



Local Government Performance Assessment

Nakapiripirit District

(Vote Code: 543)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	50%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	63%
Educational Performance Measures	53%
Health Performance Measures	82%
Water Performance Measures	70%

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>Nakapiripirit District Local Government submitted the Final Performance Contract on 1st August 2018 and approved on 2nd August 2018 as per the submission schedule of MoFPED, which was 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 revised 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>Nakapiripirit District Local Government submitted a Budget for FY 2018/2019; including a Procurement Plan for FY 2018/2019 on the 1st August 2018 as per the submission schedule of MoFPED. The District Council approved the Budget under Min. 4/NDLC/5/2018 during the Council meeting held on 30th May 2018.</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 as required.</p> <p>Note: The PFMAA LG Budget Guidelines require the submission to be by 30th June. However, this date was revised to 1st August 2018 as per the request from MoFPED.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports</p>			
<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted report to MoFPED in time, then it is compliant • If LG submitted late or did not submit, then it is not compliant 	<p>The Annual Budget Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 was submitted on 19th August 2018 (as per computer-generated date on the Q4 report submitted to MoFPED). Nakapiripirit DLG was missing on the MoFPED Submission Schedule.</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline of 31st July 2018</p>	<p>No</p>

<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY by end of the FY; PFMA Act, 2015).</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/ inventory of LG submission of quarterly reports submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the quarterly performance reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted all four reports to MoFPED of the previous FY by July 31, then it is compliant (timely submission of each quarterly report, is not an accountability requirement, but by end of the FY, all quarterly reports should be available). • If LG submitted late or did not submit at all, then it is not compliant. 	<p>All the four Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for Nakapiripirit DLG for FY 2017/2018 were submitted to MoFPED as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter One Report was submitted on 11th December 2017 to MoFPED and approved on 25th February 2018 (as per Submission Schedule of MoFPED). • Quarter Two Report was submitted on 21st March 2018 to MoFPED and approved on 22nd March 2018 (as per Submission Schedule of MoFPED). • Quarter Three Report was submitted on 1st August 2018 to MoFPED (as per computer-generated date on the Q3 report submitted to MoFPED). Nakapiripirit DLG was missing on the MoFPED Submission Schedule. • Quarter Four Report was submitted on 19th August 2018 to MoFPED (as per computer-generated date on the Q4 report submitted to MoFPED). Nakapiripirit DLG was missing on the MoFPED Submission Schedule. <p>The reports for quarters one and two were submitted by the 31st of July 2018 - PFMA Act, 2015 – Section 21 (3). However, the reports for quarters three and four were submitted after the deadline of 31st July 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</p>	<p>From MoFPED's Inventory/record of LG submissions of statements entitled</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Accounting Officer submitted to the PS/ST information regarding the status of</p>	<p>No</p>

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.

“Actions to Address Internal Auditor General’s findings”,

Check:

- 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.

implementation of all the 4 Internal Auditor General’s findings in FY/ 2016/2017 on 10th/11/2017 Ref. CR/103/4 within the recommended time limit of 28th/2/2018.

The 4 Internal Auditor General’s queries were:

Unaccounted for funds – Shs. 26,126,649.

Lack of financial records for 1st quarter in FY 2016/2017.

Fixed Assets Management.

Lack of books of accounts like Ledgers, Abstracts and Vote books.

In addition, the Accounting Officer submitted to PS/ST information regarding the status of implementation of 4 queries raised by the OAG for FY 2016/2017 on 26th/3/2018 Ref: CR/251/1 later than the recommended date of 28th February 2018 contrary to the provisions of the PFMA 2015 section 11 2g.

Notably, the Accounting Officer received the PS/ST letter on OAG’s queries for FY 2016/2017 on 16th/3/2018 which was already past the deadline for submission of responses.

The 4 OAG’s queries were:

Utilization of Mechanics and Health Supplies.

Under collection of Shs. 135,063,211.

Low Recovery of YLP funds – only 18% recovered.

Non- Disposal of Assets.

The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.

Nakapiripirit DLG obtained Unqualified Audit Opinion for FY 2017/2018.

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>CAO appointed members to the DPPC as per letter Ref: CR/214 dated 17th December 2012.</p> <p>The DPPC was functional and discussed pertinent issues such as during the meetings held on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13th May 2018: Min. 04/DPPC/05/2018 – Presentation of the Proposed Fees to be Paid by the Developers to the District before Approval by the DPPC; Min. 05/DPPC/05/2018 – Development Control in the District; and Min. 06/DPPC/05/2018 – Approval of land applications for Resilience Projects in the selected Sub-Counties. • 13th March 2018: Min. 04/DPPC/03/2018 – Presentation of the building plans of ATC (Telecommunication Mast) for Naturum Site and Approval. • 28th August 2017: Min. 04/DPPC/08/2017 – Development Applications for the New Investments in the district (i.e. district investments). <p>There was a record book in which submitted plans were recorded. It was established that the district new investments were submitted to the committee for consideration on 10th August 2018; and were subsequently approved on 28th August 2018.</p> <p>This approval was within the mandatory duration of approval (i.e. within 30 days after the submission).</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that district/MLG has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD score 1. 	<p>The CAO shared four sets of minutes of the DPPC meetings with the PS / MoLHUD as letter (Ref: CR/239/2 dated 10th July 2018). The minutes shared were for the meetings held on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18th May 2018 • 13th March 2018 • 23rd November 2017 • 28th August 2017 	<p>1</p>
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All infrastructure investments are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan: score 1 or else 0 	<p>The district did not have a Physical Development Plan due to inadequate resources from locally raised revenue (LRR).</p> <p>Therefore, it was not possible to ascertain any consistency of the infrastructure investments with the District Physical Development Plan.</p> <p>NB: It was noted that the district included in its AWP for FY 2018/2019 preparation of the District Physical Development Plan. Furthermore, the district was writing a proposal to be considered for funding by GIZ.</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>During FY 2017/2018, with the support of Water Aid Uganda, the district started preparation of an Action area plan for Namalu Town Board. The stated plan duration was 20018 – 2028.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2. 	<p>The priorities in the Nakapiripirit DLG AWP for FY 2018/2019 were based on the outcomes of budget conference held on 15th November 2017.</p> <p>For example, under:</p> <p>Water: ‘Construction of 1 public latrine in RGCs and public places in Tokoma, Kakomongole Sub-county.’ (Page 67 of AWP for FY 2018/2019) and Budget Conference Report – Section 3.1.7.2 Water and Sanitation: ‘Pit latrine construction in Namalu and Kakomongole \sub-counties’</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 Nakapiripirit Approved Second District Development Plan (2015/2016 – 2019/2020).</p> <p>For instance, under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production and Marketing: ‘Rehabilitation of Cattle Dip in Kagata Village, Lokatapan Parish, Namalu Sub-county’ in AWP for FY 2018/2019 – Vote 543 (Page 43) and ‘Establishment and Update of Livestock Infrastructure’ in the DDP (Appendices: Production and Marketing Five-Year Annualised Work Plan – Page 215). • Water: ‘Construction of 11 Public Latrines in RGCs and Public Places in Loregae, Kakomongole Sub-County’ in AWP for FY 2018/2019 (Page 67) and ‘Construction of ECOSAN Latrines in RGCs’ in the DDP (Appendices: Works and Technical Services Department Five-Year Annualised Work Plan – Page 244). 	1
<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 2. 	<p>No evidence was availed to ascertain whether project profiles were developed and discussed by the DTPC for all investments in the AWP for 2018/2019 as per LG Planning Guidelines (NPA, April 2014).</p>	0

