



Local Government Performance Assessment

Kumi Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 787)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	67%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	64%
Educational Performance Measures	87%
Health Performance Measures	71%
Water Performance Measures	0%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From MoFPED's inventory/schedule of LG submissions of performance contracts, check dates of submission and issuance of receipts and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If LG submitted before or by due date, then state 'compliant' o If LG had not submitted or submitted later than the due date, state 'non-compliant' • From the Uganda budget website: www.budget.go.ug, check and compare recorded date therein with date of LG submission to confirm. 	<p>Kumi Municipality was Compliant with the requirement to have submitted a Performance Contract to MoFPED by the 1st of August as per PFMAA and LG budget guidelines for the forth coming year. Evidence adduced by the Ag. Municipal Planner in form of a hard copy of the approved Performance Contract indicated that the report generation and submission date to MoFPED was 31st July 2018 (which was before the expiry of the deadline of 1st August 2018).</p> <p>The Report Status/Schedule generated at the MoFPED on the 28th of August 2018, also indicated that the Performance Contract was submitted on line of the 31st of August 2018.</p>	Yes
Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			

<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY by 30th June (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From MoFPED's inventory of LG budget submissions, check whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The LG budget is accompanied by a Procurement Plan or not. If a LG submission includes a Procurement Plan, the LG is compliant; otherwise it is not compliant. 	<p>Kumi municipality was Compliant with requirement as per LG PPDA Regulations, 2006, for submitting a Budget with a Procurement Plan by the 1st of August. The Budget together with the Procurement Plan were submitted and approved by MoFPED on the 31st of August 2108. Hard copies of the Budget and the Procurement Plan, duly acknowledged by the PS/ST and the Town Clerk were available in the Ag. Town Planner's office for review.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports</p>			
<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>Kumi Municipality was not Compliant with the Annual Performance Report submission date as per PFMA Act, 2015. The Annual Performance Report was submitted online on the 29th of August 2018, as reflected on the online submission date reflected on the hard copy of the Annual performance report available at the Ag. Planner's office (this was after the expiry of the deadline of 31st July 2018). The Schedule for the LG Report submission status that was generated at the MoFPED on the 28th of August 2018 did not reflect the submission date for Kumi Municipality. This was an indication that the report was submitted after 28th of August 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>Kumi Municipality was not Compliant with the Quarterly report submission dates as per PFMA Act, 2015. All the quarterly reports were submitted late as indicated below with the Quarter 4 report submitted after the deadline of 31st July 2018.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Q1 Report submitted on 20/12/17 (after Oct. Deadline) - Q2 Report submitted on 14/03/18 (after Jan deadline) - Q3 Report submitted on 18/08/18 (after the April deadline) - Q4 Report submitted on 29/08/18 (after the 31st July deadline). <p>The reasons cited by the Ag. Planner for the late submission included the late release of IPFs for the Q4 coupled with the challenges arising out of the newly introduced PBS system that included systems shut down and limited skills by the users in managing the system .</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Audit</p>			

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and the Auditor General's findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action in lines with applicable laws.</p>	<p>From MoFPED's Inventory/record of LG submissions of statements entitled "Actions to Address Internal Auditor General's findings",</p> <p>Check:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted a 'Response' (and provide details), then it is compliant • If LG did not submit a 'response', then it is non-compliant • If there is a response for all – LG is compliant • If there are partial or not all issues responded to – LG is not compliant. 	<p>Submission of the status of implementation of the Internal Auditor General's findings for the previous financial was done on April 10, 2018. The Municipal Council was thus complaint since the submission was done before the end of April 2018.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>The LG obtained a qualified audit opinion for the FY 2017/18 as per the report from the Auditor General.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a district/ municipality has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 1. 	<p>While the Physical Planner provided scanty evidence (in form of invitation letters to attend meetings of the Physical Planning Committee on various occasions) there was no evidence provided in form of appointment letters for the committee members, neither was there evidence in form of minutes of the committee meetings held during the FY 2017/18. Only one set of minutes for the meeting held on the 27/08/18 was available for review. Minutes of ONLY one meeting in a whole FY were not substantial enough to confirm that Kumi Municipality had a functional Physical Planning Committee during the FY under Review (2017/18)</p> <p>However, in August 2018, the Town Clerk appointed a new committee as per appointment letters issued on the 7/08/18, Ref. No. KMC/2014/16. The members include.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Physical Planner (Secretary) - The Town Clerk (Chairman) - Environment Officer - Lands Supervisor - Supervisor of works - Physical Planner in Private Practice - Architect in Private Practice <p>The performance of the newly constituted committee will be assessed during FY 2017/18.</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"> • Evidence that district/ MLG has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD score 1. 	<p>No minutes were shared with the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development. Only one meeting was held in the previous FY and the minutes were never shared with the Ministry of Lands Housing and Urban Development.</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"> • All infrastructure investments are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan: score 1 or else 0 	<p>The Municipality appraises and approves infrastructure investments in consistency with the available Physical Development Plan (approved on 20/06/2008) of the old Town Council. Examples of two approved plans were seen: One of a Commercial structure located at Plot 83, Ariko road and another one for a residential structure located at Plot 04 Circular road. The two investments were consistent with the existing Physical Plan of the Old Town Council.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action area plan prepared for the previous FY: score 1 or else 0 	<p>No Area Action Plans were developed during the previous FY due to limited financial allocation to the Physical Planning Unit.</p> <p>The Unit only received 26 million shillings out of which 18 million was for wages. Out of the balance of 8 million shillings, 6 million was supposed to be generated through local revenue- which was not realised- leaving a balance of ONLY 2 million for the unit's operations.</p> <p>There is need for the central government to allocate "special grants" to the DLGs to specifically fund activities related to the development of physical development plans (given that development of physical development plans requires substantial amounts of money) for the districts.</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>Evidence was provided by the Ag. Town Planner to confirm that priorities in the AWP for the current FY were a result of outcomes of the budget conference.</p> <p>Evidence adduced included a report of the Budget Conference that sat on the 13/11/2017. The report states the key priorities per sector on pages: 3 for the education sector and page 4 for the health sector. The key priorities included the construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Aterai Kabata Primary school, provision of 3 seater desks at Kelim and Otipé primary schools and procurement of a laptop for the education sector. Health priorities mainly included the construction of a water closet at the old market .</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If differences appear, a justification has to be provided and evidence provided that it was approved by the Council. Score 1. 	<p>The Capital Investments in the approved work plan (approved by Council on 31/05/18 as per minute no Cou35/2018/18), were consistent with those envisioned in the Five Year Plan.</p> <p>The capital investments outlined in the five year plan include:</p> <p>Education (pages 80-81 of the DDP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction of classroom blocks - Provision of furniture - Construction of 5 stance pit latrines - Construction of teachers' houses - Fencing of schools and sanitation facilities. <p>The current AWP states some of the investments on pages 25 and 26 of the AWP.</p> <p>Health (pages 79-80 of the DDP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Completion of Aterai HC III - Construction of a water borne toilet - Preparation of a land fill <p>The current work plan cites some of the investments on pages 20-21.</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>Project Profiles were developed and appended to the Five Year Development Plan as appendices on pages 126-163. In addition a file of Project Files was available at the Ag. Planner's office with copies of all Project profiles. The profiles were discussed during TPC of FY 2016/17 but not in FY 2017/18 because the projects had not changed hence the same profiles were still applicable.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual statistical abstract, with gender-disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum score 1. 	<p>Statistical Abstracts were not developed by the Ag. Municipal Planner due lack of skills in developing statistical Abstracts. The municipality contacted UBOS to give technical support to the Ag. Municipal Planner to develop abstracts to be used for FY 2019/20 planning cycle.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2 	<p>There was evidence adduced by the Ag. Planner to confirm that all investments implemented by the municipal council in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget that was approved by Council on the 30/05/2017 as per minute extract Cou 14/2016/17. The projects included: construction of 5 stance pit latrine at Aterai and Kabata primary schools, provision of 3 seater desks to Kelim and Otipe primary schools and the purchase of a lap top for the education office.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>Obtained the projects monitoring report and this was matched with payments as per the draft financial statements and noted that majority of the investment projects were completed as per work plan by the end of the financial year. All these projects had the retention fees outstanding. The projects include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Abata primary school by Roama (U) Ltd. that was started and completed save for the retention fees yet to be paid. 84% complete. 2. Construction of pit latrines at Aterai primary school by Roama (U) Ltd. that is pending retention and defects liability period. 84% complete. 3. Fencing of Municipal Land by OOF General Enterprises also pending retention and defects liability 94% complete 4. Construction of 5 stance pit latrine at Kelim primary school by Akibui Farmers (U) Ltd. 100% complete. <p>The completion of many of the projects is between 80-99% complete.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	<p>A review of information contained in the Annual budget performance report (as part of the Q4 report submitted to MoFPED and the Annual Final Accounts confirmed that the projects were completed within the approved budgets.</p> <p>Projects looked at were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Abata primary school by Roama (U) Ltd. that was started and completed save for the retention fees yet to be paid. 84% complete. Budget was shs. 17,500,000 and constructed at the budgeted amounts. Construction of pit latrines at Aterai primary school by Roama (U) Ltd. that is pending retention and defects liability period. 84% complete. Budget was shs. 17,500,000 and constructed at the budgeted amounts. Fencing of Municipal Land by OOF General Enterprises also pending retention and defects liability 94% complete. Budget was 24,470,620 and was constructed at the same cost. Construction of 5 stance pit latrine at Kelim primary school by Akibui Farmers (U) Ltd. 100% complete. Budget was shs. 18,727,150 and was constructed within the budget estimates. 	2
<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>There was no budget provision for O&M for the infrastructure projects implemented in the previous FY. Reasons given included:</p> <p>The infrastructure projects were newly constructed and it was not expected that they would require O&M within the first year. In addition, there was provision made for retention fees of the Contractors in case any defects arose before the expiry of the defects liability period.</p> <p>Secondly, minor issues Operations and Maintenance are taken care of the user communities of the projects. For example parents through their associations (SMC&PTA) take care of the minor repairs of the schools, and furniture while the users of the water borne toilets, through the LC system ensure minor operational and maintenance costs.</p>	0
Human Resource Management			

