



Local Government Performance Assessment

Lamwo District

(Vote Code: 585)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	50%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	46%
Educational Performance Measures	56%
Health Performance Measures	34%
Water Performance Measures	71%

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>Lamwo District LG submitted the Final Performance Contract on 1st August 2018 as per the submission schedule of MoFPED which was on the deadline of 1st August 2018, and approved on 2nd August 2018.</p> <p>Note: The PFMAA LG Budget guidelines require the submission to be by 30th June. However, this date was changed to 1st August 2018 as per the request from MoFPED.</p>	Yes
Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			

<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY by 30th June (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From MoFPED's inventory of LG budget submissions, check whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The LG budget is accompanied by a Procurement Plan or not. If a LG submission includes a Procurement Plan, the LG is compliant; otherwise it is not compliant. 	<p>Lamwo District Local Government submitted a Budget for FY 2018/2019; including a Procurement Plan for FY 2018/2019 to MoFPED on 1st August 2018 (and approved on 2nd August 2018) as per the submission schedule of MoFPED.</p> <p>The submission of the Budget for FY 2018/2019; including a Procurement Plan for FY 2018/2019 was done on the deadline of 1st August 2018.</p> <p>Note: The PFMAA LG Budget guidelines require the submission to be by 30th June. However, this date was changed to 1st August 2018 as per the request from MoFPED.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
--	--	--	------------

Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports

<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted report to MoFPED in time, then it is compliant • If LG submitted late or did not submit, then it is not compliant 	<p>Lamwo DLG submitted the Annual Budget Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 on 13th August 2018, and was approved on 21st August 2018.</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline of 31st July 2017.</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>Lamwo district submitted all the four Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for FY 2017/2018 to MoFPED as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter one was submitted on 24th March 2018 (as per Submission Schedule from MoFPED). • Quarter Two was submitted on 25th March 2018 (as per Submission Schedule from MoFPED). • Quarter Three submitted on 29th April 2018 and approved on 15th May 2018 (as per Submission Schedule from MoFPED). • Quarter Four submitted on 13th August 2018 and approved on 21st August 2018(as per Submission Schedule from MoFPED). <p>The reports for the first three quarters were submitted by the end of the FY as required by the PFMA Act, 2015. However, the Quarter Four Report was submitted on 13th August 2018, which was after the end of FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Audit</p>			

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and the Auditor General's findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action in line 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only one (1) query was raised by the Internal Auditor General for FY 2016/2017 and it was cleared. • A copy of Internal Auditor General's report for FY 2016/2017 dated 24th April 2018 Ref No. CR/103/2 showed that one query was raised which was duly responded to by the Accounting Officer as illustrated above. • Submission of status of implementation of Internal Auditor General's findings for FY 2016/2017 was belatedly made to PS/ST on 24th April 2018 contrary to the recommended time limit of by 28th February 2018 as provided for in the PFMA 2015 Section 11 2g. • Eight (8) queries were raised by the Auditor General for FY 2016/2017 and they were all cleared. Evidence of submission of Action taken by the Accounting Officer on queries raised by Office of the Auditor General was belatedly made to the PS/ST on 13th April 2018 contrary to the recommended time limit of by 28th February 2018 as provided for in the PFMA 2015 Section 11 2g. 	No
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>Lamwo DLG obtained Unqualified Audit Opinion for FY 2017/18</p>	Yes

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a district/ municipality has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 1. 	<p>The CAO / Lamwo appointed members to the District Physical Planning Committee on 10th August 2018 as evidenced in the appointment letter – Even (or Without) reference dated 10th August 2018. However, the committee was not yet functional at the time of the assessment.</p>	0
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that district/ MLG has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD score 1. 	<p>No minutes of the Physical Planning Committee were submitted to the MoLHUD since the committee had never convened any meeting since its appointment.</p>	0

<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All infrastructure investments are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan: score 1 or else 0 	<p>Lamwo District did not have a Physical Development Plan at the time of assessment. Therefore, it was not possible to ascertain whether all infrastructure investments were consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action area plan prepared for the previous FY: score 1 or else 0 	<p>There were no Action Area Plans prepared for FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2. 	<p>The priorities in the AWP for FY 2018/2019 were based on the outcomes of the Budget Conference held in Lamwo District Council Hall on the 14th November 2017. For example under Education: Construction of 2 classroom blocks at Labyango Primary School (pg. 59 of AWP for FY 2018/2019) and Budget Conference Report - Presentation of Education Department: Planned Activities and Priority Areas for FY 2018/2019 - Pages 3 - 4.</p>	<p>2</p>
--	--	---	----------

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If differences appear, a justification has to be provided and evidence provided that it was approved by the Council. Score 1. 	<p>The capital investments in the approved Annual work Plan for the FY 2018/2019 were derived from the approved Five-Year Development Plan (2015/16 – 2019/20).</p> <p>For example under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water: ‘Drilling of 6 deep boreholes’ in the AWP for FY 2018/2019 (Pages 73) and ‘Construction of 100 water supply facilities’ in the DDP (Chapter 3: Section 3.4 – Page 123) • Education, ‘Construction of 2 classroom block at Labyango Primary School’ in AWP for FY 2018/2019 (Pages 59) and construction of 25 classrooms in the DDP (Chapter 3: Section 3.4 – Page 117). 	
--	---	---	--

<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 as part of the DDP for FY 2015/2016 – 2019/2020 (Pages 178 - 202); as such they were discussed by DTPC before the plan was presented to the District Council. The minutes of the District Council meeting could not be availed to ascertain this.</p> <p>Since the approval of the DDP, the DTPC had not discussed any project profiles.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual statistical abstract, with gender-disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making-maximum score 1. 	<p>The district did not compile an Annual Statistical Abstract for 2017/2018), with gender disaggregated data. This was due to the understaffing in the District Planning Unit.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2 	<p>The infrastructure projects implemented during FY 2017/2018 (as indicated in the Local Government Quarterly Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 (Vote 585 – Quarter 4), were derived from the Annual Work Plan and Budget Estimates for FY 2017/2018. For example under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production: ‘Construction of 2 cattle crushes’ (Quarter Four Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 - Page 48) and ‘Construction of Cattle crushes’(Lamwo DLG AWP and Budget – page 76). • Health: ‘Construction of drainable latrine at Lokung HC III’ (Quarter Four Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 - Page 53) and ‘Construction of drainable latrine at Lokung HC III’ and (Lamwo DLG AWP and Budget – page 81). • Education: ‘Construction of classroom block at Opoki Primary School’ (Quarter Four Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 - Page 57), and ‘Construction of one block of 2 classrooms with a store in Opoki Primary School’ (Lamwo DLG AWP and Budget – page 84). 	<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. o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>Out of the 12 investment projects implemented (at district-level) in FY 2017/2018, 10 were completed as per work plan by end of FY 2017/2018. One of the uncompleted projects was ‘Re-gravelling of 7 Km Road (Orii – Lapidienyi in Paloga Sub-County).</p> <p>This was a completion rate of 83.3%.</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>The total budget for the ten completed projects (out of 12) was UGX 763,132,455 and expenditure was UGX 707,079,053. The expenditure was 92.7% of the approved budget.</p> <p>However, the indicator requires that ALL investment projects were completed within approved budget.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	<p>Lamwo DLG budgeted UGX 106,969,000 on O&M during FY 2017/2018, and spent UGX 79,056,375.</p> <p>This is 74% of the budget for O&M as per Lamwo DLG Draft Final Accounts for the Year Ended 30th June 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Human Resource Management</p>			

LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.