<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual statistical abstract, with gender- disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum score 1. 	<p>The Annual Statistical Abstract 2017/2018 had been compiled and presented to the DTPC to support budget allocation and decision-making. The DTPC meeting was held on 5th November 2017 (Min. 04/NOVEMBER/DTPCNLG/2017/2018 – Review and Approval of the Statistical Abstract).</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2 	<p>The infrastructure projects implemented during FY 2017/2018 (as indicated in the Local Government Quarterly Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 (Vote 543 – Quarter 4), were derived from the Annual Work Plan and Budget Estimates for FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>For instance, under:</p> <p>Education: 'Construction of a 3-stance latrine with a urinal at Lolele' (LG Quarter 4 Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 – Vote 543 Nakapiripirit - Page 69), and '2 (Construction of a three-stance pit latrine with a urinal at Lolele Primary School and a 2-stance latrine with a urinal at Kosike Primary School)' (Nakapiripirit DLG AWP and Budget – Page 58).</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>From the Nakapiripirit District Contracts Register for FY 2017/2018, 68 investment projects were undertaken. The projects were all indicated as completed by 30th June 2018.</p> <p>The examples of completed projects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of two-classroom block up to window level in Moruita Primary School – Contract No. Nakp543/Wrks/16-17/00014. Completion of maternity ward at Nayonai – Angikaalio HC II - Contract No. Nakp543/Wrks/17-18/00001. 	<p>4</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 five investment projects sampled were completed within the approved budget – their total budget was UGX 220,597,000 and the expenditure was UGX 195,130,956. This expenditure was 88.5% of the total budget.</p> <p>The projects were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of two-classroom block up to window level in Moruita Primary School (Contract No. Nakp543/Wrks/16-17/00014) with a budget of UGX 70,067,000 and expenditure of UGX 60,068,075. • Construction of General ward at Nakapiripirit HC IV (Contract No. Nakp543/Wrks/17-18/00005) with a budget of UGX 92,001,000 and expenditure of UGX 88,473,957. • Construction of a three-stance drainable pit latrine with a urinal at Lolele Primary School - Contract No. Nakp543/Wrks/17-18/00012.with a budget of UGX 22,000,000 and expenditure of UGX 14,048,000. • Construction of administration block (Contract No. Nakp543/Wrks/17-18/00029) with a budget of UGX 30,511,000 and expenditure of UGX 27,418,750. • Construction of two bathing shelters at Tokora HC IV (Contract No. Nakp543/Wrks/16-17/00022) with a budget of UGX 6,018,000 and expenditure of UGX 27,418,750. 	2
<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	<p>For O&M of infrastructure during FY 2017/2018, the district budgeted UGX 21,489,000 and spent UGX 4,660.000. This expenditure was 21.7% of the total budget as per Draft Final Accounts for the Year Ended 30th June 2018 (NOT page numbered BUT coded - GL Account Nos. 228004 & GL Account Name: Maintenance – Other).and Nakapiripirit DLG Budget,</p>	0
Human Resource Management			

<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3 	<p>There were 10 HoD at U1 salary scale in the approved establishment / organisation structure. Four (4) were substantively appointed as per their appointment letters;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. D/CAO - LG/P. 10673 dated 12th June 2017 2. CFO - CR/156/2 dated 1st October 2005 3. D/Engineer - CR/156/2 dated 1st September 2005 4. DHO- CR/160/1 20th March 2008 <p>Six (6) were performing duties of HoD as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Duties of the D/NRO were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Environment Officer (U4S) as per the appointment letter, CR/156/2 31st July 2017 6. Duties of the District Community Development Officer were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Probation and Welfare Officer as per the appointment letter, CR/156/2 15th June 2009 7. Duties of the District Commercial Officer were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Assistant Commercial Officer as per the appointment letter, CR/160/1 dated 17th August 2009 8. Duties of the DEO were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Education Officer (U4) as per the appointment letter, CR/169/1 dated 12th December 2003 9. The duties of the D/ Planner were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Bio-Statistician (U4S) as per the appointment letter, CR/156/2 dated 17th August 2009. 10. The duties of the D/ Production Officer were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Agriculture Officer (U3S) as per the appointment letter, CR/160/1 dated 31st July 2017 	<p>0</p>
---	---	---	----------

<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>There was evidence that all ten HoD were appraised on the following dates as per appraisal reports seen:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. D/CAO – 20th July 2018 2. CFO – 16th July 2018 3. D/Planner – 2nd July 2018 4. D/Engineer – 4th July 2018 5. DEO – 26th July 2018 6. D/CDO – 1st July 2018 7. D/NRO – 10th September 2018 8. D/PO – 1st July 2018 9. D/Commercial Officer – 30th June 2018 10. DHO – 1st July 2018 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 % of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	<p>One (1) position of an Enrolled Midwife was submitted to the DSC for recruitment as per the submission letter dated 27th April 2018 and recruitment/appointment letter CR239/2 dated 15th May 2018</p> <p>There was evidence that the submission was considered during DSC meetings of 37th and 38th DSC meetings of 20th May and 2nd April 2018, as per minute number CR/156/2 dd.25/04/2018, DSC/156/4</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>There were no submissions for confirmation of appointments</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	<p>There were no submissions for disciplinary action cases</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>Two (2) new employees were appointed and recruited into the district service during the month of June 2018, as per their respective appointment letter as follows,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Enrolled Midwife, Awili Bettry Bella - CR/115/4 dated 1st June 2018 Enrolled Midwife, Loger Betty - CR/115/4 dated 1st June 2018 as well as their acceptance letters dated 3rd and 4th June respectively <p>There was evidence that they accessed the payroll as per June 2018 IPPS payroll identification numbers seen as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Awili Betty Bella No. 986272 Loger Betty No. 986346 	<p>3</p>
<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2 	<p>There were no submissions for retirement</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Revenue Mobilization</p>			

<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •• If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets) from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10 %: score 4. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 2. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>OSR collected in FY 2016/2017 (excluding sale of assets) was Shs. 135,063,211 whereas OSR collected in FY 2017/2018 was Shs. 131,067,377 which resulted into a decrease of Shs. 3,995,834 as per the LG's Final Accounts for FY 2016/2017- page No.14 and Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/2018- page No. 20.</p> <p>The percentage decrease was: -3%</p> <p>Workings:</p> $3,995,834/135,063,211 \times 100 = -3\%$ <p>This decrease which contravened the PFMA 2015 Section 45 (3) was attributed to the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quarantine on livestock in the District markets of Namalu, Loregai and Lolachat which prevailed for 8 months from August 2017 to March 2018 grossly affected the revenue collection in FY 2017/2018. <p>Low LST from private firms as most NGOs left the District in FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
--	--	---	----------

<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0. 	<p>Original budget for local revenue in FY 2017/2018 was Shs. 176,044,000 (page 8) against which Shs. 131,067,377 was collected representing a budget out-turn of 74.5% as per the Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/2018- page No.20.</p> <p>Therefore the LG budget realization was 25.5% below the planned local revenue for FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>Workings:</p> $131,067,377/176,044,000 \times 100 = 74.5\%$ <p>Therefore the Budget ratio/budget realization was: $100\% - 74.5\% = 25.5\%$</p> <p>This Budget ratio/budget realization which was not in conformity with the LGFAR 2007 section 32 was attributed to the following factor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quarantine on live stock in the District markets of Namalu, Loregai and Lolachat which prevailed for 8 months from August 2017 to March 2018 grossly affected the revenue collection in FY 2017/2018. • Low LST from private firms as most NGOs left the District in FY 2017/2018. 	<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>The District collected Shs. 35,295,250 in FY 2017/2018 in respect of Local Service Tax.</p> <p>Source: Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/2018- page No. 28.</p> <p>However, the District did not transfer any money to LLGs contrary to LGA Cap 243 as amended, Regulation 85 (4).</p> <p>NOTE: CFO wrote to CAO on 28th/2/2018 Ref. CR/104/1 entitled "Submission of the District Local Revenue Returns for the period 1st July 2017 – 28th/2/2018" indicating that no Sub-county had remitted the 35% of the required collections to the District, thus explaining why the District could not release the 65% of the LST for the FY 2017/2018 to Sub-counties in accordance with the provisions of the LGA Cap 243 as amended 85 (3).</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>Actual local revenue collected in FY 2016/2017 was Shs. 135,063,211 of which 20% equivalent to Shs. 27,012,642 was supposed to be the maximum expenditure for Council emoluments and allowances in FY 2017/2018. Source: Final Accounts for FY 2016/2017- page No.14.</p> <p>However, actual expenditure on Council emoluments and allowances in FY 2017/2018 was Shs.51, 671,000 representing 38% above the recommended 20% contrary to the 1st Schedule Regulation 4 of the LGA Cap 243 as amended.</p> <p>Source: Draft Final Accounts FY 2017/2018- pages 91 & 92.</p> <p>.There was no evidence of authority sought and granted by the Minister of Local Government to spend beyond the maximum of 20% on Council emoluments and allowances in FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>Workings: $51,671,000/135,063,211 \times 100 = 38\%$</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 district had no Senior Procurement Officer. Duties were performed by a Procurement Officer as per his appointment letter CR/156/2 dated 15th August 2008</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 LG TEC carried out the evaluation of procurement items under open on 10th October 2017 and evaluated those under selective bidding on 19th March 2018 and submitted the report to the LG Contracts Committee. The evaluated projects under open bidding included among others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of walling of a new administration block at district headquarters, • Construction of a General ward at Nakapiripirit HC III. <p>The projects under selective bidding included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehabilitation of a cattle dip at Kagata. • Completion of a two-classroom block at Moruita primary school • Construction of 3 stances drainable pit latrine with urinal at Kosike primary school. 	1
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	<p>The Contracts Committee awarded contracts for projects in 2017/18 FY guided by the recommendations of TEC. The Contracts Committee for example in a meeting held on 6th November 2017 under min.26/11/CC/17-18 awarded projects under open bidding and on 6th April under minute number 69/4/CC/17-18 awarded contracts under selective bidding.</p>	1
<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2 	<p>The District procurement and Disposal plan for 2019/18 covered all the infrastructure projects as in the approved district annual work plan for example the following infrastructure projects were included; Construction of 3 production wells, Drilling of 6 deep boreholes, Renovation of district water office, Completion of a general ward at Nakapiripirit HC III, Construction of teachers' house at Lemusui primary school and Construction of teacher's house at Amaler primary school.</p> <p>The LG made procurements for 2017/18 FY in adherence to the procurement plan.</p>	2

