



## Local Government Performance Assessment

Namisindwa District

(Vote Code: 617)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	67%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	43%
Educational Performance Measures	39%
Health Performance Measures	38%
Water Performance Measures	47%

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 PFMA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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"> <li>o If LG submitted before or by due date, then state 'compliant'</li> <li>o If LG had not submitted or submitted later than the due date, state 'non-compliant'</li> </ul> </li> <li>• From the Uganda budget website: <a href="http://www.budget.go.ug">www.budget.go.ug</a>, check and compare recorded date therein with date of LG submission to confirm.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG submitted to MoFPED Annual Performance contract for the FY 2018/19 on the 24th/07/2018.</li> </ul>	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"> <li>• From MoFPED's inventory of LG budget submissions, check whether:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG submitted to MoFPED Budget that included Procurement Plan for the FY 2018/19 on the 24th/07/ 2018.</li> </ul>	Yes
Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			

<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted report to MoFPED in time, then it is compliant</li> <li>• If LG submitted late or did not submit, then it is not compliant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG submitted to MoFPED the Annual Performance Report for FY 2017/18 on the 29th/08/2018, which was past the due date of 31st/07/2018.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• If LG submitted late or did not submit at all, then it is not compliant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Though the LG submitted to MoFPED the Budget Performance Reports for all four Quarters FY 2017/18 the Performance Report for Quarter 4 was submitted on 29th/08/2018 which was past the due date of 31st/07/2018. The others were submitted on the following dates:</li> </ul> <p>Quarter I report: 06th/02/2018</p> <p>Quarter II report: 26th/03/2018</p> <p>Quarter III report: 04th/06/2018.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Audit</p>			

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and the Auditor General's findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action in lines with applicable laws.</p>	<p>From MoFPED's Inventory/record of LG submissions of statements entitled "Actions to Address Internal Auditor General's findings",</p> <p>Check:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted a 'Response' (and provide details), then it is compliant</li> <li>• If LG did not submit a 'response', then it is non-compliant</li> <li>• If there is a response for all –LG is compliant</li> <li>• If there are partial or not all issues responded to – LG is not compliant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG had no issues raised by the Internal Auditor General and Auditor General's findings for the previous financial year 2016/17 to be addressed. The LG started operations in the previous FY 2017/2018, therefore it was nonexistent during the FY 2016/2017 whose status was demanded for by the assessment manual.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement was unqualified</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a district/ municipality has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Though Physical Planning Committee (PPC) had been formally appointed under CAO's letter dated 20th/10/2017, it was not yet fully functional. PPC had held only two meetings on 15th/04/2018 and 30th/05/2018 where land applications had been considered. Committee had not approved/considered any building plans since its inception, not even for district projects contained in the district AWP FY 2018/19.</li> <li>• Building plan register was in place.</li> </ul>	0
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that district/ MLG has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD score 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG had not submitted minutes of the Physical Planning Committee to MoLHUD as at time of assessment.</li> </ul>	0

<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All infrastructure investments are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan: score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG lacked a Physical Development Plan and PPC had not considered any building plans for approval.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• Action area plan prepared for the previous FY: score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District LG had not prepared Action Area plans.</li> <li>• Lwakhakha TC (which was semi-autonomous from district) was however being supported by Ministry of Trade Industry and Cooperatives to develop an Action Area plan for ELEGU Border market for Lwakhakha site.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>Report for the Budget conference held on 31st/10/2017 prepared by the Ag. District Planner set forth the following priorities that were also contained in the AWP FY 2018/19:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Periodic maintenance of Nambolia-Bunambale road; routine maintenance of 13 roads (AWP pg.60-61)</li> <li>• Protection of 6 springs; Rehabilitation of 13 boreholes; extension of Lirima and Manafwa – Tororo GFSSs; Rehabilitation of GFSSs; and Construction of latrine in RGCs (AWP pg. 65-66)</li> <li>• Construction of 2 classrooms in Bunanganda, Bunamutsu and Bukhaleke PS; Construction of 5-stance latrine in Bunanganda, Mulondo, Magale, Bukooyi and Kaboole PSs; Supply of 3-seater desks to Bukhaleke, Bunanganda, Kabukwesi and Busekele PSs (AWP pg. 51-52)</li> <li>• Provision of agricultural inputs (AWP pg.40-41)</li> <li>• Support to 4 PWD, 20 YLP, 18 UWEP groups and provision of 20 exotic goats to women groups (AWP pg.78)</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