<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>According to the approved staff structure (approved under Council Minute No 16/2016/2017 and approved by MoPS on 18th Aug 2017; letter Ref. No. ARC 135/306/1), the Municipality has 8 departments.</p> <p>Of the 8 departments, only the education department is substantively filled. The department is headed by the Principal Education officer (Ikwap Robert), appointed on promotion as Principal Education Officer. Minute 59/2017 (a) (i) on 5th June 2017.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>All the HoDs were appraised in 2017/18 and copies of the staff appraisals seen on their files. Below is the presentation of the staff appraisal status:</p> <p>a) Ikwap Robert: Education; appraisal for 2017/18 signed by Town Clerk on 29/06/18</p> <p>b) Apolot Jane Frances: Production; appraisal for 2017/18 signed by Town Clerk on 03/07/18</p> <p>c) Angulo Ogala Charles: Finance; appraisal for 2017/18 signed by Town Clerk on 28/06/18</p> <p>d) Akiai Alice Epyanu: Health; appraisal for 2017/18 signed by Town Clerk on 01/07/18</p> <p>e) Oguttu George William: Works; appraisal for 2017/18 signed by Town Clerk on 3/07/18</p> <p>f) Eibu Vincent: Natural Resources; appraisal for 2017/18 signed by Town Clerk on 03/07/18</p> <p>Ainyo Grace: Community Based services; appraisal for 2017/18 signed by Town Clerk on 01/07/18</p> <p>The assessment team however noted that these officers had not submitted performance reports during the period under review yet it's mandatory that as vote controllers they are supposed to sign performance agreements at the beginning of the FY and performance reports at the end of the FY.</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 staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	<p>In 2017/18 FY, 16 Position were declared vacant realizing 48 vacant posts on 21st Nov 2017 Ref No: KMC 156/2. Additionally, 2 position were declared vacant for recruitment on 5th Jan 2018.</p> <p>The DSC met and considered all the declared vacant position (100%) during the meetings of:</p> <p>a) 3rd and 4th May 2018; Minute No: 32/2018 (handling submissions from Town Clerk)</p> <p>b) 5th, 6th, 7th, 9th, 12th and 13th, 14th, 15th,16th,20th,21st, 22nd,23rd, 24th, 27th, and 28th March 2018; Minute No: 21/2018 (i)</p> <p>c) 12th to 22nd February 2018; Minute No: 18/2018 (b)</p> <p>d) 6th June 2018; Minute No: 47/2018 (submissions from Town Clerk)</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>In 2017/18 the MC submitted 12 persons for confirmation to the DSC. All the 12 persons (100%) were confirmed during the meeting of 3rd and 4th May 2018; DSC minute No: 32/2018 (Handling of submissions from Town Clerk.</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>In 2017/18, there were no submissions to the DSC for disciplinary actions. All cases of indiscipline that arose were handled internally in the rewards and sanctions committee for example cases of absenteeism.</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>From the review of the updated staff list, it was found out that 47 new staff were recruited in 2017/18. These were appointed in two batches with the 1st batch being appointed on 1st March 2018 and the last batch on 1st June 2018. Below are the details of appointment and access to the payroll</p> <p>a) 1st batch: 8 new staff appointed on 1st March 2018 and accessed the pay roll in April 2018 within 2 months after appointment.</p> <p>b) 2nd batch: 38 new staff appointed on 1st June 2018 and accessed the payroll in June within 2 months after appointment. One staff accessed in September more than 2 months after appointment.</p> <p>From the above presentation it is evident that 98% of the new staff accessed the payroll within 2 months which does not score.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2 	<p>From the review of the pensioners list it was found out that none of them (0%) had accessed the pension payroll within 2 months after appointment. Below is a presentation of the status of 3 sampled staff in accessing the pension payroll.</p> <p>a) Ikara Margret: Due date of retirement; 20/9/2017, has not accessed the payroll the file is being processed at MoPS</p> <p>b) Obaja Ausman Matono: Due date of retirement 3/12/2017, accessed the payroll in June 2018</p> <p>c) Opolot Vincent: Due date of retirement 8/8/2017, has not accessed the file is being processed at MoPS</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Revenue Mobilization</p>			
<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets) from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10 %: score 4. If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 2. If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>Total of OSR for FY 2016/2017 was shs. 402,327,288</p> <p>Total of OSR for FY 2017/2018 was shs. 274,666,557</p> <p>The decrease in OSR revenue for the FY 2017/18 was shs. 127,860,731</p> <p>Percentage decrease was -.31.7 %</p> <p>The LG has a negative percentage increase in revenue generation arising out of using varying accounting principles in the recognition of income. The income for FY 2016/17 is purported to have been recorded on an accrual basis whereas that of FY 2017/18 was recorded on a cash basis. This is an inconsistency that must be addressed by the Municipal Council. The Municipal Council therefore does not score under this indicator.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within <p>+/- 10 %: then score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0.</p>	<p>Total local revenue planned/budgeted for FY 2017/2018 was shs. 725,471,000</p> <p>Total local revenue collected during the FY 2017/2018 was shs. 274,666,557</p> <p>The Municipal's revenue performance for the FY 2017/18 was therefore 37.8 %</p> <p>Since the performance is outside the +/-10% threshold the Municipal does not score under this indicator. It is however, noted that with the PBS in place the budget reported includes that of the lower local government yet on reporting its is only the revenues generated by the Municipal Council that is considered yet the lower local governments are not assessed at the same time.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	<p>Local revenue collections subjected to sharing with LLGs was shs.20,122,750 for FY 2017/18</p> <p>Amount of local revenue remitted to LLGs in FY 2017/18 was Zero shillings. The status of compliance is therefore zero percent. Since the Municipal did not remit the mandatory 50% of the share to LLG the Municipality does not score under this indicator.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the total Council expenditures on allowances and emoluments- (including from all sources) is not higher than 20% of the OSR collected in the previous FY: score 2 	<p>Total of OSR for the FY 2017/2018 was shs. 274,666,557</p> <p>Total expenditure on council allowances during the FY 2017/2018 was shs. 25,000,000</p> <p>Percentage of the council expenditures was thus 9.1%.. This is below the 20% threshold as per the indicator which implies that the Municipality receives full marks on the indicator.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2 	<p>The Municipality has a procurement officer (Omongot James) substantively appointed on probation on 1st March 2018 under DSC minute no: 18/2018 (b) (iii).</p> <p>However the Municipality does not score as the position of the procurement assistant is not filled.</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>TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee.</p> <p>For example</p> <p>(a) Technical evaluation Committee meeting was held 5/January /2018 (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002): Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Aterai P/S Lot 1</p> <p>Produced report 5/January /2018 submitted to contracts committee. The report</p> <p>Recommended that ROMA (U) Ltd be awarded contract at UGX 17,500, 000.</p> <p>(b) Technical evaluation Committee meeting was held 5/January /2018 (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002): Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Kabata P/S Lot 2</p> <p>Produced report 5/January /2018 submitted to contracts committee. The report</p> <p>Recommended that ROMA (U) Ltd be awarded contract at UGX 17,500, 000.</p> <p>(c) Technical evaluation Committee meeting was held 29/May/2018 (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002): Lot 3 Construction of a 3 stance a water closet with bath room Phase 1</p> <p>Produced report 29/May/2018 submitted to contracts committee. The report</p> <p>Recommended that Namaato Contractors Ltd be awarded contract at UGX 13,001, 600.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	<p>Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC.</p> <p>For example</p> <p>(a) (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002): Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Aterai P/S Lot 1)-Report of the contracts committee seating on 18/01/2018, minute no 6(d)//kmc/cc/01/2018 as per TEC recommendation, Contracts committee looked at the evaluation report and considered its recommendation that that ROMA (U) Ltd be awarded contract at UGX 17,500, 000.</p> <p>(b) (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002): Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Kabata P/S Lot 2)-Report of the contracts committee seating on 18/01/2018, minute no 6(e)//kmc/cc/01/2018 as per TEC recommendation, Contracts committee looked at the evaluation report and considered its recommendation that that ROMA (U) Ltd be awarded contract at UGX 17,500, 000.</p> <p>(c) (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002): Lot 3 Construction of a 3 stance a water closet with bath room Phase 1 Report of the contracts committee seating on 1/06/2018, minute no 6/kmc/cc/06/2018 as per TEC recommendation, Contracts committee looked at the evaluation report and considered its recommendation that that Namaato Contractors Ltd be awarded contract at UGX 13,001, 600</p>	<p>1</p>
---	---	---	----------

The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.