<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 LG prepared bid documents for infrastructure/investment projects for 2018/2019 FY. The bid notice was advertised in the New vision of 20th July 2018 for open bidding and prequalification</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 LG did not have an updated Contract register as the provided Contract register did not have detailed information contract payments and outstanding balances.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	<p>The LG has adhered with procurement thresholds for the projects implemented in 2017/18 FY. The projects worth 50 million and above were awarded under open bidding and those below 50m were awarded through Selective domestic bidding. This was evidenced through the following awarded projects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NAKP543/WRKS/17-18/00004 Completion of walling of a new administration block at district headquarters worth 60,094,535 (open bidding) 2. NAKP543/WRKS/17-18/00005 Construction of a General ward at Nakapiripirit HC III worth 88,473,957 (open bidding). 3. NAKP543/WRKS/17-18/00021 Rehabilitation of a cattle dip at Kagata worth 27,898,327 (selective bidding) 4. NAKP543/WRKS/17-18/00031 Completion of a two-classroom block at Moruita primary school worth 19,001,400 (selective bidding) 5. NAKP543/WRKS/17-18/00022 Construction of 3 stances drainable pit latrine with urinal at Kosike primary school worth 15,695,826 (selective bidding). 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates <p>for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</p>	<p>The works projects implemented in 2017/18 were appropriately certified with certificates of completion and interim certificates as indicated below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of walling of a new administration block at district headquarters was issued 2 interim certificates on 18/2/18 and 9/5/18, • Construction of a General ward at Nakapiripirit HC III issued 3 interim certificates on 15/5/18, 12/6/18 and 25/6/18. <p>Rehabilitation of a cattle dip at Kagata issued a certificate of completion on 29/6/2018</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of a two classroom block at Moruita primary school issued a certificate of completion on 29/6/2018. • Construction of 3 stances drainable pit latrine with urinal at Kosike primary school issued a certificate of completion on 29/6/2018. 	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2 	<p>There were no projects under implementation in 2018/2019</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management</p>			

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 LG had not yet been rolled on IFMS. It operated 23 Cash books/ Bank Accounts a sample of which were:

- General Fund A/c.
- Accountability A/c.
- Resilience Project A/c.
- NUSAF 3 Operation A/c
- Administration A/c

All the monthly bank reconciliations for FY 2017/2018 were prepared by the respective sector Accountants and approved by the CFO as per sampled June 2018 bank reconciliations below:

- General Fund A/c was reconciled on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per bank statement: 72,725,621 and Balance as per cash book: 294,355.
- NUSAF 3 Operation A/c was reconciled on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per bank statement: 4,930,541 and Balance as per cash book: 17,300,385.
- Resilience A/c was reconciled on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per bank statement was 9,900,481 and balance as per cash book: 7,853,983.
- Administration A/c was reconciled on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per bank statement: 271,996 and Balance as per cash book: 21,900.
- Accountability A/c was reconciled on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per bank statement: 74,020 and balance as per cash book: 99,020.

In addition, July to August FY 2018/2019 bank reconciliations had also been made as evidenced in the 5 sampled cash books as above.