<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"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p>Capital investments in the AWP FY 2018/19 were derived from the DDP. They were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Periodic maintenance of Nambolia-Bunambale road; routine maintenance of 13 roads (AWP pg.60-61, DDP pg.145-148)</li> <li>• Protection of 6 springs –sites not stated; Rehabilitation of 13 boreholes; extension of Lirima and Manafwa –Tororo GFSs; Rehabilitation of GFSs; and Construction of latrine in Sikiamoto RGC (AWP pg.65-66, DDP pg.149-151)</li> <li>• Construction of 2 classrooms in Bunanganda, Bunamutsu and Bukhaleke PS; Construction of 5-stance latrine in Bunanganda, Mulondo, Magale, Bukooyi and Kaboole PSs; Supply of 3-seater desks to Bukhaleke, Bunanganda, Kabukwesi and Busekele PSs; Construction of a Seed Secondary school (AWP pg. 51-52, DDP pg. 140-145)</li> <li>• Provision of agricultural inputs -onion seed, 2,000 layers, 2,600 KTB bee hives, 20 in-calf heifers, spray pumps (AWP pg.40-41, DDP pg. 135)</li> <li>• Support to 4 PWD, 20 YLP, 18 UWEP groups and provision of 20 exotic goats to women groups (AWP pg.78, DDP pg.153-154)</li> <li>• Establishment of (2) agroforestry demonstration sites in Mukoto and Bukokho SCs. (AWP pg. 68, DDP pg. 152)</li> </ul>	
--	---	--	--



<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"> <li>• Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project profiles had been developed for only some investments e.g classroom construction in Bunanganda and Bukhaleke and protection of springs, rehabilitation of boreholes, extension of GFS. Omitted for Seed secondary school, provision of agricultural inputs, establishment of Agroforestry demonstration sites and for PWD, YLP and UWEP projects. Though some environmental and social mitigation measures had been highlighted they were not costed. The profiles had not been discussed by TPC.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG had not prepared an Annual Statistical Abstract 2016/17 because it became operational in FY 2017/18. LG had the template.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<p>All the following infrastructure projects implemented in FY 2017/18 were derived from the AWP for the said year. The AWP 2017/18 which had been approved by the mother district of Manafwa, was adopted by Namisindwa District Council in meeting of 22nd/12/2017 under DLG Min.31/12/2017/18</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of District Administration block – phase 1; Renovation of office building of former Bupoto SC; Purchase of land for Bupoto SC (Q4/Annual report pg. 35-36, AWP pg.27-28)</li> <li>Construction of 2-classroom block at Tserono, Bunambobi and Bukikayi PSs; Construction of 5-stance lined latrines each in Namirama, Mutsasa, Makhame, Bumbo, Bukhabusi and Nemba PSs (Q4/Annual report pg. 59-60, AWP pg.41)</li> <li>Periodic maintenance of (3km) Nambola-Bunambale road; 21km out of 110km of routine mechanised maintenance; Construction of Sala bridge (Q4/Annual report pg.64, AWP pg. 43)</li> <li>Completion/extension of Lirima and Buwabwala GFSs; Rehabilitation of (2) Tsakhana and Soono GFSs; Construction of latrine in Munamba RGC; Rehabilitation of 17 out of 13 boreholes; Protection of 2 out of 6 springs (Q4/Annual report pg. 68-69, AWP pg. 46-47,106)</li> </ul>	2
<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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"> <li>100%: score 4</li> <li>80-99%: score 2</li> <li>Below 80%: 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>94.6% (88 out of 93) of projects implemented in FY 2017/18 were completed within the said FY. These were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(3 projects) Construction of District Administration block –phase 1; Renovation of office building of former Bupoto SC; Purchase of land for Bupoto SC (Q4/Annual report pg. 35-36, AWP pg.27-28)</li> <li>Supply of 1,300 fish fry for Bumwoni, Bubutu and Buwabwala SCs (Q4/Annual report pg. ,AWP pg. 36,123)</li> <li>(2 projects) 36 Spray pumps and 30 bee hives procured spent 29,190,000= against budget of 29,190,000= (Q4/Annual report pg.51, AWP pg.35,123)</li> <li>Supply of 36 3-seater desks each to Bukikayi, Nabini, Kabukwesi, Kaboole, Tserono PSs (Q4/Annual report pg.60, AWP pg.41)</li> <li>(3 projects) Construction of 2-classroom block at Tserono, Bunambobi and Bukikayi PSs (Q4/Annual</li> </ul>	2