• 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

The procurement and Disposal Plan for 2018/2019 year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget. For example

- Construction of pit latrines and small structures (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2018-2019/00002) at UGX 71,000,000
- Construction of a classroom block at St Mathias Apuuton Primary school (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2018-2019/00001) at UGX 55,000,000.
- Rehabilitation of a classroom block at Otipe P/S (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2018-2019/00001) at UGX 30,000,000.
- Installation of solar street lights (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2018-2019/00003) at UGX 65,000,000.
- Construction of a 2-stance latrine at Odello food market (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2018-2019/00002) at UGX 9,136,581)

In FY 2017/2018 procurements were done as per plan in accordance with the procurement plan).

- Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Aterai P/S Lot 1) - (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002) at UGX 17,500,000.
- Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Kabata P/S Lot 2) (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002) at UGX 17,500,000
- Construction of a 3 stance a water closet with bath room Phase 1 (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002): Lot 3 at UGX 13,001,600
- Installation of solar lights at Mbale-Soroti Road, Ngora Road (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00003): Lot 3 at UGX 37,952,750.

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/ infrastructure by August 30: score 2 	<p>For FY 2018/2019, By August 30 2018, all bid documents for all investment/infrastructure were prepared above 80%. The Approval date was 25/June/2018 These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of pit latrines and small structures (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2018-2019/00002) at UGX 71,000,000 • Construction of a classroom block at St Mathias Apuuton Primary school (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2018-2019/00001) at UGX 55,000,000. • Rehabilitation of a classroom block at Otipe P/S (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2018-2019/00001) at UGX 30,000,000. • Installation of solar street lights (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2018-2019/00003) at UGX 65,000,000. • Construction of a 2-stance latrine at Odello food market (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2018-2019/00002) at UGX 9,136,581) 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2 	<p>For FY 2017/2018, contract register fully updated (2017-2018).such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Aterai P/S Lot 1) - (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002) at UGX 17,500,000. • Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Kabata P/S Lot 2) (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002) at UGX 17,500,000 • Construction of a 3 stance a water closet with bath room Phase 1 (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002): Lot 3 at UGX 13,001,600 • Installation of solar lights at Mbale-Soroti Road, Ngora Road (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00003): Lot 3 at UGX 37,952,750. 	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	<p>For FY 2017/2018, procurement thresholds were well adhered to. Example of sampled projects (All infrastructure projects were below 50 million and therefore selective bidding was used. The advert dated 2/01/2018 was put on the notice board and invitation letters were sent to all pre-qualified firms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Aterai P/S Lot 1) - (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002) (Selective bidding invitation letter dated 2/01/2018) • Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Kabata P/S Lot 2) (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002) (Selective bidding invitation letter dated 2/01/2018) • Construction of a 3 stance a water closet with bath room Phase 1 (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002): Lot 3 (Selective bidding invitation letter dated 2/01/2018) • Installation of solar lights at Mbale-Soroti Road, Ngora Road (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00003): Lot 3 (Selective bidding invitation letter dated 2/01/2018) 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2 	<p>Projects implemented in the FY 2017/18 were appropriately certified with interim and completion certificates as per technical supervision. For example Completion and interim certificates were available.</p> <p>For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Aterai P/S Lot 1) - (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002) Completion certificate dated 9/May/2018. • Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Kabata P/S Lot 2) (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002) Completion certificate dated 9/May/2018. • Construction of a 3 stance a water closet with bath room Phase 1 (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002): Lot 3 Interim certificate dated 19/June/2018. • Installation of solar lights at Mbale-Soroti Road, Ngora Road (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00003): Lot 3 completion certificate dated 12/4/2018 	<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 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>The FY 2018/2019 project site boards for all projects are not yet erected available but even the ones that were erected previous financial year are not clearly labelled. They miss information on contract value and expected duration.</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 Municipality had challenges in performing the bank reconciliations. This was mainly attributed to the wrong configuration of the system in place that the Municipality and MoFPED were trying to rectify at the time of the assessment. There being no evidence of up-to-date bank reconciliations the Municipality does not score under this indicator.</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>Reviewed payment Voucher No.16151539 dated 15/12/2017 which was for payment for production and printing of 7 sign posts reading Kumi Municipal Council. The request for payment by the service provider "Neco Enterprises Limited" was dated 13/09/2017 and the town clerk forwarded it for payment on 15/09/2017. Payment was done on 15/12/2017.</p> <p>Reviewed request for payment dated 29/03/2018 from U best (U) Ltd for supply of road machines at Kumi Municipal council whose payment was done on 09/04/2018</p> <p>Reviewed request for payment by Roama Uganda Limited for the construction of the 5 stances lined pit latrine at Aterai PS that was presented for payment on 30/05/20 and recommended for payment by the Municipal education officer on 31/05/2018. Payment was authorized on 04/06/2018 and was done on 19/06/2018 As per payment voucher 18257160.</p> <p>Request for payment was submitted by Nyabutai Uganda Limited on 21/11/2017 for the retention for the construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrines at Kumi PS. This was recommended for payment on 19/12/2017. Payment was done on 26/03/2018 via voucher 17282006 and was approved on 10/01/2018</p> <p>Request for payment submitted by Manjiya Boys (U) Ltd. was prepared and submitted on 22/01/2018 for retention of construction and engraving of stance pit latrine at Boma North PS was recommended for payment by the Municipal education officer on 08/2/2018. Payment was done on 26/03/2018 under voucher 17282008</p> <p>From the above, it is evident that the bills are settled within time. The Municipality scores the mark under this indicator.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor: 1 point. • LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2. 	<p>Ms. Achom Stella was appointed as the internal auditor as per Minute No. 54/2017 (I) of the Kumi District Service Commission in a letter dated 1/06/2017 and referenced KMC. 156/2 and signed off by the Ag. Town Clerk Mahab Malik. There is therefore a substantive internal auditor.</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>	<p>• LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Date issued</th> <th>Reference</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Quarter 1</td> <td>27/10/2017</td> <td>KMC.252/2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Quarter 2</td> <td>20/02/2018</td> <td>KMC.252/2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Quarter 3</td> <td>28/04/2018</td> <td>KMC.252/2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Quarter 4</td> <td>08/08/2018</td> <td>KMC.252/2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Quarter 1 was issued on 27/10/2017 and was sent to the speaker Kumi Municipal Council who received it on 01/12/2017, MoLG received it on 17/11/2017 and the Mayor received it on 1/12/2017. The Directorate of Internal Audit MoFPED received it on 20/11/2017.</p> <p>Quarter 2 report was issued on 20/02/2018 and was circulated to the Municipal Council on 07/03/2018, Deputy Mayor on 07/03/2018, Central Registry on 05/03/2018, Directorate of Internal Audit MoFPED on 2/03/2018 and MoLG on the same date as MoFPED</p> <p>Quarter 3 was prepared on 28/04/2018, Delivered to MoLG, Directorate of Audit MoFPED on 18/06/2018, delivered to central Registry on 07/06/2018</p> <p>Quarter 4 was prepared on 08/08/2018 and was distributed to Central Registry on 15/08/2018, Mayor 14/08/2018, Directorate of Internal Audit MoFPED on 09/08/2018</p>	Quarter	Date issued	Reference	Quarter 1	27/10/2017	KMC.252/2	Quarter 2	20/02/2018	KMC.252/2	Quarter 3	28/04/2018	KMC.252/2	Quarter 4	08/08/2018	KMC.252/2	2
Quarter	Date issued	Reference																
Quarter 1	27/10/2017	KMC.252/2																
Quarter 2	20/02/2018	KMC.252/2																
Quarter 3	28/04/2018	KMC.252/2																
Quarter 4	08/08/2018	KMC.252/2																
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports: score 2.</p>	<p>There is no evidence that the LG has provided information to the Municipal Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of audit findings.</p>	0															