<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2. 	<p>The LG made timely payments to suppliers as evidenced in the sampled payments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M/s Sons of Ngitaruk Enterprises request for payment of Shs. 2,178,027 dated 8th/5/2018 for fencing Moruita HCII recommended for payment on 8th/5/2018 and was paid on 14th/5/2018 vide PV-9/5 within 6 days. • M/s 21st Century Architects request for payment of Shs. 11,668,563 dated 27th/6/2018 for construction of a 2 stance pit latrine in Lolele P/S was recommended for payment on 27th/6/2018 and was paid on 29th/6/2018 vide PV-13/6 within 2 days. • M/s Royal Techno Industries request for payment of Shs. 100,000,000 dated 20th/10/2017 for construction of Lolachat Piped Water Supply System was recommended for payment on 20th/10/2017 and was paid on 25th/10/2017 vide PV-19/10 within 5 days. 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor: 1 point. • LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2. 	<p>The LG had no substantive District Senior Internal Auditor but CAO had assigned a one Ms.Lokunoi Rita (Appointed as Senior Accounts Assistant) as caretaker of Internal Audit Department on 2nd/7/2018 Ref. CR/116/1 copied to Human Resource Officer.</p> <p>The former Head of Internal Audit Department (Kezi Charles Lowot) crossed to the newly created District of Nabilatuk as Head of Finance.</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>All the 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/2018 were prepared and submitted to the relevant authorities as indicated below:</p> <p>Q1: to District Chairperson on 30th/1/2018 Ref. AUD/214/6 copied to CAO, LGPAC among others. (Produced late by the interdicted DIA)</p> <p>Q2: to District Chairperson on 15th/1/2018 Ref. AUD/251/6 copied to CAO, LGPAC among others. (Produced timely by DIA who replaced the interdicted DIA)</p> <p>Q3: to District Chairperson on 16th/4/2018 Ref. AUD/251/6 copied to CAO, LGPAC among others.</p> <p>Q4: to District Chairperson on 30th/7/2018 Ref. AUD/213/1 copied to CAO, LGPAC among others.</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 no evidence availed to the assessment team that the LG had provided information to the Council and LGPAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1. 	<p>The LGPAC did not sit throughout FY 2017/2018 to review the 4 quarterly internal audit reports due to lack of quorum created by the expiry of the term of office for 3 members.</p> <p>The new LGPAC had not yet been reconstituted as at the assessment time.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG maintains an up- dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	<p>The LG only maintained a Register for Fixed Assets – General in conformity with the recommended format but which was messed up by mixing General assets with other assets like Motor vehicles. This section records only assets like Fixtures & fittings, Computers, Photocopiers & their accessories to mention but a few.</p> <p>The other 2 sections of the LG assets register i.e. Motor Vehicles & Heavy Plants and Land & Buildings were not maintained contrary to the provisions of the Local Government Accounting Manual 2007.</p>	0
<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unqualified audit opinion: score 4 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0 	<p>Nakapiripirit DLG obtained Unqualified Audit Opinion for FY 2017/2018.</p>	4
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2 	<p>The District Council met and discussed service delivery related issues as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Min. 4/NDLC/5/2018 – Presentation and Approval of Annual Work Plans and Draft Budget Estimates for FY 2018/2019 for Both Nakapiripirit and Nabilatuk Districts (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 30th May 2018). • Min. 4/NDLC/2018 – Presentation of the Budget Estimates for FY 2018/2019 by the District Chairperson (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 29th March 2018). • Min. 7/NDLC/3/2018 – Presentation of Committee Recommendations / Reports (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 19th March 2018). • Min. /7/NDLG/2018 – Presentation of Committee Recommendations on Reports. (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 18th December 2017). • Min. 6/NDLC/2017 – Appointment of the Members of the District Service Commission (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 12th September 2017). 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/ complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 1. 	<p>The district LG had not designated a person to coordinate response to feedback as well as respond to feedback and complaints.</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 clear system in place for recording, investigating and responding to grievances. There was even no book for recording grievances.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, it was reported that complaints were reported to top leadership of the district (e.g. RDC, District Chairperson, and CAO), who bring them to the attention of responsible officials during appropriate meetings.</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 Pensioners' Schedule for July and August 2018 were displayed at the Notice Board in the Administration Block at Nakapiripirit District Headquarters. The display date was 9th September 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1. 	<p>At the time of assessment the procurement plan or any other procurement information had not been displayed on any notice board at Nakapiripirit District Headquarters.</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>The district Annual Performance Assessment results were disseminated during the DTPC meeting held on 4th September 2018 (as per Min. 3/DTPC/SEPT/FY2018/2019 – Discussion of Preparation for national assessment).</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1 	<p>The CAO communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to lower Local Governments. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter from CAO (Ref: CR/210/9 dated 27th April 2018) to Sub-County Chiefs concerning “Monitoring and Support Supervision on Implementation of Early Childhood Development (ECD) and Nutrition Communication for Development (C4D). • Letter from CAO (Ref: CR/210 dated 25th April 2018) to Sub-county Chiefs and Town Clerk regarding “Presidential Directive on Household Census”. 	<p>1</p>
<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1. 	<p>The district conducted community dialogue meetings / barazas as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Report (October – December 2017) dated 31st January 2018 regarding conduct of community dialogue on GBV (ending FGM, child marriages, and re-entry of child mothers into school). • Report from the Health Inspector ‘Following Sanitation and Hygiene Pre-Triggering Exercise Towards Attainment of Open Defecation Free (ODF) Villages in Loregae and \kakomongole \sub-counties’ as per forwarding letter Ref: CR/106/1 dated 14th April 2018. 	<p>1</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women’s roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG gender focal person and CDO have provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion into their activities score 2. 	<p>The district Gender Focal Person provided guidance and support to sector departments on how to mainstream gender in their activities through conducting gender and equity analysis in all departments from 14th to 16th November 2017 evidenced by a report dated November 2017. the Gender focal person also conducted sensitisation trainings on social safeguard issues (gender, child protection and HIV/AIDS) from July to October as evidenced by an activity report dated October 2017</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the gender focal point and CDO have planned for minimum 2 activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and address vulnerability and social inclusions and that more than 90 % of previous year's budget for gender activities/ vulnerability/ social inclusion has been implemented: score 2. 	<p>The gender focal person and the CDO planned a number of activities according to the 2018/19 work plan to strengthen gender roles and they included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training of LLGs on gender awareness and gender mainstreaming. 2. Supporting UWEP activities. 3. Supporting youth livelihoods (IGAs) groups. <p>This was evidenced by the approved district AWP 2018/2019 page 90.</p> <p>The budget allocated for gender mainstreaming activities in 2017/18 FY was 5,648,000 and was fully implemented. This was evidenced by payment vouchers numbers 3/10, 6/6, 9/6, and 11/6 each worth 912,000 for quarterly women council meetings and voucher 2/3 worth 1000,000 payments for gender mainstreaming activities.</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 the sampled projects. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction of a General ward at Nakapiripirit HC III was screened on 23/12/17. - Rehabilitation of a cattle dip at Kagata was screened on 2/3/18 - Completion of a two-classroom block at Moruita primary school was screened on 16/3/18. - Construction of 3 stances drainable pit latrine with urinal at Kosike primary school was screened on 15/11/17. 	<p>1</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	<p>LG integrated environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents evidenced by provision of budget for environment in the BOQs for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a General ward at Nakapiripirit HC III had a budget of 200,000 for environmental management. • Rehabilitation of a cattle dip at Kagata had a budget of 300,000 • Completion of a two-classroom block at Moruita primary school had a budget of 100,000. • Construction of 3 stances drainable pit latrine with urinal at Kosike primary school had a budget of 200,000. 	<p>1</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1 	<p>The projects sampled were implemented on district owned land for example land where district headquarters are located was surveyed as evidenced payment voucher number 4501 worth 7m payment for surveys and titling of district land. Land agreement for Kosike primary school dated 28/6/18 and kagata dip was located on land owned by ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO: score 1 	<p>The Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form was completed for the sampled completed projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a General ward at Nakapiripirit HC III issued on 31/5/18. • Rehabilitation of a cattle dip at Kagata issued on 29/6/18 • Completion of a two-classroom block at Moruita primary school issued on 29/6/18. • Construction of 3 stances drainable pit latrine with urinal at Kosike primary school issued on 27/6/18. 	<p>1</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance (new one): Score 1 	<p>The contract payments for projects were effected without seeking for any environmental and social clearance as required.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that environmental officer and CDO monthly report, includes a) completed checklists, b) deviations observed with pictures, c) corrective actions taken. Score: 1 	<p>The Environmental officer and the Community Development Officer monitored the projects and wrote reports on 16th may 2018 for education projects and 17th may 2017 for health projects. However there was no evidence that projects implemented by sectors lower other than health and education were visited .</p>	<p>0</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 	<p>The LG Department of Education had 43 governments P/S and a total of 465 teachers.</p> <p>There was evidence that for FY 2018/19, under Vote 543, the LG approved 5,570,558 billion for education department including wages for teachers.</p>	4
<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 	<p>The Staff list obtained indicated that 41 out of 47 schools had at least 7 teachers per school and 1 Head Teacher.</p> <p>These includes:</p> <p>Naweeet P/S, Cucu P/S, Doo P/S, Nokala P/S among others.</p>	0
<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>The LG filled 465 positions of primary school teachers. The department had a ceiling of 511 teachers, thus 90.9% positions were filled.</p>	3

<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	<p>The LG Department of Education had filled 2 positions for Inspector of Schools. The senior inspector of schools position was not duly filled because there was no wage bill.</p> <p>Ms. Amei Alice is the substantively appointed inspector of schools, but also care taking as senior inspector of Schools. And from July when the district was sub divided to create Nabilatok, she had also been acting as DEO.</p> <p>Mr. Lomorgin Joseph is the other inspector of schools.</p> <p>The LG staff structure currently is 3 out of seven staff: 2 Inspector of school and 1 sports officer.</p>	<p>6</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary Teachers: score 2 	<p>The LG did not submit a recruitment plan to HRM for Primary teachers.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Inspectors: score 2 	<p>The LG did not submit a recruitment plan to HRM for the senior inspector of schools. The acting DEO was not in position to explain because she was new in office as acting DEO.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Monitoring and Inspection</p>			

<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% school inspectors: score <p>3</p>	<p>The district had one (1) Inspector of Schools as per the appointment letter CR/160/1 dated 31st July 2017</p> <p>There was evidence that he was appraised as per the appraisal report seen, dated 5th July 2018</p>	<p>3</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.

Maximum 6 for this performance measure

Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY

- Primary school head teachers o 90 - 100%: score 3
- o 70% and 89%: score 2
- o Below 70%: score 0

The district had forty three (43) primary schools and therefore 43 Head Teachers as per the district staff list.