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

There were 10 Heads of Department at U1 salary scale in the approved organisation structure. Two (2) HoD were substantively appointed and eight were performing duties as follows:

1. The duties of the District Production Officer were being performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Agriculture Officer U3 as per his appointment letter CR/159/1 of 19th April 2005
2. The duties of the District Engineer were being performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Superintendent of Works U4 as per the appointment letter dated 10th May 2012
3. The duties of the District Natural Resources Officer were being performed by an Officer whose substantive appointment was Environment Officer as per his appointment letters/163/5 of 10th January 2011
4. The duties of the District Education Officer were being performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Education officer scale U3 as per the appointment letter CR/156/5 of 8th June 2017
5. The duties of the Deputy CAO were being performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Assistant Secretary scale U3 as per his appointment letter CR/156/11 of 22nd October 2012
6. The duties of the District Chief Finance Officer were being performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was an Accountant U4 scale as per his appointment contained in DSC meeting DSC/156/4/21, minute number 17
7. The duties of the District Commercial Officer were being performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Commercial officer scale U3 as per his appointment letter Cr/156/4 of 12th July 2012
8. The Duties of the District Planner were being performed by an Officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Planner U3 as per the appointment contained in the minutes of the Kitgum DSC, sitting to consider Lamwo District's recruitment cases, held on 17th and 18th November 2010 minute number 6/1/2010

<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>There were Ten (10) Heads of Department; nine were assessed between July and August 2018. The tenth HoD who was performing the duties of District Planner was interdicted before the assessment as per the interdiction letter dated 5th September 2018.</p> <p>The assessment was therefore based on 9 HoD who were all assessed.</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>Five (5) vacant positions were submitted to the DSC for recruitment of new employees on 11th August and received by the DSC on 14th August 2017. They were considered and approved for appointment during the DSC meeting held on 7th and 8th September 2017 as per DSC minute number 19/22017.</p> <p>Twenty (20) vacant positions were submitted 13th March 2018 and received by the Commission on 18th March 2018. They were considered and approved for appointment from 19th to 21st June 2018 as per DSC minute number 30/6/2018</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	<p>Forty three (43) names of employees were submitted by the HR Unit, to the DSC for confirmation of their appointment on 3rd July 2017 and received by the Commission on 4th September 2017. They were considered and approved for confirmation in their appointment during the DSC meetings held on 7th and 8th September 2017 as per DSC minute number 19/2017 (c)</p> <p>Thirty nine (39) names of employees were submitted on 14th March 2018 and received, in batches by the Commission on 19th and 28th March; and 5th April 2018. They were considered and approved for confirmation in their appointment during the DSC meetings held on 17th and 18th April 2018</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>The HR Unit Submitted four (4) disciplinary action cases to the DSC on 14th March and received by the Commission on 19th March 2018. They were considered during the DSC meeting held on 17th and 18th April 2018 as per minute number 22/04/2018 (f)</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>Four(4) candidate were appointed to the district service on 14th September 2017as per the appointment letters and assumed duty during the month of October as per their respective “Notification of Assumption of duty memos”. (seen) They accessed the district payroll during the month of in December 2017 as per IPPS payroll. (seen)</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2 	<p>The HR Unit submitted 12 names of employees who were to retire during the financial year 2017/18 on 10th April2017. There was no evidence that they accessed the retirement payroll within the stipulated timeframe.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Revenue Mobilization</p>			