<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>Reviewed the forwarding letter dated 29/06/2018 referenced COU 214/4 to the Mayor from the Secretary LG PAC where they were submitting the PAC report on 3rd Quarter findings from the Internal Auditor. Various recommendations were done.</p> <p>Letter dated 27/04/2018 referenced COU 214/4 to the mayor from Secretary LG PAC in which internal audit findings for the 2nd quarter were reviewed and PAC made its recommendations.</p> <p>Letter dated 23/01/2018 to the Mayor from Secretary LG PAC in which the audit findings were reviewed and PAC recommendations were done.</p> <p>In all case above there is no evidence by way of a letter from the Town Clerk on the status of implementation of the PAC recommendations.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG maintains an up- dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	<p>Reviewed the assets register although maintained in a manual book. There recording of the assets register is in line with the provision in the manual.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unqualified audit opinion: score 4 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0 	<p>From the Auditor General's report the LG obtained a qualified opinion implying that it scores 2.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2 	<p>Evidence was adduced by Ag. Municipal Planner to confirm that Council meets and discusses service delivery issues including monitoring reports and LG PAC among other issues.</p> <p>A set of 6 minutes of Council meetings were presented to the Assessor indicating that the council met 6 times during the FY as follows:</p> <p>Meeting of the 08/08/2017. Discussed and approved the Procurement plan as well as the Recruitment Plan as per minute extract number Cou 04/2017/18- Recruitment Plan- and Minute number Cou 05/2017/18 for the Recruitment Plan.</p> <p>Meeting of 15/12/2017- Received and discussed the executive committee report and was also addressed by the Mayor of Kumi Municipal Council.</p> <p>Meeting of 20/12/2017: Discussed reports of the Standing Committees as per minute number Cou 13/2017/18. Education issues included; need to seek clearance from MoPs to recruit more education staff, need to intensify monitoring schools by the education office and the political leaders in order to identify gaps that may require more technical support for improved performance, need to pass bylaws for school feeding programs, need for private schools to meet Ministry of education standards and requirements, need for teachers to pursue further studies to improve on their knowledge and skills. Health issues included; concern about the late release of PHC funds that affected timely implementation of planned activities, drug stock outs and the need for the health facilities and DHO to make request for drugs from NMS well in time, lack of an Operating Theatre at Kumi HC IV and lack of running water at health facilities.</p> <p>Water issues included shortage of water at the motorised boreholes especially during the dry season, need to collect data about all water sources within the municipality, need for communities to embrace the support from Habitat rather than resisting it.</p> <p>Meeting of 29/03/2017/18 mainly handled the laying of the budget for 2018/19 as per minute number Cou 32/2017/18.</p> <p>Meeting of the 31/05/2017: reviewed and approved the work plans and budgets for 2018/19 as per minute number Cou 35/2017/18.</p>
---	---	--

<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 1. 	<p>Kumi municipality has a designated person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints from the citizens.</p> <p>The Town Clerk appointed the Probation and Welfare Officer to also act as the Communications Officer (as per appointment letter dated 08/05/18 Ref. KMC 153/2) to handle among other responsibilities issues of communication in order to enhance accountability and Transparency.</p> <p>Complaints and grievances for the residents of the municipality are presented to the Communications Officer who registers all verbal complaints in the Complaints Register, clearly indicating the Complainant; date and nature of complaint. Documented complaints however, are mostly addressed to the Town Clerk who then forwards the complaints to the Communications Officer to take appropriate action. The documented complaints are filed in the file for Complaints and Grievances seen at the office of the Communications Officer.</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>Complaints and grievances for the residents of the municipality are presented to the Communications Officer who registers all verbal complaints in the Complaints Register, clearly indicating the Complainant; date and nature of complaint. Documented complaints however, are mostly addressed to the Town Clerk who then forwards the complaints to the Communications Officer to take appropriate action. The documented complaints are filed in the file for Complaints and Grievances seen at the office of the Communications Officer.</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>There was evidence to confirm that the municipality published the LG pay roll and pensioner registers. The September Payroll was displayed at the notice board by the entrance of the main office block. Pension register was also displayed on the public notice board with only one staff indicated.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1. 	<p>The Detailed Procurement Plan was pinned at the notice board (and a copy also available at the procurement office) by the entrance to the main office block while Notices of the Best Evaluated Bids were clearly displayed at the main notice board outside the main office block. The Best Evaluated Bids capture information including, the date when the bid notice was made, subject of procurement, method of procurement, name of provider and total contract price.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1. 	<p>Some evidence was provided by the Ag. Municipal Planner to confirm that the LG assessment results and implications were at least discussed and disseminated to the lower level local governments. The evidence adduced included:</p> <p>A report of the Extra Ordinary TPC meeting that was convened by the Town Clerk on the 30th of July 2018, and was purposely convened to discuss the performance assessment results, implications of the results and strategies for improved performance in the future.. According to the Ag. Planner, during the meeting, the heads of departments were given hard copies of the summarised synthesis report and were urged to discuss the results with their staff and also discuss areas of improvement for future performance. The national assessment results were also pinned on the notice board.</p> <p>The results however, were not published on the budget website as it often down.</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>Evidence was provided to confirm that the municipality communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level during the previous year.</p> <p>According to the Ag. Municipal Planner, the major mode of dissemination was through the provision of hard copies of the relevant documents to all heads of departments and division heads. Secondly, copies of the documents were also displayed on public notice boards (at the time of the assessment, the first Budget call Circular had already been displayed at the public notice board at the entrance of the main office block).</p> <p>Guidelines for BFP and PBS were also discussed at the TPC meeting that was convened on the 3/07/2017 as per minute extract TPC, Min. 24/2017/18 and as per min. 25/2017/18-BFP-26/2017/18.</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>There was no evidence provided to Assessor at the time of the assessment to confirm that discussions were held at Barazas or radio programmes to provide feedback about the status of activity implementation.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG gender focal person and CDO have provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion into their activities score 2. 	<p>Guidance has been provided by gender focal point person to departments regarding how to mainstream gender. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report (Ref Date:,3 October, 2017) CAPACITY BUILDING GENDER MAIN STREAMING FOR ALL HEADS OF DEPARTMENT AND OTHER STAKEHOLDER (TPC.Min. 24/2017/18). Held at Municipal Council Board Room. • Provided guidance to schools to include senior women and men at Kumi Township P/S. • The training was conducted on gender main streaming in the community centre with attendance from all the division (Report dated 29/11/2017). • Annual Report 2017-2018 captures all Gender related activities that were accomplished. 	<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>In FY 2018/19 Gender focal point person and CDO have planned activities (work plan) (Vote 787 Kumi Municipal Council). These include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender Main streaming • children and youth services, • community based services and • support to disabled and elderly, representation on Women councils. • probation and welfare support • operation of community based services Department. • UWEP Projects supported in 2 divisions. <p>In FY 2017/18 over 90% of the planned activities on gender activities/vulnerability/social inclusion well implemented e.g</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% achievement was registered as was planned. Departments were helped on how to conduct culture mainstreaming, use data for planning, mentoring of departments on gender main streaming, facilitating youth council meetings, supporting people with disabilities, dissemination of gender aggregated data, conducting radio talk shows (UWEP activities). 	<p>2</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 1 	<p>Environmental screening and EIA are carried out for activities and projects are planned and budgeted for in respective BOQs for specific projects in each department depending on the department e.g Education (Voucher number 051 indicates money drawn from the budget as planned for conducting environmental screening school projects. For example.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Aterai P/S Lot 1) - (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002) screening done 2/05/2018. • Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Kabata P/S Lot 2) (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002) screening done 2/05/2018. • Installation of solar street lights (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2018-2019/00003) screening done on 10/April/ 2018 • Construction of a 2-stance latrine at Odello food market (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2018-2019/00002) screening done 17/June/ 2018 	<p>1</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	<p>Environmental and social management and health and safety plans are integrated and appended on the bid documents are contracts agreements for example: for example bid documents reviewed, they contain the clause on environmental management and health and safety plans (They are well captured in the BOQs in the contract and bid documents).</p> <p>For example contract for the projects below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of pit latrines and small structures (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2018-2019/00002) • Construction of a classroom block at St Mathias Apuuton Primary school (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2018-2019/00001). • Rehabilitation of a classroom block at Otipe P/S (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2018-2019/00001) • Installation of solar street lights (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2018-2019/00003) • Construction of a 2-stance latrine at Odello food market (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2018-2019/00002) 	<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 projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1 	<p>At the time of assessment, there no evidence of land ownership. The municipality has no Land tittle and other areas where projects were, there was no proof of land ownership.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO: score 1 	<p>All completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Kabata P/S Lot 2) (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002) certification form completed and signed 13/June/ 2018 • Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Aterai P/S Lot 1) - (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002) certification form completed and signed 13/June/ 2018 • Installation of solar street lights (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2018-2019/00003) certification completed and signed 9th /April/ 2018. <p>Mitigation Certification Forms completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance (new one): Score 1 	<p>The contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance. Clearance is done after inspection of contracts committee and based on the report of this committee dated 05/06/2018, environmental and social clearance dated 08/05/2018. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Kabata P/S Lot 2) (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002) • Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Aterai P/S Lot 1) - (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002) 	<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 environmental officer and CDO monthly report, includes a) completed checklists, b) deviations observed with pictures, c) corrective actions taken. Score: 1 	<p>Monthly reports were well prepared by the Environmental Officer and CDO (Reports dated 4/05/2018, 5/06/2018). The checklists are completed. There were no deviations observed as per pictures with pictures (c) corrective actions taken.</p> <p>Reports covered all the completed projects such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Kabata P/S Lot 2) (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002) • Construction of 5- stance pit latrine at Aterai P/S Lot 1) - (Ref; KUMC 787/WRKS/2017-2018/00002) 	<p>1</p>
---	--	---	----------