There was evidence that only (14) Head Teachers were appraised as per the appraisal reports seen, representing 33% compliance

The following fourteen (14) Head Teachers' Appraisal Reports and dates of appraisal were seen as follows;

1. Sr. Amule Immaculate, St. Mary's Girls PS – 15th February 2018
2. Aboka Mathew, Napongae PS – 29 January 2018
3. Opio Robert, Okwapon PS – 20th February 2018
4. Asere John Francis, Tokora PS – 20th February 2018
5. Odonge Dorothy Lolelo PS – 22nd January 2018
6. Awas Lino Sam, Nakapiripirit PS – 23rd December 2017
7. Nakiru Leah, Karobe PS – 23rd January 2018
8. Achia Mary Lorol, Lokaala PS – 23rd January 2018
9. Ochen Charles, New Natirae PS – 15th February 2018
10. Okalebo John Robert, Lolachal PS – 15th February 2018
11. Apiot Stella Rose, Nakaale PS – 8th January 2018
12. Yeko Shakiru, Kaiku PS – 8th January 2018
13. Emalingat Richard, Kanomongole PS – 18th January 2018
14. Otai Sam, Morita PS – 18th May 2018

<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1 	<p>The LG received and circulated the following circulars/guidelines and policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On 2/10/2017. The Schools Calendar ref ADM/298/311/01. • Focus of School inspection on 19/7/2017 • Circular no. 14/2016 on school feeding • Guidelines for Registration of students on 20/3/2018. • Enforcing closure of illegal schools on 26/3/2018 ref ADM/104/212/01 • In a letter dated 26/2/2018, the DEO sent out communication to head teachers circular on school inspection focus. 	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 2 	<p>The LG department had a meeting with head teachers to explain the guidelines and circulars disseminated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -on 8/8/2018 meeting with Head teachers on Teachers Time on Task. 43 schools were represented in this meeting. -on 10/11/2017 a dialogue meeting with Head teachers under minutes 4-5 on support supervision tools. 	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all registered primary schools²</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59 % score 1 o Below 50% score 0. 	<p>There was evidence that the LG department of Education inspected schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Term III inspection was done and report dated 4/12/2017. 33 out of 43 schools were inspected between 13-18/11/2017 according to the report. • Term II inspection was done and report written on 8/8/2018. The inspection period was July to August. 33 schools out of 43 were inspected. • Term I inspection was done and reported on 10/5/2018. The inspection period was 4/4-27/4/2018. 40 schools out of 43 were inspected. <p>Thus school inspection for the 3 terms was at 78.5 %, = 6</p>	<p>6</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	<p>There was no evidence that the department had a meeting to discuss the findings of the school inspection report. The sectorial committee also did not meet to discuss the reports of school inspection.</p> <p>The acting DEO referred to informal meeting to discuss inspection reports but did not have any evidence to present because the meetings were not documented.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 	<p>There was evidence that the LG Department of Education submitted School inspection report to DES.</p> <p>The reports were submitted on 8/6/2018 and on 14/09/19, but as accountability document.</p> <p>The matrix of submission obtained from DES did not indicate that the reports were submitted, most likely because the report was submitted as accountability report</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed- up: score 4. 	<p>There was no evidence that the school inspection recommendations from the reports were followed up since there was no discussion of the recommendation.</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>The school list and PBS list provided was not consistent. In fact the School list was done in 2017 in July and the PBS list which the assessment team reviewed was done in December 2017. The lists were compared and did not match.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS: score 5 	<p>The school enrollment list and the PBS generated lists on enrollment reviewed were inconsistent because the school list provided to the assessment team was not the same list from which the PBS list was generated. According to the reviewed enrollment list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kakomongole P/ S list was 533, PBS list was 419. • Nadip P/S school list was 285, PBS was 281. • Nakuri P/S list was 375, PBS was 513. <p>The Acting DEO was not aware of the existence of another PBS list and School list on enrolment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the 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 Works and Education Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 17th May 2018 (under Min. 3/WKEC/2018 – Scrutinizing AWP and Draft Budget Estimates). • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 17th April 2018 (under Min. 4/NDLC/WKE/2018 – Presentation of. Departmental Activity Reports). • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 22nd February 2018 (under Min. 4/WKE – Presentation of. Departmental Activity Reports). • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 23rd August 2017 (under Min. 3/WKRC/2017 – Presentation of. Departmental Activity Reports). 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>The Works and Education Committee presented issues that required approval to Council. This was evidenced from the minutes of the District Council where it was established that the committee had presented its issues during the meetings held on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19th March 2018 (under Min. 7/NDLC/3/2018 – Presentation of Committee Recommendations / Reports. • 18th December 2017 (under Min. /7/NDLG/2018 – Presentation of Committee Recommendations on Reports. 	<p>2</p>

<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO/MEO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80 % schools: score 0 	<p>There was evidence that SMCs in sampled schools were functional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Namoroto P/S SMC meeting was held on 6/6/2018 the Agenda was on Performance improvement of learners. • Napongae P/S SMC meeting was held on 15/3/2018. Agenda 3 b was communication from chairman SMC. • Sakale P/S SMC meeting was held on 3/8/2018. Agenda 3 was communication from SMC chair. • Achegertolim P/S SMC meeting took place on 2/2/2018. • Nakapiripirit P/S SMC meeting was on 16/6/2017 to handle PTA recommendations. 	<p>5</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants <p>e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</p>	<p>There was no evidence on the notice board at the LG publicised the list of schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants. The acting DEO informed the assessment team that they did not put up the list.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The LG Education department has submitted input into the LG procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to the Procurement Unit that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	<p>The procurement input dated 2/8/2017 was submitted to PDU before 30th /4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a 2 classroom block at Morita P/S • Renovation of a 2 classroom block at Nakaale P/S. • Construction of a 2 stance drainable latrine in Kosike P/S & Lolele P/S. • Construction of a teachers house at Natirae P/S. 	<p>4</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3. 	<p>The LG Education department had timely certified and recommended suppliers for payment as per the sampled payments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M/s 21st Century Architects request for payment of Shs. 11,668,563 dated 27th/6/2018 for construction of a 2 stance pit latrine in Lolele P/S was certified under certificate No. 1 dated 27th/1/2018, recommended for payment on 27th/6/2018 and was paid on 29th/6/2018 vide PV-13/6 within 2 days. • M/s Galaxy General Suppliers & Contractors request for payment of Shs. 29,280,060 dated 28th/6/2018 for construction of a teachers house in Natirae P/S was certified under certificate No. 2 dated 28th/6/2018, recommended for payment on 28th/6/2018 and was paid on 28th/6/2018 vide PV-15/6 within 1 day. • M/s Ikay Technologies Ltd request for payment of Shs. 4,126,280 dated 28th/6/2018 for completion of a 2 classroom block & Office at Lokadwaran P/S was certified under certificate No. 4 dated 18th/4/2018, recommended for payment on 18th/4/2018 and was paid on 29th/6/2018 vide PV-26/6 within 1 day. 	<p>3</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15th of July for consolidation: score 4 	<p>The Education department submitted the annual performance report for the FY 2017/2018 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner on 2nd August 2018 (as per Email from the PBS – Re: Reg. Head of Department Validation’ dated 2nd August 2018 alerting the Planner / Nakapiripirit DLG about the submission by the Department)</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline of 15th July 2018.</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If sector has no audit query score 4 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 o If all queries are not responded to score 0 	<p>The LG Education department had 1 internal audit query raised in 4th quarter FY 2017/2018 but which had been cleared by the District Education Officer as per his response letter to CAO dated 27th/8/2018 Ref. CR/251/6.</p> <p>This query was : Unaccounted for funds totalling to Shs. 2,476,000</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills, etc.: Score 2 	<p>On 25/4/2018 a training for teachers on gender responsive pedagogy and menstrual hygiene management was done for 43 school teachers.</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 no evidence that the LG in collaboration with gender department issued and explained guidelines on sanitation for girls and PWD in P/S.</p> <p>The acting DEO said there was training but did not provide any hard evidence as proof</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	<p>There was evidence from some of the sampled and visited schools that SMCs' met the gender requirement.</p> <p>The 5 sampled schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Namoroto P/S had 5 female members out of 12 members • Nakapiripirit P/S had 5 female members out of 12. • Napiananga P/S had 3 female members out of 10. • Lolachat P/S had 4 female members out of 13 • Tokora P/S had 3 female members out of 13. 	<p>1</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide- lines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 1: 	<p>There was no evidence of dissemination of the environment guidelines in schools by the environment officer.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide- lines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 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 were no screening forms to indicate that education projects were subjected to environment screening before execution.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide- lines on environmental management are dissemi- nated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1 	<p>A teacher's house in Natirae was visited and a site visit report written on 20/7/2018.</p>	<p>1</p>
--	---	---	----------

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health care workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health care with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 80% filled: score 8 • 60 – 80% - score 4 • Less than 60% filled: score 0 	<p>The LG Health department had filled the structure for health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage FY 2018/2019 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of 257 health staff establishment for Nakapiripirit LG as per the PHC staff structure for 2018/2019, 163 had been filled representing 63% whereas 94 were not filled representing 37%. 	4
<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan for primary health care workers to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/re- quest to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of primary health care workers: score 6</p>	<p>The LG Health department had submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to HRM for FY 2018/2019 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A letter dated 10th/9/2018 Ref. HEA/156/2 from DHO to the CAO titled “Submission of Existing Vacancies for Replacement” was submitted awaiting response. 	6