<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets) from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10 %: score 4. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 2. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>Total of OSR for FY 2016/2017 Shs. 85,620,079 (Excluding disposal of Assets)</p> <p>Total of OSR for FY 2017/2018 Shs. 80,437,477 (Excluding disposal of Assets)</p> <p>Decrease Shs. -5,182,602</p> <p>Percentage -6%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The District LG OSR decreased by -6% from Shs 85,620,079 in FY 2016/2017 to Shs.80,437,477 in FY 2017/2018 excluding disposal of Assets. This decrease was attributed to the following factors: - • The insecurity at the Uganda – South Sudan boarder led to the closure of two boarder markets namely: Ngomoromo & Apiriti markets. • Shortage of manpower (Parish Chiefs) who collect revenue. 	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0. 	<p>Total Local Revenue Planned/Budgeted (Original not Revised budget) for FY 2017/2018 was Shs.200,000,000 (As per original budget for FY 2017/2018)</p> <p>Total Local Revenue collected during FY 2017/2018 was Shs. 80,437,477.</p> <p>The budget realisation fell short by 60% of what had been planned in the original budget for FY 2017/2018.</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. 42,639,284 in respect of Local Service Tax deducted from District staff (As at 30/06/2018).</p> <p>Status of compliance:</p> <p>There was evidence that the DLG remitted Shs. 1,740,000 and Shs. 3,645,000 to Lamwo TC and Padibe TC respectively leaving a balance of Shs.37,254,284 subject to sharing between the District and the nine (09) Sub-counties at a ratio of 35: 65.</p> <p>However, the District retained Shs. 35,454,284 and remitted only Shs. 200,000 to each of the (09) Sub-counties totalling to Shs. 1,800,000 representing a percentage 095% : 5% as at 31/3/2018 contrary to the provisions in the LGA Cap 243 as amended section 85 (4) which requires the districts to remit 65% to LLGs and retain 35%.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the total Council expenditures on allowances and emoluments- (including from all sources) is not higher than 20% of the OSR collected in the previous FY: score 2 	<p>Total expenditure on Council allowances and emoluments during FY 2017/2018 was Shs. 42,600,000.</p> <p>Percentage was 49.8%</p> <p>The District spent Shs. 42,600,000 in FY 2017/2018 on Council allowances and emoluments derived from Shs. 85,620,079 collected in FY 2016/2017.</p> <p>This was equivalent to 49.8% of OSR for FY 2016/2017 over and above the recommended 20% contrary to the LGA Cap 243 as amended First Schedule 4</p> <p>However, the District Chairperson wrote to the Minister of Local Government on 4th December 2017 Ref. CR/1201/4 seeking permission for authority to spend higher than the 20% worth Shs. 28,600,000.</p> <p>The Minister granted the authority to spend higher than 20% of the local revenue on councillors' emoluments and allowances totalling to Shs. 28,600,000 as per his letter to the District Chairperson dated 11th December 2017 Ref. MC.22.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2 	<p>The position of Senior Procurement Officer scale U3 was not substantively filled. Duties were being performed by a Procurement Officer scale U4 as per the appointment letter CR/156/4 of 27th July 2012</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	<p>The TEC report revealed that all projects were assessed and recommendations made to the contracts committee which reports were based on to award the contracts. The TEC report for projects under domestic bidding was submitted on 3rd October 2017 while the report for small projects under Selective bidding was submitted on 29th January 2018.</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>There was evidence that the Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC for example the Contracts Committee sat on 5th October 2017 and considered all the projects under Open Domestic bidding and sat again on 1st February and awarded the smaller project under Selective domestic bidding. The Contracts Committee based its decisions to award contracts on the recommendations of TEC</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2 	<p>The District Procurement and Disposal Plan for 2018/19 covered all the infrastructure projects in the AWP and these included drilling of 6 deep boreholes, Low cost sealing of 1.3 km road in Padibe TC, Construction of District Health Office, Construction of a 2 classroom block, completion of Lamwo TC Administration Block, Construction of Mini Laboratory at Headquarter and Renovation of a classroom block at Abakadyak PS.</p> <p>The procurements for 2017/18 FY adhered to the Procurement Plan. (procurement plans and Budget for 2017/18 and 18/19 were reviewed for the above information)</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/ infrastructure by August 30: score 2 	<p>The district prepared all the bid documents for all infrastructure/investment by 31st July 2018. The bid notice under open domestic bidding was advertised/issued in the New Vision of 2nd August 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2 	<p>The district had an updated Contract Register and complete procurement files for all projects executed in the previous year (FY 2017/18). The register was duly signed by the CAO.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	<p>The sampled 5 projects implemented in 2017/18 FY complied with the Procurement thresholds with projects worth 50 million and above awarded through Open Domestic bidding and those below 50 million awarded through Selective National bidding. The sampled projects were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low cost sealing of 1.3 km Road in Padipe Town Council worth 364,726,908. 2. Construction of a 2 classroom block with a store at Opoki PS, worth 65,821,140. 3. Construction of Market Stalls at Ogako Lacan Market worth 45,480,000. 4. 4 Stances drainable Pit latrine at Lokung HC III worth 15,846,475. 5. 3 Stances drainable Pit latrine with a washroom at Lagwel Trading Centre worth 14,880,500. 	2
<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2 	<p>The works projects implemented in 2017/18 were appropriately certified with interim certificates for example some of the sampled projects were issued with interim certificates as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Classroom block at Opoki PS issued on 12/6/2018. - 4 Stances pit latrine at Lokung HCIII issued on 29/6/2018. - Low cost sealing of 1.3 km road in Padibe was issued with 5 interim certificates the fifth one issued on 6/04/2018 	2
<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all works projects 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 labelling of projects was not satisfactory as no site board had a contract value on them and only 3 out of the 5 sampled projects had a site board that is, the 1.3 km road in Padibe TC, the market stall and the 2 classroom block.</p>	0
Financial management			

The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.

• Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4

The District was not yet rolled on IFMS and it operated 26 bank accounts namely:

General Fund Collection A/c, Global Fund A/c, Nodding Syndrome A/c, UWEP A/c, YLP A/c, Prelnor A/c, UNHCR A/c, LGMSD A/c, Education & Sports A/c, Production & Marketing A/c, Health A/c, Natural Resources & Water A/c, Capacity Building A/c, Environment A/c, Community Based Services A/c, Administration A/c, Boards & Commissions A/c, Finance A/c, Works A/c, UNICEF A/c, NUSAF III Operation A/c, NUSAF III Project A/c NUDEIL Implantation A/c, Planning Unit A/c, Lamwo District Integrated Project A/c, Youth Livelihood Operation A/c, and DRDIP A/c.

These accounts were reconciled monthly as at 30/06/2018, prepared by the respective sector Accountants, and approved by the Head of Finance.

Similarly, the same cash books but for FY 2018/2019 had been duly reconciled on monthly basis up to 30th August 2018.

The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

- 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.

The District LG maintained a Creditors Register for FY 2017/2018 which indicated the payment status of each supplier as per sampled suppliers below:

A sample of three transactions from Education, Health and Water Sectors showed that the payments to suppliers were within the 2 months' timeline in the absence of the timing clause in their signed contracts.

Education Sector:

M/s TAI-TAI Company Ltd payment request for construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms with office and Store at OPOKI P/S in Padibe Sub-county for Shs. 58,778,278 dated 13/6/2018 was paid on 28/6/2018 against Payment Voucher No. 11/6/18 within only 15 days.

Health Sector:

(M/s Giant Plum Enterprises (U) Ltd request for payment for construction of OPD at Agoro Health Centre III in Agoro Sub-county for Shs. 29,726,000 dated 28/06/2018 was paid on 29/6/2018 against payment Voucher No. 20/6/18 within only 1 day

.

Water Sector:

M/s KAL BROS Company Ltd request for payment for supply of Pump Plants for Bore holes and construction materials for Shs. 18,869,097 dated 21/6/2018 was paid on 29/06/2018 against Payment Voucher No. 6/6/18 within 8 days.

M/s Ebowa Investments Ltd submitted their payment request for Drilling & Installation of (04) Deep Boreholes Lot 1 dated 29/6/2018 for Shs. 51,726,690 was paid on 30/6/2018 against Payment Voucher No. (not indicated on the voucher) within only 1 day.