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>The LG education de- partment has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• 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>	<p>The LG, Kumi MCi Education department budgeted for the head teacher and the minimum 7 classroom teachers in the Performance Contract FY 2018/2019 (Vote 787, Work plan 6), dated 31/7/18 indicates budgeting for head teachers and teachers. Example: A list of 16 primary schools, a list of 249 teachers including Head teachers.</p>	4
<p>The LG education de- partment has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• 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>	<p>As per teachers list, the Municipal council deployment is done accordingly ascertained with H/R payroll, 249 teachers and 4 teachers' vacancies advertised. Also to show deployment, in the sampled schools, example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Otiye P/S has a head teacher and 17 teachers. -Wiggins P/S has 18 teachers including the head teacher. -Kumi Town ship P/S has 20 teachers including the head teacher. -Boma North P/S has 14 teachers including the head teacher. 	4

<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision o If 100%: score 6 o If 80 - 99%: score 3 o If below 80%: score 0 	<p>According to Kumi Municipal Council approved structure as per MEO's proposed work plan to the H/R dated 16/5/18 structure for primary teachers is filled with a wage bill provision. The wage bill provision is for 249 teachers.</p> <p>Teachers proposed by office of the MEO was 253, the wage bill provision is 249 placements filled is 247 as a result of retirements, death and transfers of service which is 98%</p> <p>Meanwhile the district has advertised and short listed for the short fall of 4.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	<p>The Municipal council approved structure (Approved establishment of the council, as per P/S of the Public Service Ministry dated 18/8/17 of ref; ARC 135/306/01. The HRM staff registers and the PBS has the 253 teachers</p>	<p>6</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary Teachers: score 2 	<p>The MEO has accordingly submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the FY 2018/2019 on.16/5/18 Education Department proposed Primary Teachers positions to be filled to the tune of 253 of them .</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Inspectors: score 2 	<p>The MEO has accordingly submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the FY 2018/2019 on.16/5/18 Education Department proposed Positions of school inspectors to be filled are 2.</p>	<p>2</p>
--	---	---	----------

Monitoring and Inspection

<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% school inspectors: score 3 	<p>The District has only one Inspector of schools (Atai Stella); the officer was appraised 30/06/2018 by Principal Education officer.</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 o 90 - 100%: score 3 o 70% and 89%: score 2 o Below 70%: score 0 	<p>The District has 16 government aided primary schools. Review of the 16 head teacher’s files revealed that they were all appraised in 2017 calendar year; performance reports to evidence this finding were seen. Below is a presentation of the appraisal status of 5 of the 16 head teachers.</p> <p>a) Okion Augustine: Kelim PS; performance report signed by SAS 2/1/2018</p> <p>b) Akol perpetua: Aterai PS; performance report signed by SAS 22/12/2017</p> <p>c) Akweny Eunice: Olunga PS; performance report signed by SAS 22/12/2017</p> <p>d) Alungat Hellen: Okouba PS; performance report signed by SAS 20/12/2017</p> <p>e) Ilemungolet Jane: Omulokonyo PS; performance report signed by SAS 5/1/2018</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<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>All guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the FY 2017/2018 were communicated to schools. For example on 26/3/18 a letter by PS MoES about enforcing closure of illegal schools, and construction of 84 more facilitation in 27 schools on 2/8/18.</p> <p>The head teachers’ meeting dated 29/1/18 education policies and guidelines and on 1/6/18 about school inspection</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 2 	<p>A number of meetings were held with head teachers of primary schools on different dates to elaborate and sensitize on the matters regarding illegal schools closure on 26/3/18 and on 1/6/18 on school supervision as guided by the MOES</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all registered primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <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>All individual government schools 16 reports as at 12/10/17 inspected by Associate Assessors. Also on 22/1/18 inspection of Kumi Christian Visionary School.</p> <p>Eagles P/S inspection report by an inspector on 17/11/17.</p> <p>A report for quarter 2 by a Municipal Inspector dated 17/1/18.</p> <p>Quarter 4 report by inspector of schools on 4/8/18.</p> <p>Term 2 inspection report by inspector of schools on 2/10/17. and E- Inspection report as generated by the DES from the tablet as used and sent by the inspectors on 11/8/18.</p> <p>All the 16 primary schools were inspected, and the sampled schools;</p> <p>-Otiye P/S inspected six times by the CCT, Associate Assessors on 30/8/17,7/9/17, 28/5/18, 5/7/18, 31/7/18 and 25/5/18.</p> <p>-Wiggins P/S inspected four times on 31/8/17, 20/6/17, 12/4/18, 12/6/18.</p> <p>-Kumi Town ship P/S inspected six times by PEO, Education Officer, Inspectors, and Sports Officer on 18/9/17, 25/9/17, 12/8/17, 26/4/18, 7/8/18, 15/8/18.</p> <p>-Boma North P/S was inspected six times on 12/10/17, 8/2/18, 28/5/18, 13/3/18 and 4/4/18 by MEO, CCT, Sports Officer and Inspectors.</p>	<p>12</p>

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	<p>The education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations.</p> <p>For example Minutes of department meetings of inspection reports on 4/6/18 where absentees of teachers and pupils, poor sanitation, time keeping problems in teachers and pupils.</p> <p>Meeting on 30/1/18 where seating facilities, asset registers, support supervision and feeding program.</p> <p>On 17/7/17 in a department meeting absenteeism, lesson planning, feeding program, H/T and SMC meetings recommendations were discussed and a meeting on 10/4/18.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 	<p>The Municipal Education department submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports through e- inspection as used by the tablet, dated 11/8/18.</p> <p>DES acknowledgement on 21/12/17 and reports for quarters 1, 2, and 3 as submitted by the MIS on 11/7/18.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed- up: score 4. 	<p>Inspection recommendations are followed-up. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Meeting of the SMC and PTA on 21/11/17 at Bazaar P/S to enforce the feeding program as per MIN. 6/SMC/PTA/11/2017. SMC and PTA meeting on 4/12/17 at Kumi Girls on performance improvement with awards to teachers for good results, Min; 7/12/2017. MEO letters to Akite Grace on absenteeism on 8/9/17, to Akurut Sarah on 6/11/17, to Ecodu Fredrick 7/11/17 and on Oenen Rose on 13/11/17. MEO letter to town clerk for action on seating facilities and latrines at Otipe, Kelim, Kabato with Aterai P/S receiving latrines on 20/6/18. 	<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>Data submitted was accurate and consistent</p> <p>For example performance contract FY 2018/2019 dated 31/7/18 provides the list of schools of 16 which are consistent with PBS report as reviewed by the assessor. The MoES has confirmed it dint issue forms of EMIS.</p>	<p>5</p>

<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS: score 5 	<p>Enrolment data submitted for all schools in place with 12,565 pupils as per list and was consistent with PBS data.</p>	<p>5</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>Evidence was provided to confirm that the Council Committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues, inspection, LG PAC among other issues.</p> <p>Evidence was adduced in form of minutes of meetings of the education committee which were convened as follows:</p> <p>Meeting of 16/11/2017 that mainly discussed the need to have the Municipal Land fenced off , including fencing of all schools in the municipality. Ref.Min number 08/MEC/2017/18.</p> <p>Meeting of the 12/10/ 2017 that discussed the achievements, challenges and constraints of the education sectors as per minute number 03/MEC/2017/18. Issues included the need to increase staffing levels in the education sector, need for the government to ensure timely transfer of the conditional grants to enable timely implementation of activities, completion of construction of two classrooms at Baaza and Wigen primary schools, need to ensure that all teachers access the payroll, need for head teachers to conduct peer support supervision exercises.</p>	<p>2</p>
--	---	--	----------

<p>The LG committee re- sponsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>Education issues for approval by Council were mainly tabled during the meeting of the 20/12/2017. The key issues resolved included but were limited to : the need to seek clearance from MoPs to recruit more education staff, need to intensify monitoring schools by the education office and the political leaders in order to identify gaps that may require more technical support for improved performance, need to pass bylaws for school feeding programs, need for private schools to meet Ministry of Education standards and requirements, need for teachers to pursue further studies to improve on their knowledge and skills.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (estab- lished, 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>All the 16 primary schools in Kumi Municipal Council have functional SMCs; the office of the MEO has a record of submitted minutes of SMC meetings as submitted by the schools. These SMCs meet regularly and keep minutes. For example as sampled ,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Kumi Town ship P/S has 13 members including 4 female and held meetings on the 26/9/17, 28/6/18 and 20/9/18 where they discussed budget, induction of SMCs and UNRA compensation among other issues. -Wiggins P/S has 13 members including 4 female. They also held meetings on school achievements, challenges and reaction, a Kitchen Project Proposal for submission to IDI, a development partner and hand over meetings for old to new SMCs on 20/9/17, 28/2/18 and 9/7/18. -Otipe P/S has 13 members including 3 female and held meetings on 10/8/17, 17/7/18 and 14/8/18, sanitation, performance improvement of upper primary and the budget were some issues discussed. -Boma North P/S has 13 members including 6 female. Meetings were held on 27/9/17, 23/6/18 and 20/8/18 where a Development plan, Budget for UPE finance and Budget approval. 	<p>5</p>