<p>The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital In-charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0 	<p>The district had seven (7) health facilities and therefore 7 Officers in Charge of health facilities as follows;</p> <p>Health Centre IV 1</p> <p>Health Centre IIIs 3</p> <p>Health Centre IIs 3</p> <p>There was evidence that all seven Officers in Charge of Health Centres were appraised as per the appraisal reports seen, representing 100% compliance</p> <p>The 7 appraisal reports of Officers in Charge were checked to establish the dates of their appraisals as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chasma Boniface, Nursing Assistant, Nobuleger HC II – 20th August 2018 2. Gimono M. Dunya, Enrolled Nurse Nakapiripirit HC III – 25th June 2018 3. Adoch Caroline Sen. Nursing Officer, Nabilatuk HC II – 31st July 2018 4. Lokwang Peter, Sen. Medical Officer, Tokora HC IV – 30th June 2018 5. Pifua Josephine Enrolled Midwife, Marita HC II 20th August 22918 6. Akello Alice Nursing Officer, Namalu HC III 31st July 2018 7. Cherungoi, Enrolled Nurse, Lemusui HC III – 26th June 22018
---	--	---

<p>The Local Government Health department has deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY, and if not provided justification for deviations: score 4 	<p>The LG Health department had deployed health workers in line with the list submitted with the budget for FY 2018/2019 as indicated in the 5 sampled health facilities below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Nakapiripirit HC III Approved 19 and filled 12. 2) 407 Brigade HC III Approved 19 and filled 7 3) Karinga HC II (PNFP) Approved 9 and filled 8. 4) Moruita HC II Approved 9 and filled 4 5) Tokora HC IV Approved 48 and filled 31. 	<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>The DHO had communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by MoH in FY 2017/2018 to health facilities as evidenced in the 5 sampled health facilities.</p> <p>The communication by DHO on 28th/2/2018 to health facilities was on the following Guidelines, policies and circulars:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidelines for HIV/AIDS Coordination of Decentralized levels in Uganda (No date). Health Management Information Systems and Health Unit Data Base – 2010. Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for Health Services – 2010/11 – 2014/15. Readiness Assessment Report for Addressing Gender Based Violence in Uganda – 2011. Uganda National Guidelines for HIV Counselling and Testing. 	<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>The DHO held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by national level as evidenced in the 5 sampled health facilities.</p> <p>At the 5 visited health facilities namely: Nakapiripirit HCIII, Moruita HCII, Karinga HCII, 407 Brigade HCIII, the in-charges were explained on 13th/9/2017 and at Tokora HCIV: the in-charge was met on 14th/9/2017.</p> <p>The following were explained to the in-charges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MOH Guidelines for Regional Referral Hospital Management – 2016. Uganda Clinical Guidelines – 2016. Uganda Public Health Service 1st Edition – 2014. Health Sector Police Statement FY 2013/2014. Local Government Performance Assessment Manual – June 2018 among others. 	<p>3</p>
<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: score 3</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DHT had supervised Tokora HCIV as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q1: on 5th/7/2017. Q2: on 27th/10/2017. Q3: on 28th/2/2018. Q4: on 31st/5/2018. 	<p>3</p>

<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DHT had supervised lower level health facilities in FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:</p>
<p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</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>Q1 supervision was conducted in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nakapiripirit HCIII, 407 Brigade HCIII, Moruinga HCII, Karinga HCII on 13th/9/2017 representing 100%. <p>Q2 supervision was conducted in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nakapiripirit HCIII, 407 Brigade HCIII, Moruinga HCII, Karinga HCII on 13th/12/2017 representing 100%. <p>Q3 supervision was conducted in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nakapiripirit HCIII, 407 Brigade HCIII, Moruinga HCII, Karinga HCII from 22nd/3-3rd/6/2018 representing 100%. <p>Q4 supervision was specifically for VIRAL LOAD. A total of 18 health facilities were supervised from 11th - 24th/6/2018. Representing 100%</p> <p>Note: Tokora HCIV formed a HSD which was supervised by the DHT as in 6(i) above.</p>

The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up

Maximum 10 points for this performance measure

- Evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4

There was evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports were discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions in FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:

- Q1 supervision meeting held on 13th/9/2017 Min. 03, 2017: The issues were: Lack of running water in Maternity ward & Laboratory and no power since 2017.

The recommendations were that the DHO should contact Water department to fix running water in taps at the Maternity ward. In addition, Solar panels should be replaced with new ones.

- Q2 supervision meetings held on 13th/12/2017: The issues were: No weighing scale for adult patients at Karinga HCII. The recommendation was that the in-charge of the health facility through the DHO should request for a weighing scale as a matter of urgency.

- Q3 Supervision meeting held from 22nd/3/2018 to 3rd/4/2018 at Karinga HCII and 407 Brigade HCIII. The issue discussed was that Temperature for Cold Chain was not recorded which was a risk to maintain the Potency of Vaccines and the recommendation was that the in-charges of the affected health facilities should ensure that temperatures of cold boxes and fridges were recorded.

- Q4 supervision meetings held from 11th – 29th/6/2018 in Nakapiripirit HCIII and 407 Brigade HCIII discussed the issue of Viral Load and CD4 for HIV Clients not documented in specific registers and the recommendation was that the in-charges should hold continuous medical education for the record keeper to record the CD Counts and Viral Load for all patients on ARVs..

<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 	<p>There was evidence that the recommendations were followed up and specific activities undertaken for correction as indicated below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Q1: Moruita HCII. <p>Corrective actions taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water department contacted and water tank was fixed on top of the Maternity ward with a pump to supply water to maternity ward. • Solar was budgeted for but not yet purchased. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Q2: Karinga HCII. <p>Corrective action taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weighing scales were bought by Joint Medical Stores. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Q3: Karinga HCII. <p>Corrective action taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temperature for cold chain was emphasized and a staff assigned to ensure that it was recorded on daily basis. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Q4: Nakapiripirit HCIII and 407 Brigade HCIII. <p>Corrective action taken:</p> <p>The Viral Load and CD4 for HIV patients were well maintained both in the Patients Register at the Health facilities and Patients cards.</p>	6
<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10 	<p>The LG had submitted accurate / consistent data regarding the health facilities receiving PHC funding as per HMIS reports and PBS.</p> <p>This was evidenced in a letter to the Permanent Secretary MoFPED dated 3rd/9/2018 Ref. CR/350/2 copied to the Permanent Secretary MoH, RDC, CAO and DHO.</p> <p>The list contained 13 health facilities receiving PHC funding.</p>	10

Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented is- sues 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 Production Social Services Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 18th May 2018 (under Min. 3/PSSC/5/2018 – Scrutinizing Annual Work Plans and Draft Budget Estimates for FY 2018/19). Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 18th April 2018 (under Min. 3/PSS/04/2018 – Presentation of Departmental Activity Reports). Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 21st February 2018 (under Min. 4/PSSC/2018 – Presentation of Departmental Activity Reports). Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 21st August 2017 (under Min. 4/SSC/2017 – Presentation of Departmental Activity Reports). 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented is- sues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>The Production Social Services Committee presented issues that required approval to Council.</p> <p>This was confirmed from the minutes of the District Council which showed that the committee had presented its issues during the meetings held on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 19th March 2018 (under Min. 7/NDLC/3/2018 – Presentation of Committee Recommendations / Reports. 18th December 2017 (under Min. /7/NDLG/2018 – Presentation of Committee Recommendations on Reports. 	<p>2</p>