<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor: 1 point. • LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2. 	<p>The District did not have a substantive Principal Internal Auditor at the time of the assessment but Mr. NYERO JAMES who was appointed as an Internal Auditor was caretaking the office without any letter of assignment from CAO.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2. 	<p>The District LG produced all the 4 Quarterly Internal Audit Reports for FY 2017/2018.They were addressed to the District Speaker in accordance with the LGA Cap 243 as amended Section 90 (2).</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports: score 2.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG provided information to Council and LGPAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year FY 2017/18.</p> <p>However, none of the queries raised was cleared as illustrated below:</p> <p>8 queries raised in quarter 1 but none was cleared.</p> <p>1 query raised in quarter 2 but none cleared.</p> <p>6 queries raised in quarter 3 but none cleared.</p> <p>6 queries raised in quarter 4 but none cleared.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1. 	<p>Action by the Accounting Officer, LGPAC on Internal Audit Queries raised during FY 2017/2018 was as in the table below:</p> <p>The Accounting Officer and the LGPAC received all the four Quarterly Internal Audit reports for FY 2017/2018 on the same day and reviewed by the LGPAC.</p> <p>However, the minutes of review meetings by the LGPAC since FY 2013/2014 to date were still in draft form (handwritten in a counter book) without endorsement of the Chairman and Secretary hence no evidence of follow up.</p> <p>Similarly, the LGPAC report to Council availed to the assessment Team for FY 2017/2018 was not dated nor signed by the Chairman. In addition, members' signatures and dates as proof for attending meetings were not captured.in the report.</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>The DLG maintained an assets register for Motor Vehicles & Heavy Plants, Furniture & Small Office Equipment, Land & Buildings and Computers, Printers, Photocopiers, Scanners & Other Accessories.</p> <p>It was maintained in accordance with the format recommended in the Local Government Accounting Manual 2007 Form AC 33 (a), Form AC 33 (b) and Form AC 33 (c).</p> <p>However, the entire LG assets register had not been up-dated as required at the time of the assessment.</p>	<p>0</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>Lamwo DLG obtained Unqualified Audit Opinion for FY 2017/18</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2 	<p>An attendance book was availed to show registration of councilors on the days the District Council meetings were held (e.g. 28th August 2017, 29th September 2017, 6th October 2017, 11th December 2017, 29th March 2018, and 17th April 2018).</p> <p>However, one copy of unsigned minutes for a meeting held on 28th August 2017 was presented.</p> <p>There was no evidence of any discussion of services delivery issues.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/ complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 1. 	<p>The Assessment Team was informed that the Principal Human Resource Officer (Ms Okeny Harriet Charity) was designated by CAO/Lamwo to coordinate response to feedback (grievances / complaints). However, there was no letter of appointment at the time of assessment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/ complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which should be displayed at LG offices and made publically available: score 1 	<p>There was no system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances at the time of assessment. Much as grievances were said to be reported, there was no book availed to ascertain recorded these complaints.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2 	<p>The district Payroll and Pensioner Schedule were displayed on the wall and Notice Board respectively at the 'Old' Administration Blocks at Lamwo District Headquarters.</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>Information on procurement e.g. 'Bid Notice under Open Domestic Bidding' was published in the New Vision newspaper (of 2nd August 2018 – Page 32) displayed on the Notice Boards at the new Administration Block, and 'Old' Administration Blocks at Lamwo District Headquarters. However, the procurement plan had not been displayed</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1. 	<p>There was no evidence that the District performance assessment results and implications were published.</p> <p>However, Minutes of the DTPC meeting,(held on 28th February 2018) were availed as evidence but these indicated (under Min. 5/2/2018 – Preparation for 2017/2018) there was a discussion to prepare for LG APA for FY 2017/2018 and no mention of dissemination of the LG APA results for FY 2016/2017.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1 	<p>Evidence was provided to confirm communication and explanation of guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during FY 2017/2018. The evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A letter from the CAO /Lamwo DLG to all Senior Assistant Secretaries (of even or without reference dated 28th February 2018) regarding 'Leasing and Titling of Government and Institutional Land'. • A letter from the CAO / Lamwo DLG to all Town Clerks (Ref: CR/210/... dated 17th January 2018) regarding 'Selection of Beneficiaries under PRDP III Restocking Component' 	<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 feedback on status of activity implementation: score 1. 	<p>Community meetings and barazas were said to have been conducted during FY 2017/2018. However, no documentary evidence was presented.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG gender focal person and CDO have provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion into their activities score 2. 	<p>The district Gender Focal Person was on leave and no evidence was availed on guidance and support provided to sector departments on how to mainstream gender in their activities</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the gender focal point and CDO have planned for minimum 2 activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and address vulnerability and social inclusions and that more than 90 % of previous year's budget for gender activities/ vulnerability/ social inclusion has been implement-ted: score 2. 	<p>The gender focal person had planned activities according to the work plan to mainstream gender in other departments and through workshops and seminars and a budget of 500, 000 was approved for gender mainstreaming activities in the 2018/19 FY approved budget. The budget of 300,000 was allocated for gender mainstreaming activities in 2017/18 FY was fully utilised.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 1 	<p>Environmental screening was done for only the road and water projects (particularly boreholes); mitigation measures were planned and budgeted for. This was evidenced through reviewing of environmental screening forms which were prepared.</p> <p>However Education and Health projects were not screened as there was no evidence availed to that effect</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	<p>The reviewed bid documents for the 5 sampled projects revealed that only one bid for project on Low cost sealing of 1.3 km road in Padibe Town council had integration of environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the bid document. The rest of the 4 bids lacked sections on the integration of environmental and social management and health and safety.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1 	<p>Many of the implemented projects were done on government owned institutions like schools and Health centres and sub-county for example 4 out of the 5 sampled projects were done on public/government land and the 5th one the 3 stances pit latrine with washroom at Lagwel Trading centre was constructed on land whose owner and the district had a written agreement on how the facility should be accessed by the community</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO: score 1 	<p>The Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Forms were not completed for completed projects as there was no certificate signed by the Environmental Officer and CDO</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance (new one): Score 1 	<p>The reviewed contract payments for 3 sampled projects did not have certificates on environmental and social clearance as a requirement for contract payment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that environmental officer and CDO monthly report, includes a) completed checklists, b) deviations observed with pictures, c) corrective actions taken. Score: 1 	<p>There was no evidence of monthly reports written on projects by either the Environmental officer or the Community Development Officer.</p>	<p>0</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>The LG education de- partment has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 	<p>For the FY 2018/19, the LG performance contract pages 28-35, under education Vote 527 covering education sector indicated a budget for 71 Primary Schools for 1 head teacher and at least 7 teachers each was drawn.</p> <p>70 out of 71 Schools had up to P7. Only one (1) School (Lomwaka P/S) was up to P5. From the staff list there were 571 teachers for the 71 schools.</p>	4
<p>The LG education de- partment has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 	<p>The staff list obtained for all the 71 Schools indicate that at least one (1) Head Teacher and a minimum of seven (7) teachers, for P7 schools were deployed in the various schools. From the five schools sampled (Ogwangcan P/S, Ogakolocan P/S, Ayago P/S, Apoki P/S and Padibe Boys P/S) the names of teachers on the list were consistent with the teachers on ground after a roll-call was conducted in the sampled schools.</p> <p>However, the staff list needed to be updated as some teachers had since left the school on transfers and or retirement.</p> <p>There were also new postings. For instance, Mr. Otii Caste was transferred from Ogwangcan P/S, but his name was still on the list. He was replaced by Mr. Onen Michael Omoga who was not on the staff list but was already at the school. This situation was in all the sampled schools.</p>	4