<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non- wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	<p>All schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants were posted on public notice boards at the main notice board and Education Department notice board.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The LG Education department has submitted input into the LG procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to the Procurement Unit that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	<p>Education Department Submissions of the procurement in put including for Desks, Construction of 5 stance VIP latrines at Kumi Town ship P/S, Omolokonyo P/S, and Bazaar P/S.</p> <p>Construction of 2 stance VIP latrines at Kumi boys P/S.</p> <p>Construction of one classroom block with a store and office at ST. Mathias Apuuton P/S. These are some of the projects as submitted on 30/5/18. However the procurement plan was submitted later than 30/4/18.</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>Reviewed a couple of vouchers and the attendant request for payment and ascertained that the DEO timely certified and recommended the requests for payment. These included:</p> <p>1- Request for payment dated 30/05/2018 from Roama Uganda Limited for the 5 stances lined pit latrine at Kabata PS was recommended for payment by the municipal education officer on 31/05/2018 the payment was approved on 04/06/2018 and payment was done on 19/06/2018 as per PV18257160.</p> <p>2-Request for payment by Roama Uganda Limited for the construction of the 5 stances lined pit latrine at Aterai PS was presented for payment on 30/05/20 and recommended for payment by the Municipal education officer on 31/05/2018. Payment was authorised on 04/06/2018 and was done on</p>	<p>3</p>

19/06/2018 As per payment voucher 18257160.

3- Request submitted by Nyabutai Uganda Limited on 21/11/2017 for the retention for the construction of 5 stance lined pit latrines at Kumi PS was recommended for payment on 19/12/2017. Payment was done on 26/03/2018 vide voucher 17282006 and was approved on 10/01/2018

4-Request for payment submitted by Manjiya Boys (U) Ltd. prepared on 22/01/2018 for retention of construction and engraving of stance pit latrine at Boma North PS was recommended for payment by the Municipal education officer on 08/2/2018. Payment was done on 26/03/2018 under voucher 17282008

5- Request for payment submitted by Kumi Workers Enterprises Ltd for the construction of 5 stance pit latrine at Kumi PS dated 21/11//2017 was recommended by the Municipal Education officer on 19/12/2017. Payment was done on 02/02/2018 per voucher 16638568 after approvals for payment on 10/01/2018. The LPO shows that it was approved on 24/01//2018 yet the request for payment was done on 21/11/2017

6- Request made by Pajodesa (U) Ltd for the construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Aputon PS was recommended for payment by the Municipal Education Officer on 19/12/2017 Payment was done on 08/02/2018 via voucher no. 16656870 and approval for payment was done on 10/01/2018.

7- Request by Akibui Farmers limited for the construction of a 5 stance lined VIP latrine at Kelm PS was submitted on 1/02/2018 and recommended for payment on 8/2/2018. Payment was done as per voucher dated 26/03/2018 and voucher 17282010. The LPO was however, signed on 20/03/2018 and 21/03/ 2018 yet the request was dated 1/02/2018 and recommendation for payment was done on 06/02/2018.

<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15th of July for consolidation: score 4 	<p>The Ag. District planner could not provide evidence to confirm that the education sector submitted quarterly reports in time to the Planning Unit to enable the planners develop a consolidated plan. It was also not possible to ascertain whether the Q4 report for the education sector was submitted before the 15th of July to the Planner for consolidation (the PBS system does not provide for retrieval of submission dates by the department and neither the Planner nor the Education officer had copies of the education sector Q4 reports). However, the consolidated quarter 4 report was available in the Town Planner's office.</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>Reviewed a correspondence dated 07/08/2018 from Ms. Atai Stella, Municipal Inspector of Schools to the Town Clerk Kumi Municipality stating the status of implementation of the quarter 4 internal audit issues. Two items were identified regarding submission of PLE results and inadequate accountability. Both issues were disposed of.</p>	<p>2</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>At the time of assessment, there was evidence that education department has disseminated guidelines on gender, environment charging the head teachers on all these issues including how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills. H/Ts meeting on the 18/11/17. and training of Snr. women at Kumi Diocese on managing adolescence of girls and managing sanitation on 25/7/18.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2 	<p>The education department and gender focal person issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools.</p> <p>Training of Snr. women at Kumi Diocese on managing adolescence of girls and managing sanitation on 25/7/18.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	<p>The School Management Committees meet the guidelines on gender composition. All schools sampled have two or more female members on their SMC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Kumi Town ship P/S has 13 members including 4 female. -Wiggins P/S has 13 members including 4 female. -Otiye P/S has 13 members including 3 female. -Boma North P/S has 13 members including 6 female. <p>Appointment letters issued by the PEO on 11/6/18 to all schools.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide- lines on environmental management are dissemi- nated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 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>The Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education). Guidelines issued in H/Ts meeting on 7/9/17 and in the school report at the AGM held on 9/2/18.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide- lines on environmental management are dissemi- nated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all school infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 1 	<p>Screening forms signed by Environmental Officer and the CDO were available for all school infrastructure projects, such as the proposed project of construction and engraving of a 5 stance at the Aterai P/S , Kabata P/S all signed on 23/4/18.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide- lines on environmental management are dissemi- nated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1 	<p>The Environmental Officer and Community Development Officer visited the sites to check whether the mitigation plans are complied with reports as above dated 30/4/18 for both Kabata and Aterai primary schools.</p>	<p>1</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health care workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health care with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 80% filled: score 8 • 60 – 80% - score 4 • Less than 60% filled: score 0 	<p>The Kumi MC HD had substantively recruited 90.7% of the required PHC workers – see table:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The fully substantively recruited were 49 i.e. according to the HD’s staffing and deployment lists. 2. The staffing norm was estimated at 54 PHC workers going by the MC’s HD records. 3. The Kumi MC HD’s Staffing Norm for the HWs was 54 but only 49 of the PHC workers had been filled at the time of the assessment. 4. The HD offered evidence of attempts made to fill more than 5 vacancies through ads. Those the HD attempted to recruit but failed to attract can be seen from the 2 advertisements one in The New Vision 23rd/4/2015 (page 44) and the other in The Daily Monitor 13th/1/2017 (page 41). Other efforts includes TC’s letter (23rd/12/2016) to DSC (submission paper no. 1/2016). 5. The approved health sector staffing structure is based on PS/MoPS Transmittal Letter to CAO dated 18th/8/2017 Ref: ARC/135/306/01 adoption of the staff structure and establishment for Kumi MC for the FY 2017/18. 6. The above means that the total effort works to 54 out of the 54 (100% i.e. the numerator is 54 divided by the denominator of 54 multiply by 100) – see table. 7. The MC had IPFs with a PHC wage bill provision for 54 amounting to UGX 831,562,000 for the FY 2018/19, this was meant to cater for 54 according to the PBS records on staffing levels. <p>ID Type of HF No. Norm Filled Vacant</p> <p>1 MHO 1 6 4 2</p> <p>2 Hospital - - - -</p> <p>3 HC IV 1 48 45 3</p> <p>4 HC III - - - -</p> <p>5 HC II - - - -</p> <p>Total 2 54 49 5</p>	<p>8</p>

<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>From a review of the PBS records, there was no evidence that Kumi MC's HD submitted a comprehensive staff recruitment plan/request to HRM that covered 11 PHC workers (see table):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The HD's Recruitment Plan FY 2018/19 was not captured in (and so could not be extracted from) the PBS (Staff Establishment and Recruitment 2018/19 records. 2. The official (signed and stamped) MHO's submission letter to TC copied to HRM (dated 23rd/5/2017) of the Recruitment Plan for the FY 2018/19 advocated for filling the remaining vacancies of 11 (5 and 6 other) PHC HWs (i.e. 2 at MHO level and 9 at HC IV level). 	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital In-charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0 	<p>The Municipal Council has only one Health Unit; Kumi Health Centre IV. The in-charge of this health facility (Awor Rhoda) was appraised on 3/7/2016 by the Principal Health Inspector.</p>	<p>8</p>

<p>The Local Government Health department has deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY, and if not provided justification for deviations: score 4 	<p>The HD and HF records on deployment were only marginally comparable. According to the HD records, the deployed HWs for Kumi HC IV were in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with budget in FY 2018/19. However, on closer scrutiny, the HD and HF records on deployment levels were somewhat different. The minor discrepancies or inconsistencies were evident when it came to what the HD and HF levels documented as the filled HF positions (see table):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For some HFs the staff deployment was not in accordance with the positions as seen in HD's official records. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> For Kumi HC IV, the HD records indicated that it had 45 staff yet the HF's records showed 43 fully-filled portfolios. The Municipal planner showed at excel sheet that the indicated that the figure was 41. For the differences, these were often attributed to inclusion of staff that absconded from official duty, those that went on study leave without authorization, some promoted and others applying for leave without pay, et cetera. <p>ID</p> <p>HF's Deployed HWs FY 2017/18</p> <p>Norm</p> <p>HF Records HD Records MC Planner</p> <p>1 Kumi HC IV 43 45 41 48</p>	<p>0</p>
--	---	--	----------

<p>Monitoring and Supervision</p>			
<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/ MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 	<p>There was mixed evidence from the sampled HFs that the MHO/HD was effective when it came to communicating all the circulars, guidelines and policies issued by the national level for the FY 2017/18 (see table). There was only evidence that the sampled HFs had access to some assorted circulars, guidelines and policies from the national level (i.e. did not receive all or 100% of those issued). Indeed, there were both apparent and reported challenges in the mode of communication and documentation between and within the HD and HFs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> As signals for commitment towards "effective communication" and investment into efforts towards supporting CME, more systematic records of those received and those distributed would be necessary. Even going by their own 	<p>0</p>

records alone, there was no documented evidence that the MHO had communicated all the circulars, guidelines and policies received from the center (i.e. in the spirit of ensuring “effective communication” and promoting CME).