<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p>	<p>There was evidence that health facilities had functional HUMCs established, meetings held and discussion of budget and resource issues on quarterly basis as per the 5 sampled health facilities indicated below:</p>
<p>Maximum 6 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 6 • If 80-99 %: score 4 • If 70-79: %: score 2 • If less than 70%: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nakapiripirit HCIII had 6 members of HUMC and held a review meeting on 5th/9/2017 and discussed the cost of bringing running water and power in the maternity ward. There were more meetings held on 28th/1/2018, 5th/4/2018 and 17th/6/2018 representing 100% where the issue of understaffing resulting into too much waiting time was discussed. • Karinga HCII had 5 members of HUMC and held their meetings on 10th/8/2017, 30th/10/2017, 31st/3/2017 and 2nd/6/2018 representing 100%. Issues discussed included the VHT not being active in mobilizing the community on use and adhering to TB and HIV treatment. • Moruita HCII had 5 members of HUMC and held their meetings on 27th/1/2018 and 10th/5/2018 representing 50%. Issues discussed included having too small rooms for OPD at the facility and no PHC non-wage grants for the facility since FY 2017/2018. • 407 Brigade HCIII had no HUMC yet. • Tokora HCIV had 15 members of HUMC and held their meetings on quarterly basis: 3rd/9/2017, 14th/1/2018, 24th/4/2018 and 31st/7/2018 representing 100%. Issues discussed included broken fence among others. <p>The average percentage was $(350/5)=70\%$.</p>

<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non- wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 4 	<p>There was evidence that the LG had published all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants as was indicated at the Ag. DHO's notice board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Tokora HCIV Shs.32, 340,132 for PHC non-wage recurrent grant for FY 2018/2019. Nakapiripirit HCIII Shs. 6,691,596 for PHC non-wage recurrent grant for FY 2018/2019. Lolachat HCIII Shs. 13,383,192 for PHC non-wage recurrent grant for FY 2018/2019. Nabulenger HCIII Shs. 6,691,596 for PHC non-wage recurrent grant for FY 2018/2019. Lorengedwat HCIII Shs. 6,691,596 for PHC non-wage recurrent grant for FY 2018/2019. 	<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 an- nual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2 	<p>The LG Health department submitted in put to procurement plan to the PDU on 29th June 2018 way out of time as submission was supposed to be made by 30th April 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2. 	<p>The LG Health department submitted form PP1 to the PDU on 29th June 2018 for procurements that included the completion of the general ward for Nakapiripirit HC III.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/ MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4. 	<p>.The LG Health department had timely certified and recommended payment to suppliers as per sampled payments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M/s Sons of Ngitaruk Enterprises request for payment of Shs. 2, 178,027 dated 8th/5/2018 for fencing of Muruita HCII was certified under certificated No. 2 dated 2/5/2018, recommended for payment on 8th/5/2018 and was paid on 14th/5/2018 vide PV-9/5 within 6 days. M/s Kolir Youth Development Ltd request for payment of Shs. 1,235,448 dated 2nd/5/2018 for construction of a 2 stance pit latrine at Tokora HCIV was certified under certificated No. 2 dated 2/5/2018, recommended for payment on 2nd/5/2018 and was paid on 14th/5/2018 vide PV-7/5 within 12 days. M/s Keke General Enterprises (U) Ltd request for payment of Shs. 6,311,700 on Invoice No. 03 dated 4th/4/2018 for renovation of Drug store at Tokora HCIV was certified under certificated No. 1 dated 20th/3/2018, recommended for payment on 27th/3/2018 and was paid on 4th/4/2018 vide PV-3/4 within same day. 	<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 Health department submitted the annual performance report for the FY 2017/2018 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner on 3rd August 2018 (as per Email from the PBS – Re: Reg. Head of Department Validation’ dated 3rd August 2018 alerting the Planner / Nakapiripirit DLG about the submission by the Department)</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline of 15th July 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If sector has no audit query: Score 4 If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: Score 2 points If all queries are not responded to Score 0 	<p>The LG Health department had 2 internal audit queries raised in 2nd & 4th quarters FY 2017/2018 but which had been cleared by the DHO as per his response letter to CAO dated 21st/2/2018 Ref. CR/251/6.</p> <p>These queries were:</p> <p>Q2: Unaccounted for funds totalling to Shs. 25,073,000.</p> <p>Q4: Unaccounted for funds under Uganda Sanitation Fund totalling to Shs. 13,558,000.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			

<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30 % women: score 2 	<p>There was evidence that the HUMC met the gender composition as per guidelines as seen in the 5 sampled lower health facilities below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nakapiripirit HCIII HUMC had 6 members of which 4 were male and 2 were female representing 33% Moruit HCII HUMC had 5 members of which 3 were male and 2 were female representing 40%. Karinga HCII had 5 members of which 3 were male and 2 female representing 40%. Tokora HCIV had 9 members of which 5 were male and 4 were female representing 59%. 407 Brigade HCIII had no HUMC representing 0%. <p>Therefore on average $(172/5) = 34\%$ met the gender composition requirement as required.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2. 	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women.</p> <p>However, in the 5 sampled health facilities, the following posters which served as Information, Education and Communication on Sanitation Management were seen on the walls:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proper use of pit latrines which should be kept clean and covered. Rubbish bin and how it should be used. Hand washing with soap and use of Tip Tap. <p>In all the sampled health facilities there was no evidence of separation of pit latrine for men and women</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 2 	<p>Health facility infrastructure projects implemented were screened before approval for construction for example the construction of general ward for Nakapiripirit HC III , Fencing of Moruita HC II and construction of 2 stance pit latrine at Tokora HC IV were all screened on 23/12/2017</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 2 	<p>Site visits were conducted by the environmental officer and the CDO as evidenced by the monitoring report written on 17th may 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has is- sued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal2: score 4. 	<p>The LG had issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal as indicated in the 5 sampled health facilities.</p> <p>The guidelines in form of posters and charts on management of medical waste disposal were as indicated in the 5 sampled health facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chart on how to use Colour Coded Bins. How to use and maintain placenta pit. Charts on how to construct and maintain placenta pit. 	<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>From the review of the AWP and MIS data from MoWE indicated that, Nakapiripirit District safe water coverage average was at 62%. There were four (4) sub counties that were found to have safe water coverage below the district average. These were;</p> <p>Lolachat S/C 42%, Moruita S/C 47%, Loregae S/C 56% and Kamongole S/C 61%.</p> <p>AWP and Budget for FY 2018/19 indicated that Sector Development grant of Ushs 354,268,863 was planned.</p> <p>The AWP and Budget 2018/19 indicated the following projects had been planned for FY 2018/19;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 New bore holes siting and drilling at a cost of Ush 22,190,000 each • 3 production wells at a cost of Ushs 35,000,000 each. • 15 Rehabilitations of boreholes at a cost of Ushs 2,900,000 each • Renovation of Water office at a cost of Ushs 57,898, <p>4 boreholes, 3 production wells and 15 rehabilitation of boreholes were allocated to sub counties with safe water coverage below district average.</p> <p>This makes a total of USHs237, 260,000 allocated to sub counties with safe water coverage below district average which was calculated to be 70% of the total development grant.</p> <p>Sub counties of Lolachat, Lolengadwat and Nabilatuk had been incorporated in the new district of Nabilatuk; therefore they were not planned for in Nakapiripirit district.</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>The district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: <p>Score 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 80-99%: Score 10 o If 60-79: Score 5 o If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>The review of AWP and Budget 2017/18 revealed that the Water department had planned for the following projects in the sub counties that were below district average;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feasibility study and design of Piped water supply scheme at Nakobekobe 2. Completion of phase 2- construction of piped water supply system at Lolachat S/C. 3. Construction of public Latrine at Kokomongole S/C 4. Rehabilitation of 6 boreholes. <p>Annual progress reports submitted to MoWE (Quarter 1 to Quarter 4 reports) and sample site visits revealed that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second Quarter Report dated 22nd January 2018, 2 boreholes were rehabilitated. • Fourth Quarter report dated 2nd August 2018, all the projects were completed in this phase. These included feasibility study design for PWS at Nakobekobe, Completion of phase 2 construction of PWS at Lolachat and rehabilitation of 6 boreholes. 	
---	---	---	--

Monitoring and Supervision

<p>The district Water department carries out monthly monitoring of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the district Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15 • 80% - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10 • 70 - 79%: score 7 • 60% - 69% monitored: score 5 • 50% - 59%: score 3 • Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored: score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the District Water and sanitation committee monitored and supervised water supply and sanitation projects in the district in FY2017/18.</p> <p>On record, there was monitoring report for all the projects implemented in FY 2017/18 dated 16th January 2018. This report indicated that the District water department monitored the construction of 5 stance Latrine at Kakomongole, Rehabilitation of 6 boreholes and Construction of phase 2 Lolachat PWS</p> <p>Also in file were form4 attached to Quarter 01 and Quarter 2 reports dated 27th September 2017 and 2nd January 2018 respectively which revealed that all the water sources in the district were monitored.</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>From the review of Quarterly reports for the FY 2017/18 submitted to the MoWE, it was revealed that MIS data submitted consisted accurate data to that from MIS report from MoWE.</p>	<p>5</p>