<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100%: score 6 o If 80 - 99%: score 3 o If below 80%: score 0 	<p>There was no wage bill provision for 2018/19 for Primary School Teachers' recruitment. There was however, a wage bill for enhancement of science teachers' salaries in secondary schools only. Primary School teachers' recruitment were not provided for in the Wage Bill.</p> <p>In the Education Department, there was also a wage bill provision for recruitment of staff at the district, specifically; DEO, Senior Education Officer and Sports Officer under the LG Education Sector Vote 527.</p> <p>Evidence from approved staff structure for the LG indicate that position of only one (1) Inspector of Schools was filled.</p> <p>There was still need to fill the position of Senior Inspector of Schools and DEO position.</p> <p>The two positions in the education department that were filled are that of Senior Education Officer & Inspector of schools, who are both substantially appointed as per the staff structure. The Senior Education Officer was care taking the DEO position currently.</p> <p>There was provision in the FY 2018/19 Wage bill for one (1) Senior Inspector of schools, one (1) DEO, and one (1) Sports Officer. These positions had been cleared for recruitment for the current FY.</p> <p>In total, only 3 out of 193 vacant positions were cleared for recruitment. 112 positions had been substantially filled so far according to the staff establishment and recruitment plan 2018/19.</p>	<p>0</p>
--	--	--	----------

<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	<p>Evidence from approved staff structure for the LG indicate that position of only one (1) Inspector of Schools was filled.</p> <p>There was still need to fill the position of Senior Inspector of Schools and DEO position.</p> <p>The two positions in the education department that were filled are that of Senior Education Officer & Inspector of schools, who are both substantially appointed as per the staff structure. The Senior Education Officer was care taking the DEO position currently.</p> <p>There was provision in the FY 2018/19 Wage bill for one (1) Senior Inspector of schools, one (1) DEO, and one (1) Sports Officer. These positions had been cleared for recruitment for the current FY.</p> <p>In total, only 3 out of 193 vacant positions were cleared for recruitment. 112 positions had been substantially filled so far according to the staff establishment and recruitment plan 2018/19.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary Teachers: score 2 	<p>A copy of the recruitment plan from Education Department was obtained. A recruitment plan for 64 Deputy Head Teachers, 38 Head Teachers & 88 Senior Education Assistants were submitted for recruitment, but not cleared for recruitment this FY as per the staff establishment and recruitment plan FY 2018/19.</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 Senior Education Officer who was care taking Office of the DEO confirmed that the list was submitted to HRM through the CAO. The Assessment team saw the letter and the staff list submitted for appointment.</p> <p>There was provision in the FY 2018/19 Wage bill for one (1) Senior Inspector of schools. this was submitted to HRM together with the list of other staff.</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>There was one (1) Inspector of Schools for the for 71 Primary Schools in the district and was appraised as per the appraisal report dated 14th January 2018</p>	<p>3</p>
---	--	--	----------

<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary school head teachers o 90 - 100%: score 3 o 70% and 89%: score 2 o Below 70%: score 0 	<p>There were 71 Head Teacher out of whom 53 were appraised, representing 75% compliance. Six School Head Teachers Appraisal Reports were sampled indicating that the appraisals were generally conducted between October 2017 and March 2018</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1 	<p>For the FY 2017/18, there was evidence that guidelines below were received and issued at the LG level:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WASH: Global Hand wash was received on 20/8/2018 2. Submission of quarter report, circular No. 10/2017. 3. Circular on School charges from the MoES. 4. Adherence to school Calendar, circular No. 8/2018. 5. School feeding guidelines Manuel was received; and 6. Enforcing of illegal schools circular ADM/104/212/01 were all received and copies filed. <p>There was evidence on the notice boards, minutes of meetings and in files of sampled schools that some guidelines were shared. The above circulars were communicated to schools through the SMC meetings scheduled for 3/2/2018, 18 /4/2017 and 20 /12/2017.</p> <p>The circular on Adherence to School Calendar was seen on the notice boards at the entrance to the education office building.</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>There was evidence of meetings with School Heads on 28th/6/2018 to disseminate guidelines on School Calendar. Other meetings took place on 20/12/17 & 3/2/2018 with head teachers on Inclusion and Closure of illegal Schools respectively. Minutes of these meetings are available in the file at the DEOs Office.</p>	2
<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>School inspection was at 66.1%. (60-69%=3)</p> <p>Although there were 3 school inspections in 2017/18, none of the inspections covered 100% of the 71 schools. Term II report dated 28/7/2018 covered 48 out of 71 schools. Term I dated 19/4/2018 covered 46 out of 71 schools. The average coverage is thus approximately 47% total school.</p>	3

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspec- tions, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and fol- lowed 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>Evidence of the Education department meetings held to discuss school inspection reports was seen in the DEO's files. The reports were dated 20/11/17 and 30/6/2018 respectively. There was evidence that the meeting that discussed school inspection reports made recommendations for corrective actions. One of the recommendations was the appointments of additional Head Teachers and Deputies for schools that did not have substantially appointed head teachers and deputies.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspec- tions, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and fol- lowed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 	<p>There was no evidence of submission of school inspection reports to DES & or, MoES according to the requirement.</p> <p>The matrix for submission of monitoring, work plans, reports & accountability from DES was blank for Lamwo LG, an indication that no reports were submitted to this effect.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspec- tions, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and fol- lowed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed- up: score 4. 	<p>There was no evidence that the inspection report was submitted to DES and that the recommendations of the reports were followed-up.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>There was evidence that the Education Department submitted accurate/consistent data. Form A Statistical Returns for all the 71 primary schools was seen in the files in the DEOs' Office. Each school file had a copy of the EMIS Statistical Form and there was evidence that it was used to submit accurate/consistent data to MoES.</p>	5
<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS: score 5 	<p>There was evidence of Enrolment data for all 71 primary schools and the data was submitted according to EMIS reporting & PBS formats.</p>	5
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG committee re- sponsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>The Health, Education, and Community Based Services Committee was in place. However, no minutes of any meetings held were presented to the assessment team.</p>	0