2. The records suggested that they distributed (i.e. 14) far more than CG is purported to have issued (i.e. 9). The records also suggested that Kumi HC IV had received (i.e. 12) far more than the HD had received from the center (i.e. 9).
3. At a HD level, it was difficult to retrieve official information with respect to the total number of circulars, guidelines and policies received by the HD in the FY 2017/18 or even an official record of those they were able to dispatch/ distribute to HFs. This was attributed to weak documentation system of Incoming and outgoing communications (e.g. through logbooks or registers), which made it difficult to secure more systematic records of those got and those sent. Again, it was even harder to retrieve information with respect to what circulars, guidelines and policies the HD had sent in FY 2017/18 (i.e. a complete record of what they were). Incoming communication and usage logbooks would be the most systematic way by which to achieve effective record keeping but one that required intervention. As a result, the HD’s rough records indicated that it had gotten in the region of 9 circulars, guidelines and policies altogether but the number received by the HF was 12.
4. At a HF level, while it was often difficult for the HF to establish when exactly they had received what circular, guideline or policy, on the whole the sampled HF possessed an average of (only) 12 circulars, guidelines or policies issued in the FY 2017/18 (see table). When you compare with the HD’s rough records, it is clear that the HD distributed in the region of 14 circulars, guidelines and policies altogether. The fact that the HF about 12 circulars, guidelines and policies surpass the number sent to the HD (9) but below that the MHO distributed (14) indicates that the records have mixed/uneven accuracy.

ID Circulars, Guidelines and Policies FY 2017/18)

1 Received by MHO/HD from CG 9

2 Distributed by MHO /HD to HFs 14

3 Received by Kumi HC IV 12

4 MHO Visits to Kumi HC IV 4

<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>In line with the quest to support effective communication and promote CME, it was clear that the MHO attempted to explain some of the issued circulars, guidelines and policies issued by the national level in FY 2017/18):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The MHO presented Q4 Minutes of the MHT 12th/6/2018 (Agenda 8 on Guidelines and Circulars; Min: 8/06/2018; pages 10 to 12). 2. However, the sampled HF could not point to or present any documented evidence e.g. visitors Books or support supervision logbook to confirm that the MHO had explained any circular, guideline and policy. 	<p>3</p>
--	---	---	----------

The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services

Maximum 6 points for this performance measure

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

The Kumi MC HD compiled evidence on support supervision but rather inadequately, to the extent that it was not easy to gauge its coverage, efficiency and effectiveness in the FY 2017/18. Going by the MoH Supervision Logbooks for Kumi HC IV, the MHT visits are evident (see table) as follows.

ID HFs OFFICIALVISITS (FY 2017/18) TOTAL

MHO MHT HSD

1 Kumi HC IV 4 - N/A 4

According to HD records:

1. The MHO covered 100% of the HF at least once in a quarter (i.e. only Kumi HC IV) – see table.
2. The Kumi HC IV was represented in Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4 support supervision quarterly reports, pointers of complete coverage than omission (see table).
3. The MHO worked with the lead HWs of Kumi HC IV (to constitute the MHT), a situation that created potential for role conflicts and indicating possible conflicts of interest.

ID Date No. of Supervision Visits - Kumi HC IV
Comments

Q1 1st/9/2017 1 out of 1 (100%) See pg. 7 text

Q2 4th/10/2017 1 out of 1 (100%) See pg. 10 attendance

Q3 27th/3/2018 1 out of 1 (100%) See pg. 7 attendance

Q4 12th/6/2018 1 out of 1 (100%) See pg. 7 attendance

<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p>	<p>There was no support supervision for lower level HFs in FY 2017/18 because Kumi MC did not have any since its formation and at the time of the assessment 28th/9/2018. As seen in the table, the above means that the performance measure is not applicable (N/A) – i.e. 0 out of 0 covered equals 100% (see table).</p>
<p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>• If 100% supervised: score 3</p> <p>• 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2</p> <p>• 60% - 79% of the health facilities: score 1</p> <p>• Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	<p>ID Date Supervised Comments</p> <p>HC IIIs HC IIs</p> <p>Q1 1st/9/2017 N/A N/A Not Applicable (N/A) – Kumi MC had no HC IIs and IIs at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>Q2 4th/10/2017 N/A N/A</p> <p>Q3 27th/3/2018 N/A N/A</p> <p>Q4 12th/6/2018 N/A N/A</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

- 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

There was evidence that Kumi MC HD discussed the results/reports arising from the quarterly support supervision reports (see table):

1. The HD provided evidence of the existence of all the 4 quarterly reports for FY 2017/18 (see table).
2. For the MHT monthly meetings, documented evidence indicated that MHT met 12 out of 12 mandatory times, an indication that the MHT was functional. NB: According to HD records at the time of the assessment 28st/9/2018), the accessed 12 MHT monthly meetings for FY 2017/18 included 6th/7/2017, 9th/8/2017, 1st/9/2017, 4th/10/2017, 7th/11/2017, 4th/12/2017, 8th/1/2018, 6th/2/2018, 27th/3/2018, 9th/4/2018, 7th/5/2018 and 8th/6/2018).
3. For all the 4 quarterly reports, there were corresponding MHT monthly meetings minutes discussing the reports. However, for all the said documentation, the MHT minutes appeared to be copy-and-paste material from the corresponding quarterly reports. This means that the evidence was limited that it was the quarterly reports being discussed and indeed being used fully to make recommendations in each quarter for all quarters (see table).

ID Quarterly Reports MHT Monthly Meetings MHT Minutes Covering the 4 Quarters Issue and Page in Minutes

Q1 1st/9/2017 1st/9/2019 Min: 4 (bullet 1&2)
Uncollected garbage (pg 5)

Q2 4th/10/2017 7th/11/2017 Min: 6 Disease trends (pg. 5)

Q3 27th/3/2018 27th/3/2018 Min: 5.03.2018 Disease prevention & control (pg.3)

Q4 12th/6/2018 8th/6/2018

Min: 5/06/18 Environmental health & sanitation coverage (pg 2-3)

Maximum 10 points for this performance measure

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 ample evidence at HD and HF levels that the support supervision recommendations had been followed up and specific activities undertaken for correction (see table):

1. At HD level, all the 4 quarterly reports had a section on areas of improvement and there was evidence that most advice, proposals, recommendations or suggestions had been followed up with specific actions and/or activities (see table). NB: weak documentation led the HD staff to struggle to offer proof of follow up of some recommendations.
2. At HF level, the improvised counterbook (used as the MoH support supervision logbook) contained several recommendations made at HF level, recommendations that were made in the course of support supervision and indeed ones that the HF followed up with corrective actions cum measures (see table). As is commonly the case with HF level systems, because of weak documentation systems, picking evidence of the actual follow up actions for some recommendations sometimes proved difficult.

ID Level Recommendation Follow up

1 HD (MHO's Office) Q1 Support Supervision Feedback Report (dated 11th/9/2017, page 2, under section 4.3 on areas of improvement the recommendation – Performance Graphs should be Filled and Displayed The PHIs/ Ag. MHO/HD Office has graphs of information posted with respect to the performance of Kumi HC IV for the FY 2017/18.

2 HF (Kumi HC IV) Train staff in Help Babies Breath (HBB) in support of the CME and CPD functions (no MoH logbook serial number but improvised counter book used see 27th /4/2018) Continuous Medical education (CME) and Continuous Personnel Development (CPD) logbook (dated 3rd/5/2018) captured training details on the HBB topic e.g. covering 23 participants etc.).