<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>The water facilities listed in the MIS report provided by the MoWE reflected 1 Feasibility design of PWS, 1 Construction of PWS, Rehabilitation of 6 boreholes and Construction of 1 VIP Latrine.</p> <p>This was exactly the same information found in the PBS and AWP for FY 2017/18.</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 procurement plan for all the investment items approved which included Drilling and sitting of 6 Boreholes, 3 production wells, 15 borehole rehabilitations and renovation of Water office was submitted to the PDU together with the final work plan on 2nd July 2018 which was beyond the required deadline of 30th April 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the contract manager prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2 	<p>There was no proof of appointment of Contract manager for WSS projects in the district by the district and contract management plan was not presented to the assessment team.</p> <p>However, the DWO presented site meetings held evidenced by the minutes;</p> <p>For instance minutes of the site meeting held on 26th May 2017 which was held at Lolachat piped water supply system site. Another site meeting was held on 01st May 2017 aimed at resolving land issues for the piped water scheme at Lolachat. There was no proof of any site meeting held on any of the two projects implemented in FY 2017/18.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	<p>The assessment team visited the two projects implemented in the FY 2017/18. These were</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of Peeped Water Supply System at Lolachat Construction of 5-Stance VIP latrine at Kakomomgelo. <p>All the above projects were found to have been constructed as per design.</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 district water officer presented a completion certificate issued for the completion of construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Kakomongole dated 16th February 2018.</p> <p>Lolachat piped water supply system was still under defects liability period and hence not yet handed over by the contractor.</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>DWO appropriately certified all the WSS projects as evidenced by;</p> <p>For instance two interim certificates for the Completion of Lolachat Piped water supply system requested on 07th May 2018 and 20th September 2018 were certified on 07th May 2018 and 20th September 2018 respectively.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district Water department has certified and initiated payment for works and supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<p>The LG Water department had timely certified and recommended payment to suppliers as indicated in the sampled payments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M/s Royal Techno Industries request for payment of Shs. 145,699,379 dated 7th/5/2018 for construction of Lolachat Water Supply System was certified under certificate No. 4 dated 7th/5/2018, recommended for payment on 7th/5/2018 and was paid on 8th/5/2018 vide PV-11/5 within 1 day. M/s Royal Techno Industries request for payment of Shs. 100,000,000 dated 20th/10/2017 for construction of Lolachat Piped Water Supply System for construction of Lolachat Water Supply System was certified under certificate No. 3 dated 20th/9/2017, recommended for payment on 20th/10/2017 and was paid on 25th/10/2017 vide PV-19/10 within 5 days. M/s Asicco General Enterprise request for payment of Shs. 800,000 dated 23rd/4/2018 for supply of stationery to Water Sector was recommended for payment on 23rd /4/2018 and paid on 3rd/5/2018 vide PV-7/5 within 10 days. 	<p>3</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

<p>The district Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Plan- ning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	<p>The Water department submitted the annual performance report for the FY 2017/2018 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner on 7th August 2018 (as per Email from the PBS – Re: Reg. Head of Department Validation’ dated 7th August 2018 alerting the Planner / Nakapiripirit DLG about the submission by the Department)</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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If sector has no audit query score 5 If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 If queries are not responded to score 0 	<p>The LG Water department had 3 internal audit queries raised in the 2nd and 3rd quarters FY 2017/2018 but which had been cleared by the DWO as per his response letter to CAO dated 21st/2/2018 Ref. CR/251/6.</p> <p>These audit queries were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q2: Unaccounted for funds totalling to Shs. 8,706,000 and Non-remittance of 6% Withholding Tax totalling to Shs. 7,020560. Q2: Unaccounted for funds totalling to Shs. 2,712,500. 	<p>3</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 Finance, Planning, Administration and Water Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 16th May 2018 (under Min. 3.WKE/5/2018 – Scrutinizing Annual Work Plans and Draft Budget Estimates for FY 2018/2019). Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 16th April 2018 (under Min. 3/FPW/4/2018 – Presentation of Departmental Activity Reports). Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 18th August 2018 (under Min. 3/FPAC/201 – Presentation of Departmental Activity Reports). 	<p>3</p>
<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	<p>There Finance, Planning, Administration and Water Committee presented issues that required approval to Council as evidenced from the minutes of the District Council meetings held on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 19th March 2018 (under Min. 7/NDLC/3/2018 – Presentation of Committee Recommendations / Reports. 18th December 2017 (under Min. /7/NDLG/2018 – Presentation of Committee Recommendations on Reports. 	<p>3</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2. 	<p>There was no information no information about the AWP, budget and water development grant releases found displayed on the Noticeboard 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>Only the 5 Stance VIP Latrine at Kakomongole was clearly labelled with name of the project, source of funding, date of construction and contractor's name.</p> <p>The Piped water supply system at Lolachat was not labelled.</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>There was no evidence that information on tenders and contract awards had been displayed on the District Notice board by the time of the assessment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If communities apply for water/ public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	<p>There was evidence of community participation in form of applications for water source and contribution towards the construction of water sources. For instance the assessment team sampled a few applications from communities with the corresponding contribution in form of receipts;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application from Narionomor village- Moruita S/C dated 3rd September 2018 and contribution of Ush 200,000 receipt No: 0284 Application from Nacherer Village- Kakomomgole S/C dated 14th September 2018 and contribution of Ushs 200,000 Receipt No: 1630 Application from Loreng Village- Loregae S/C dated 15th February 2018 and contribution of Ush 200,000 receipt No: 5158. 	<p>1</p>

<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water and Sanitation Committees that are functioning evidenced by either: i) collection of O&M funds, ii(carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, iii) facility fenced/protected, or iv) they an M&E plan for the previous FY: score 2 <p>Note: One of parameters above is sufficient for the score.</p>	<p>The assessment team visited the Piped water supply at Lolachat which was still under management of the contractor hence no User committee had been formed yet.</p> <p>However, when the assessment team visited the 5stance VIP latrine at Kakomongole, it was found out that the facility was not maintained properly with human wastes all over the facility and bushes growing around the facility and no proof of O&M fund collection was presented to the team.</p> <p>This proved to the assessment team that the User committees were not functional.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	<p>The Environment screening reports for all WSS projects implemented were well filed and available on file for review. The environmental screening reports for the sampled facilities were completed on different dates as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of 5-stance VIP Latrine dated 15th December 2016. Construction of Lolachat piped water supply system dated 24th November 2015 	<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>From the review of the Environmental Screening reports, the assessment team realized that unacceptable environmental concerns identified were cutting of trees around the project areas and the mitigation measures put in place was to plant more trees after the completion of the works before hand over of the projects.</p> <p>Environmental Compliance certificates were issued by the environment officer as a proof that the follow support had been made.</p> <p>For instance Environmental Compliance certificate for the construction of 5 stance VIP latrine was issued on 09th February 2018 and for the Lolachat piped water system was issued on 13th September 2018.</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>From the review of sampled contract documents for Construction of 5 stance VIP Latrine at Kakomongole ref: Nakp543/Wrks/1617/00029, Element 6 item (AM) of BOQ, indicates the clause of Environmental mitigation measures.</p> <p>However no Environment protection clause was found in the contract documents for the construction of piped water system at Lolachat.</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>The lists of members of WSCs were provided in the software progress reports of the District Water Office. All committees had women, with majority having over 50% members being women and with women occupying key positions. For instance from the sampled projects, Domoye P/S (Lolachat S/C), Namorulem borehole (Lolachat S/C) and Mruangamion Borehole (Lolachat S/C) out of 9 WSC members, 5 were found to be women occupying at least two key positions of Vice chairman, Secretary, Treasurer and care taker.</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/</p> <p>RGCs provided by the Water Department.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3 	<p>The assessment team visited the 5-stance VIP latrine at Kakomongole and found out that, the facility had separate stance for women, men and PWDs and had a ramp. However, the ramp was not accessible and the PWD stance had no hand rails which are meant to provide support to the PWDs.</p>	<p>0</p>
--	--	---	----------