<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>There was no evidence during assessment that the education sector committee had presented issues that required approval to Council.</p>	<p>0</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 71 schools have functional SMCs as seen from the minutes of their meetings and the list on the walls in most schools. All the five sampled schools had list of SMCs and confirmed that the Committee were active and met at least twice last term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMC meetings on 27/7/2018 to withdraw the UPE Capitation Grant under minutes no. 8/7/2018. • SMC meetings on 9/7/2018 to approve budgets of Ogakolacan P/S in Padibe sub county. <p>There are at least 60 filed reports (80-90%) from various SMCs in the DEOs Office.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non- wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants <p>e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</p>	<p>There was evidence on the notice board that the LG made public all the schools receiving non- wage recurrent grants for FY 2017/18. The list was paosted on the walls at the education office building.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The LG Education department has submitted input into the LG procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements,</p> <p>to the Procurement Unit that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	<p>The sector submitted its procurement input to the Procurement Unit covering all investment items in the approved annual work plan for example on pages 30-36 of the LG approved budget estimates/plan for FY 2018/19 the Education department planned for retention of latrine and class room blocks at Abakadyak and Apoki primary schools respectively. This was captured in the Procurement Plan on pages 30-32.</p>	4
Financial management and reporting			
<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3. 	<p>There was evidence that the Education department had certified and initiated payment for supplies on time as per sampled transaction below: -</p> <p>Education Sector:</p> <p>M/s TAI-TAI Company Ltd payment request for construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms with office and Store at OPOKI P/S in Padibe Sub-county for Shs. 58,778,278 dated 13/6/2018 was certified on 12/6/2018 (Certificate No. 001) and was paid on 28/6/2018 against Payment Voucher No. 11/6/18.</p> <p>within only 15 days.</p>	3
<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 Education department submitted the annual performance report for the FY 2017/2018 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner for consolidation.</p> <p>However, no evidence was availed to ascertain when the submission was made to the Planner. The assessor, thus, could not establish whether the submission was by the 15th of July 2018 or thereafter.</p>	0

<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 4 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 o If all queries are not responded to score 0 	<p>The sector provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings FY 2017/2018. Two queries were raised but both were not yet cleared.</p> <p>The two queries raised were: Unaccounted for funds and 5% collection from the schools.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills, etc.: Score 2 	<p>There was evidence of dissemination of guidelines on how senior woman/man teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys in schools about reproductive health, life skills & Hygiene.</p> <p>A training workshop for senior woman/man teachers from 24 primary schools took place on 22/8/2018, sponsored by CARE International to disseminate guidelines on hygiene, and reproductive health.</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>There was evidence that the gender focal person was engaged in issuing and explaining guidelines on Gender Based Violence & Violence Against Children (GBV/VAC) but not on sanitation for girls & PWD.</p> <p>The support from Education partners to schools also covered menstrual hygiene management for girls, and distribution of re-usable pads to girls in several primary schools including Agoro, Dicwinyi, Pangira, Potwach among others.</p> <p>All the above activities were however supported by NGO education partners operating in the district (CARE International and LWF</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>There was evidence that the SMCs existed in all the 71 primary schools and, the SMCs were constituted according to the guidelines of 1/3 female. The sampled schools: Ogwangan P/S, Ogakolocan P/S, Ayago P/S, Apoki P/S and Padibe Boys P/S had well constituted SMCs of 3-5 female members out of 13 members each.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 1: 	<p>There was no evidence that the Education department, issued any guidelines on Environmental management (on tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education). The Environment office whom the assessment team interacted with was not aware of any environment management guidelines.</p>	<p>0</p>

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

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health care workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health care with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 80% filled: score 8 • 60 – 80% - score 4 • Less than 60% filled: score 0 	<p>The LG advertised all vacant positions in 1 quarter 2017/2018,</p> <p>Approved structure were as follows:</p> <p>Total no=358</p> <p>Filled = 190 - 53.1%.</p> <p>The posts indicated government scales of each carder of Health worker</p>	0
<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan for primary health care workers to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/re- quest to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of primary health care workers: score 6</p>	<p>The department did not submit a recruitment plan / request due to the suspension of any increase in the wage bill. The level of vacant posts remained at 46.9%</p>	0
<p>The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital In- charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in- charges are conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0 	<p>There were twenty two (22) heath facilities and therefore 22 Officers in-Charge. Out of these 18 were appraised representing 82 % compliance</p> <p>Performance Appraisal Reports of eight (8) School Head Teachers were sampled indicating that performance appraisals were conducted between June and July 2018</p>	4