<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10 	<p>There was accurate and consistent data and reports on the 1 HF (Kumi HC IV) receiving PHC funding (as per MoH formats). The following was evident in the records:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 1 HF (Kumi HC IV) receiving PHC funding had been posted both on the MC and HD's Notice Boards covering the 1 HF receiving PHC funding for the FY 2017/18. 2. The 1 HF (Kumi HC IV) receiving PHC funding was posted on the notice board appeared all through the HD's/MHO's official files cum records 3. The 1 HF (Kumi HC IV) receiving PHC funding was reflected in the MoH HMIS Excel spreadsheet. NB: Their reporting rate was among the lowest and most inadequate (far below the required 100% threshold, indicating that it did not submit HMIS reports consistently in the FY 2017/18). 4. The 1 HF (Kumi HC IV) receiving PHC funding were still covered in the PBS FY 2018/19 (e.g. between pages 47-48 covering work plans and budget estimates). 	
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>Evidence was provided to confirm that the council committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including support supervision reports, LG PAC reports among other issues.</p> <p>Evidence was provided by the Ag. Planner including a set of minutes of meetings that were convened as follows:</p> <p>Meeting of the 12/10/2017 (as per minute extract 03/MEC/ 2017/18) discussed among other issues the need to process a land title for Kumi HC IV, need for the contractor undertaking works for the Operating Theatre at Kumi HC IV to ensure that the works are completed within the contractual time, need to find resources and construct accommodation for health workers at the various health facilities, need to construct a new Placenta pit at Kumi HC IV, need to construct new toilets at Kumi HC IV and also fix fire extinguishers at the facility.</p> <p>PAC issues were not discussed by the standing committees as the PAC makes recommendations directly to the Town Clerk who then instructs the officers concerned to take action as per recommendations of PAC.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>The council committee for health presented issues for council approval mainly during the Council sittings of: 20/12/2017 (as per minute extract Cou 13/2017/18) as other issues were settled at committee meetings. Some of the key issues tabled for council approval as per minute extract Cou/13/2017/18 included the need for government to always ensure that PHC funds are released in time to ensure timely implementation of planned activities, council resolved that the health facility in-charges and the DHO should always ensure that the projections for drugs and the requisitions are made in time and submitted to NMS to avoid stock outs of drugs at health facilities. Council resolved that the MoH should consider allocating funds for the construction of an Operating Theatre at Kumi HC IV and also observed that there is need to provide running water at Kumi HC IV.</p> <p>Other meetings of the 29/03/2017 and that of 31/05/2017 discussed the laying of the work plans and budgets and approval of the budgets respectively.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 6 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 6 • If 80-99 %: score 4 • If 70-79: %: score 2 • If less than 70%: score 0 	<p>According to the sampled HF, the HUMC was functional (100%) i.e. with minutes that covered the 4 quarters of the FY 2017/18 – see table). This evidence was not corroborated by MHO/HD records because support supervision by MHT was mostly concerned with other preoccupations (hence had not mainstreamed HUMC operations in the support supervision function:</p> <p>ID HFs' HUMCs Meetings in FY 2017/18 Functionality</p> <p>1 Kumi HC IV 4 100%</p> <p>Average 4 100%</p>	<p>6</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 4 	<p>The MC /HD publicized the list of 1 HF (Kumi HC IV) receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grant on notice boards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At the HF level, Kumi HC IV had the list posted with extracts of information concerning the specific HF (i.e. it being the only HF receiving PHC funding). 2. At the HD level, the HD/MC notice board had Kumi HC IV posted as the only HF receiving PHC funding. NB: The HD had not conceived of a more pragmatic and systematic ways of publishing information e.g. the LG website as a wider transparency and accountability mechanism. 	<p>4</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has submitted input to procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2 	<p>With the MHO submission letter of the HD's input to the procurement plan to the PDU dated 20th/6/2018, the submission was not in time (before 30th April 2018) for FY 2018/19. Reportedly, the delayed submission arose from MoFPED's changes of IPFs for the FY 2018/19. However, the submissions covered investment items that were reflected in the AWP 2018/19 (e.g. land titling, procurement of medical equipment, O&M services for HF infrastructure rehabilitation and O&M costs for HD vehicles as seen in the PBS on pages 10-11 as well as in the AWP pages 48-49 (PBS pages and 106-111). This indicated that the contents of items were consistent with on comparison of the PBS and the health sector AWP FY 2018/19.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2. 	<p>The MHO submitted Procurement Form PP1 on the 30th/5/2018 (on purchase of a laptop), hence did not submit it in time (i.e. by the end of the Q1 for FY 2017/18 i.e. by 30th/9/2017).</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/ MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4. 	<p>A request was made for payment vouchers to ascertain whether the DHO timely recommended and certified suppliers' request for payment. Due to the poor filing nature of documents at the District and specifically the Finance department, the department was unable to avail the payment vouchers for the Health department and neither was there a claims register for this purpose. Constant reminders were made to avail documentation but still this was not done. The Kumi Municipal therefore does not score under the indicator.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	<p>No evidence was adduced by the Ag. Planner to confirm that the health sector submitted annual performance reports for the previous year in time to the Planner for consolidation. While there was a hard copy of the consolidate Quarter 4 report, the Planner had no evidence of the submission dates by the health sector (and other sectors) due to the limitations of the PBS system and the absence of hard copies of department quarterly reports that might have reflected the dates when the reports were generated.</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>Reviewed the audit reports generated on the sector and noted that the sector responded to queries raised by the internal audit</p> <p>The correspondence to the Town Clerk Kumi Municipal Council from the Principal Health Inspector, Ms Akiai Alice provided for responses and status of implementation of the audit findings. The inadequate accountability was later resolved and the query retire.</p>	<p>2</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>Based on the only available sample of HF (see table), only 100% of the committees met the gender composition requirement. The composition based on the existing members put gender composition at 42.9% way above the official requirements of 30% (see table).</p> <p>ID Name of HF All Members Female Members %/Female</p> <p>1 Kumi HC IV 7 3 42.9%</p> <p>Gender Composition Requirement 30%</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2. 	<p>The HD possessed circular (dated 3/7th/2017) no sanitation-related information focusing on labeling patients toilets and quoting the Public Health Act. However, this evidence was incomplete:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Kumi HC IV did not confirm (with documented evidence) that the circular had reached its offices Some of Kumi HC IV toilets had been labeled but only recently and with temporary marking (masking tape and marker ink, all vulnerable to the elements and/or vagaries of weather. 	<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>Only 1 health infrastructure investment project was supported in the FY 2017/18 (Construction and Engraving of 3-stance water closet). The assessor reviewed 1 Environment and Social Impact Screening Form signed and stamped by EO and CDO dated 17th/6/2018. It outlined risks (e.g. debris and other waste to be generated) as well as suggesting mitigation plans (e.g. appropriate disposal).</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>At the time of the assessment, the EO and/or CDO had no Site Visit Report to confirm that the mitigation measures were being complied with. The MHO attributed the omission to the project being phased and incomplete at the time of the assessment (28th/9/2018).</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal: score 4. 	<p>On access to guidelines on segregation of medical waste (either in form of a chart or otherwise):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Kumi HC IV demonstrated with (documented evidence) access too that such segregation of medical was guidance. This was being enforced or followed through by means of use of assorted number and type of waste bins. The assessor saw no MHO circular to the said effect (e.g. Guidelines on Health Care Waste Management to Kumi HC IV). 	<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 	Performance measure is inapplicable for Kumi municipality which is under NWSC	0
<p>The district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: <p>Score 15</p> o If 80-99%: Score 10 o If 60-79: Score 5 o If below 60 %: Score 0 	Performance measure is inapplicable in Kumi municipality which is under NWSC	0
Monitoring and Supervision			

<p>The district Water department carries out monthly monitoring of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the district Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15 • 80% - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10 • 70 - 79%: score 7 • 60% - 69% monitored: score 5 • 50% - 59%: score 3 • Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored: score 0 	<p>Performance measure is inapplicable for Kumi municipality which is under NWSC</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the district has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: Score 5 • List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>Performance measure is inapplicable for Kumi Municipality which is under NWSC</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>NWSC</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The district Water department has submitted input for district's procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted input for the district procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	<p>Performance measure is inapplicable for Kumi municipality which is under NWSC</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>Performance measure is inapplicable for Kumi municipality which is under NWSC</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	<p>NWSC</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	<p>NWSC</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>NWSC</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has certified and initiated payment for works and supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<p>The performance indicator is inapplicable for the Kumi Municipality that is under National Water.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<p>The district Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	<p>The performance measure is inapplicable as the municipality is under National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</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>No issues were pointed out under the sector.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3 	<p>This performance measure is inapplicable as the Municipality is under National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	<p>This performance measure is inapplicable as the municipality is under National Water and Sewerage Corporation.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2. 	<p>Performance measure inapplicable in Kumi Municipality which is under NWSC</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>NWSC</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	<p>NWSC</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If communities apply for water/ public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	<p>Performance measure is inapplicable in Kumi Municipality which is under NWSC.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water and Sanitation Committees that are functioning evidenced by either: i) collection of O&M funds, ii(carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, iii) facility fenced/protected, or iv) they an M&E plan for the previous FY: score 2 <p>Note: One of parameters above is sufficient for the score.</p>	<p>NWSC</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	<p>Performance measure is inapplicable in Kumi municipality which is under NWSC</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>NWSC</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>NWSC</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If at least 50% WSCs are women and at least one occupying a key position (chairperson, secretary or Treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements: score 3 	<p>Performance measure is inapplicable in Kumi municipality which is under NWSC</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/ RGCs provided by the Water Department.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3 	<p>Performance measure is inapplicable in Kumi municipality which is under NWSC</p>	<p>0</p>