If queries are not responded to score 0 	<p>The District Water department had no internal audit query in FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3 	<p>The Works and Technical Services Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2017/2018 as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 13th - 14th February 2018 (under Min.05/TSAC/02/2018 – Discussion of Second Quarter Departmental Reports. Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 23rd – 24th November 2017 (under Min.05/TSAC/11/2017 –Review of Sector Performance. 	<p>3</p>
<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	<p>The Works and Technical Services Committee presented issues that required approval to Council during FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ‘Resolutions of the 6th Technical Service, Administration, Production, Natural Resources, and Finance Committee held on 17th – 18th August 2017 at the Production Boardroom Presented to the General Council for Adoption’ ‘Recommendations of Technical Services, Finance, and Administration Committee held on the 8th – 9th of May 2018 in Production Department’. ‘Recommendations of Technical Services and Administration Committee held on the 13th – 14th of February 2018 in Production Department’. ‘Recommendations of Technical Services and Administration Committee of Kotido District Local Government held on the 23rd – 24th of November 2017 in Production Department’. 	<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 only declaration of grant releases for 3rd quarter FY2017/18 dated 16th January 2018 on the Notice board of District water department. AWP, Budget and Water development grant expenditures were not displayed on any notice board and no filed copy was presented to the Assessment team.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2 	<p>Five water facilities were sampled and visited and were found to be clearly labelled and the labels indicated the name of project, date of construction, the name of the contractor and source of funding. The sampled facilities were; Naatabaabur (Kotido S/C), Nakirioni (Panyangara S/C), Masula (Nakapelimoru S/C), Nasinyon (Nakapelimoru S/C) and Nakinenes (Nakapelimoru S/C).</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	<p>A pre-qualification list for FY 2018/19 as of 3rd August 2018 was found by the assessment team displayed on the district notice board. For instance, for the rehabilitation of boreholes two companies namely; KAL-BROS company Ltd and Max & P enterprises were pre-qualified.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If communities apply for water/ public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	<p>Application letters for WSS facilities from communities represented by sub counties together with the minutes of the meetings held by communities were submitted to the District Water Office as per sector critical requirements for action and were properly filed. For instance an application for borehole by Napeikar Village Kacheri S/C dated 19th January 2018, Lobeel Village Rengen S/C dated 18th January 2018 and Naitai Village Rengen S/C dated 18th January 2018 were sampled.</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>From the sampled and visited facilities, the assessment team found out that the facilities were fenced and well maintained. The sampled facilities were; Naatabaabur (Kotido S/C), Nakirioni (Panyangara S/C), Masula (Nakapelimoru S/C), Nasinyon (Nakapelimoru S/C) and Nakinenes (Nakapelimoru S/C).</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	<p>The environment Officer revealed to the assessment team that there was no environmental screening carried out for the WSS facilities. Therefore no environmental screening reports were presented to the assessment team. This was as a result of limited funding and poor coordination between the department of Environment and water department.</p> <p>The environment officer revealed that the District water department had not been involving the environment office in the planning and implementation of WSS facilities.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1 	<p>There were no screening reports as per templates hence the assessment team could not verify whether there were any unacceptable environmental concerns that had not be addressed or any mitigation measures put in place.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	<p>There was no clause about Environmental protection and mitigation measures in the contract documents sampled. For instance construction of Renovation of block occupied by UWA offices Contract ref; KOTI528/Wrks/17-18/00015.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The district Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If at least 50% WSCs are women and at least one occupying a key position (chairperson, secretary or Treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements: score 3 	<p>Review of information contained in FORM 1 and the detailed formation of WSCs per water source revealed that at least 50% WSCs are women and at least one occupied a key position (chairperson, secretary or treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements. For instance out of 7 WSC members at Nataabaaabur 4 were women and chairperson and treasurer being women.</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/</p> <p>RGCs provided by the Water Department.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3 	<p>The District Water Department had not budgeted for any Sanitary facility since 2013. According to the DWO, there were issues with the O&M of the sanitary facilities with the community mishandling them. As a result, a decision was reached to prioritize water supply other than continued investment of money in sanitation facilities which were not helping the community.</p> <p>However no proof of any letter or meeting minutes was presented to the assessment team to effect the decision of prioritization of the water supply.</p>	<p>0</p>
--	--	---	----------