<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>From the three Health facilities sampled and visited i.e. Ogako HC II, Lukung HC III and Padibe West HC III, the following were the findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the 15 Health workers in Lukung HC III were still working. In Padibe West HC III out of nine staff one absconded and another was dismissed leaving only seven. In Ogako HC II, the two staff members of staff deployed were working. <p>However, overall out 358, only 190 posts were filled representing 53.1% establishment level</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Monitoring and Supervision</p>			
<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 	<p>Guidelines, policy documents and circulars were displayed at the three Health Units visited. They included guidelines on proper use of placenta pit, colour coded bins and safety boxes for sharp medical instruments at the Health Units.</p> <p>At the DHO's Office the guidelines displayed included one on Ionized Preventive Therapy in Uganda-June 2014, which is still relevant</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/MHO has held meetings with health facility in- charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	<p>No evidence of meetings held by DHO to explain the Government guidelines, policies and circulars to in-charges of healthy units.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: score 3</p>	<p>In DHO's office, 3 reports on support supervision for Padibe HC IV and Madi Opei HC IV were seen dated 3rd December 2017, 10th January 2018 and 5th July 2018.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% supervised: score 3 • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60% - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0 	<p>Only evidence of dates of visits by HSD was seen in the supervision books. No supervision reports were availed to the assessment Team.</p> <p>However, scanty hand written information captured in a counter book by the HSD regarding staff welfare, time keeping and absenteeism were presented as evidence of supervision in FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	<p>The scanty information obtained from the supervision book indicated that issues like staff welfare, absenteeism and timekeeping were discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective action like disciplinary action against errant health staff.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 	<p>The only corrective action taken was introduction of attendance books in health facilities like Lukung HC III and Padibe HC III by the HSD to monitor arrival and departure time by health workers.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10 	<p>The current lists - both at Ministry of Health and at the DHO' office - indicate that they were 27 health facilities but later on the DHO physically counted and established that 4 were closed due to lack of resources like human resource and materials.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>The Health, Education, and Community Based Services Committee was in place. However, no minutes of any meetings held were presented.</p>	<p>0</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>There was no evidence during assessment that the sector committee responsible for health had presented issues that required approval to Council.</p>	<p>0</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>The assessment team Visited 4 health facilities namely Agoro HC III, Parungu HC III, Pawach HC III and Katum HC III which were found to have functional HUMCs.</p> <p>Agoro and Parungu HC III facilities had a 7-man HUMC respectively whereas Pawach and Katum HC II had 6 and 5 members respectively.</p> <p>However, there were no formal minutes of meetings held apart from scanty information in the supervision books majorly regarding supervision.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non- wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 4 	<p>At the 3 sampled health facilities publicised the lists and DHO's there were lists dated July 2017 – June 2018 on notice boards signed by the DHO.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has submitted input to procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2 	<p>The paper work on input to procurement to PDU covering all health sector investments like Rehabilitation of OPD, at Agoro H/C III, Construction of 4-stance latrine with washroom at Lokung H/C III, Oral Medicines and Sundries in the Sector annual work plan was seen but no evidence of submission to PDU was availed to the assessment team.</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>No evidence of submission to PDU was availed to the assessment Team .</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>There was evidence that the Health department had certified and initiated payment for supplies on time as per sampled transactions below: -</p> <p>Health Sector:</p> <p>M/s Giant Plum Enterprises (U) Ltd request for payment for construction of OPD at Agoro Health Centre III in Agoro Sub-county for Shs. 29,726,000 dated 28/06/2018 was certified on 29/6/2018 (Certificate No. 001) and was paid on 29/6/2018 against payment Voucher No. 20/6/18 within only 1 day</p> <p>M/s Pit Tek Construction Company Ltd request for payment for construction of a 4-stance Drainable Latrine at Lokung Health Centre III in Lamwo TC For Shs. 14,138,709 was certified on 29/6/2018 (Certificate No. 001) and was paid on 29/6/2018 against Payment Voucher No. 26/6/18 within a day.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	<p>The DHO submitted the annual performance report for t FY 2017/2018 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner on 8th July 2018 (as per Email from the PBS – Re: Reg. Head of Department Validation’ dated 8th July 2018 alerting the Planner / Lamwo DLG about the submission by the DHO)</p> <p>The submission was made before the 15th of July 2018</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If sector has no audit query: Score 4 • If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: Score 2 points • If all queries are not responded to Score 0 	<p>The sector provided information on the action on queries raised by the District Internal Auditor during FY 2017/2018 where one query was raised but was not yet cleared.</p> <p>The query raised was the Sector's failure to submit their books for audit.:</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30 % women: score 2 	<p>The following 4 sampled health facilities had HUMCs in place with composition as per guidelines as follows:</p> <p>Agoro HC III with 7 members of which 3 were female representing 42% and 4 men.</p> <p>Parungu HC III with 7 members of which were female representing 42% and 4 men.</p> <p>Pawach HC III with 6 members of which 2 were female representing 30% and 4 male.</p> <p>Katum HC III with 5 members of which 2 were female representing 40% and 3 male.</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>At the three sampled health facilities i.e. Padibe West HC III, Ogako HCII and Lukung HC III there were posters on how to manage health waste using the 4 coded bins.</p> <p>How to manage domestic waste by using pits.</p> <p>Pit latrines were clearly marked for gents and ladies by use of diagrams and writing in vernacular like MONI</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 2 	<p>Information got from Environmental officer revealed that Environmental screening was done for only the borehole projects. there were no environment screening forms for the health projects.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 2 	<p>There was no evidence that visits were conducted by the Environment Officer and the CDO to the health project sites.</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>Guidelines seen displayed at the three Health Units visited included proper use of placenta pit, colour coded bins, Safety boxes for sharps at the Health Units.</p>	<p>4</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the district Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below average coverage: score 10 o If 80-99%: Score 7 o If 60-79: Score 4 o If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>The District safe water coverage was found to be at 95% and all the sub counties have safe water coverage of 95%. However DWO informed the assessment team that since all sub counties were covered to the district average, now they consider functionality during allocation. The district functionality average was at 79% and sub counties which were below functionality average and had been considered for allocation of a Deep borehole each in the current FY are;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agoro – 65% 2. Lokung – 76% 3. Padibe West – 78% 4. Madiopei – 64% <p>Reference: AWP and Budget 2018/19</p>	10
<p>The district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Score 15 o If 80-99%: Score 10 o If 60-79: Score 5 o If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>The district water department had budgeted for construction of 8No_ deep boreholes in the 8 sub counties with safe water coverage below the functionality average in the previous financial year 2017/2018 and have all been implemented according to the Annual progress reports 2017/2018. However one sub county Madiopei with 64% functionality was left out during the implementation. The sub counties where these projects have been implemented are: Lokung, Padibe east, Padibe west, Palabek gem, Palabek kal, Palabek ogil, Paloga and Agoro. As a result 87.5% is considered.</p>	10

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>A monitoring plan which was part of the AWP 2017/2018 had been established. All 600 boreholes were monitored. Reference to the monitoring report presented to the Assessment team dated 23rd June 2018. Monitoring of all water facilities was conducted by DWSCC to check the status of the facilities and it indicated 600 facilities were functional and 88 facilities were nonfunctional.</p>	<p>15</p>
<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the district has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: Score 5 • List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>MIS reports that were submitted to the MoWE had accurate and consistent data of the Water facilities. And the Performance contract Lamw585/Wrks/22017-18/00001 Lot 1&2 shows the number of water facilities.</p> <p>This was also evidenced by the Invitation to Bid advertisement in the New vision of 11/08/2018.</p>	<p>5</p>

<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>The list of Water facilities presented in MIS at MoWE were consistent with those in the PBS. These included; Lokung- lemur BH, Padibe west-Tadi South BH, Padibe west- Lubiri BH, Palabek Gem- Anaka central BH, Palabek Kal- Pauma west BH, Palabek Ogil- Paracelle BH, Paloga- Bungu BH, Agoro- Lugede BH.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The district Water department has submitted input for district's procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted input for the district procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	<p>The DWO did not submit input for the district procurement plan that covered all investment items in the approved Sector AWP and budget to PDU within the stipulated deadline of 30th April 2018. The submission was made on 2nd July 2018 beyond the stipulated deadline of 30th April 2018 as required. This included Deep Borehole drilling and installation 6No.</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>The DWO had the contract Management Plan incorporated in the contract documents and also it was evidenced from the monitoring Reports for FY 2017/2018 submitted on 23rd June 2018.</p> <p>Contract documents reference; Lamw585/Wrks/17-18/00001 lot 1&2;</p> <p>Monitoring Reports FY 2017/2018</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	<p>All the three sampled WSS facilities were constructed as per designs.</p> <p>The three boreholes sampled are; Padibe East-Tadi south BH, Paloga – Keca Village BH and Parabek gem- Anak BH.</p> <p>Sanitation facilities sampled were; Drainable latrine at Lokung HCIII, 3 Stance Drainable latrine at Lagwel and 3 stance Latrine at Padibe town council</p> <p>This was evidenced from the Drawings, BOQ and specifications from Contract document reference: Lamw585/Wrks/17-18/00001 lot 1&2</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	<p>The contractor technically handed over the 8No-boreholes and they were being used by the community but still under monitoring. DWO informed the assessment team that completion certificates will be issued after monitoring and defects liability period is over. Handover reports were not available at the time of assessment, However Interim certificate No; 2 signed and issued on 29th June 2018 and payment made on 30th June 2018 for the completed projects was available in the DWO files.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2 	<p>The DWO had certified all the payments withholding retention money to be certified at the end of the defects liability period. For example Payment request for construction of Boreholes 4No_ Lot 1 dated 29/6/2018 for Shs. 51,726,690 was certified on 29/6/2018 (Certificate No. 002)</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The district Water department has certified and initiated payment for works and supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<p>There was evidence that the Water department had certified and initiated payment for supplies on time as per sampled transactions below:-</p> <p>·</p> <p>Water Sector :</p> <p>M/s KAL BROS Company Ltd request for payment for supply of Pump Plants for Bore holes and construction materials for Shs. 18,869,097 dated 21/6/2018 was certified on 29/6/2018 (LPO No. 2906, GRN No. 026 dated 18/6/2018 7 21/6/2018 respectively) and was paid on 29/06/2018 against Payment Voucher No. 6/6/18 within 8 days.</p> <p>M/s Ebowa Investments Ltd submitted their payment request for Drilling & Installation of (04) Deep Boreholes Lot 1 dated 29/6/2018 for Shs. 51,726,690 was certified on 29/6/2018 (Certificate No. 002) and was paid on 30/6/2018 against Payment Voucher No. (not indicated on the voucher) within only 1 day.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<p>The district Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	<p>The DWO submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner on 19th July 2018 (as per Email from the PBS – Re: Reg. Head of Department Validation’ dated 19th July 2018 alerting the Planner / Lamwo DLG about the submission by the DWO)</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline of 15th July 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The District Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 5 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 <p>If queries are not responded to score 0</p>	<p>Action on queries raised by the District Internal Auditor during FY 2017/2018 was represented as in the table below.</p> <p>The query raised was the Sector's failure to submit their books for audit.</p> <p>This query had not yet been acted upon by the Accounting Officer as at the time of the assessment</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>The Natural Resources, Production, Marketing, Works and Technical Services Committee was in place. However, no minutes of any meetings held during FY 2017/2018 were presented during assessment.</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>There was no evidence during assessment that the sector committee responsible for water had presented issues that required approval to Council.</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>The DWO presented a file copy of request for transfer of Non-wage recurrent grant to department dated 22nd March 2017 and also a file copy indicating contract reference, contract sum, and contractor, date of display and date of removal was found in the DWO office files. DWO explained that due to limited space on the District notice boards, they display the information for limited period and removed to create space for display of other information. The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures had not been displayed on the district notice boards and no file copy was presented to the Assessment team.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2 	<p>Three WSS projects were sampled during the site visit and only one was found to be clearly labelled as required. The following boreholes with their respective numbers were visited:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deep Borehole at Padibe East- Tadi south marked DWD 64354 2. Deep Borehole at Pagola- Keca Village marked DWD 64355. 3. Deep Borehole at Palabek Ogili- Mudu North West marked DWD64353 <p>Out of the three projects sampled, only one at Keca Village marked DWD 64355 had labels indicating the name of the project, Date of Construction, the Contractor;'s name and source of funding.</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>A file copy indicating contract reference numbers, contract sum, and contractor, Date of display and date of removal was presented to the assessment team. Information given by the DWO was that due to limited space at the Notice boards, documents are displayed for a limited time, and then later removed to create space for other displays.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If communities apply for water/ public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	<p>Sub counties had applied for water and sanitation facilities on the behalf of the community and all applications were received and filed by DWO.</p> <p>This was also evidenced by filed land offer agreements made between some members of the community and the district.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water and Sanitation Committees that are functioning evidenced by either: i) collection of O&M funds, ii(carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, iii) facility fenced/protected, or iv) they an M&E plan for the previous FY: score 2 <p>Note: One of parameters above is sufficient for the score.</p>	<p>From the Sampled water facilities, it was observed that WSCs were functional as evidenced by O&M fund collection registers and well maintained and fenced water facilities.</p> <p>Sampled WSS projects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Deep Borehole at Padibe East- Tadi south marked DWD 64354 Deep Borehole at Pagola- Keca Village marked DWD 64355 Deep Borehole at Palabek Ogili- Mudu North West marked DWD64353 	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			

<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	<p>All the projects had Environmental Screening reports as per templates. For example the Environmental screening for Drilling of deep bore hole at Tadi south in Padibe East Subcounty and Drilling of borehole at Keca Village in Paloga Subcounty which were done on 22/05/2018 and 23/05/2018 respectively.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1 	<p>There were no unacceptable environmental concerns from the previous FY</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	<p>There was a clause on Environmental protection of the sites in the Contract documents presented by the Environmental Officer with procurement reference; Lamw585/Wrks/17-18/00001 lot 1&2 for the construction and drilling of 8No deep boreholes divided into two lots of 4No boreholes each.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The district Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If at least 50% WSCs are women and at least one occupying a key position (chairperson, secretary or Treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements: score 3 	<p>From the sampled WSS facilities, Gender Equity in WSCs had been followed with at least 50% of the WSC membership being female.</p> <p>The sampled WSS facilities with their respective membership composition were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deep Borehole at Padibe East- Tadi south marked DWD 64354, Membership composition was 9 members with 6 female members occupying the positions of Chairperson, Vice chairperson and Treasurer. 2. Deep Borehole at Pagola- Keca Village marked DWD 64355, Membership composition was 9 members with 7 female members occupying the positions of Chairperson, Vice chairperson, secretary and Treasurer. 3. Deep Borehole at Palabek Ogili- Mudu North west marked DWD64353, Membership composition was 11 members with 8 female members occupying the positions of Vice chairperson, secretary, Treasurer and caretaker. 	<p>3</p>
<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/</p> <p>RGCs provided by the Water Department.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3 	<p>The Sampled public sanitation facilities were found to be having separate stances for women and men, ramps and provision for PWDs.</p> <p>The sampled Sanitation facilities include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 4 stance Drainable latrine at Lokung HCIII- Lamwo town council 2. 3 Stance Drainable Latrine with a washroom at Lagwel trading Centre Padibe West S/C 3. 3 Stance Latrine at Padibe Town council 	<p>3</p>