report pg.59, AWP pg. 41)

- Periodic maintenance of Nambola-Bunambale road, Tsekululu SC (Q4/Annual report pg. 64, AWP pg.43) –though erroneously captured in Annual report as not achieved
- Construction of Sala bridge (Q4/Annual report pg.64, AWP pg.43)
- (6 projects) Construction of 5-stance lined latrines each in Namirama, Mutsasa, Makhame, Bumbo, Bukhabusi and Nemba PS (Q4/Annual report pg. 60, AWP pg.41)
- (3 projects) Completion/extension of Lirima; Rehabilitation of (2) Tsakhana and Soono GFSS (Q4/Annual report pg. 69, AWP pg. 46-47)
- Construction of latrine in Munamba RGC (Q4/Annual report pg. 69, AWP pg. 108 )
- Rehabilitation of 17 out of 13 boreholes (Q4/Annual report pg.68, AWP pg. 46)
- (2 projects) Protection of 2 out of 6 springs (Q4/Annual report pg. 68, AWP pg.46)
- 5 Ha (24,000 seedlings) out of 20 Ha of trees established in Namabya, Bupoto, Bubutu, Bukiabi and Tsekululu watersheds spent 24,816,000= against budget of 12,000,000= (Q4/Annual report pg.70, AWP pg. )
- Support to 27 YLP and 35 UWEP groups (Q4/Annual report pg. 79, DEC meeting of 30th/05/2018 Min DEC 90/05/2018)

#### Incomplete projects

- 21km out of 110km of routine mechanised maintenance (Q4/Annual report pg.64, AWP pg.43)
- (4 projects) Protection of 4 out of 6 springs (Q4/Annual report pg. 68, AWP pg.46)

The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.

- Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2

Based on the following sample of projects (excluding roads and water) whose total expenditure was 994,650,000= against a total budget of 1,065,833,000=, representing -6.7% variance, the projects were completed within the approved budget.

- Construction of District Administration block – phase 1; Renovation of office building of former Bupoto SC spent 609,666,000= against budget of 661,600,000= (Q4/Annual report pg. 35-36, AWP pg. 27-28)
- Purchase of land for Bupoto SC spent 19,838,000= against budget of 20,000,000= (Q4/Annual report pg. 35-36, AWP pg.28)
- 36 Spray pumps and 30 bee hives procured spent 29,190,000= against budget of 29,190,000= (Q4/Annual report pg.51, AWP pg.35,123)
- Supply of 36 3-seater desks each to Bukikayi, Nabini, Kabukwesi, Kaboole, Tserono PSs spent 30,690,000= against budget of 33,043,000= (Q4/Annual report pg.60, AWP pg. )
- Construction of 2-classroom block at Tserono, Bunambobi and Bukikayi PSs spent 160,283,000= against budget of 176,000,000= (Q4/Annual report pg.59, AWP pg. )
- Construction of 5-stance lined latrines each in Namirama, Mutsasa, Makhame, Bumbo, Bukhabusi and Nemba PSs spent 120,167,000= against budget of 134,000,000= (Q4/Annual report pg. 60, AWP pg. )
- 5 Ha (24,000 seedlings) out of 20 Ha of trees established in Namabya, Bupoto, Bubutu, Bukiabi and Tsekululu watersheds spent 24,816,000= against budget of 12,000,000= (Q4/Annual report pg.70, AWP pg. )

<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;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"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LG had spent 19,956,000= against budget of 11,600,000=, representing 172%, on renovation of offices of former Bupoto SC – now the district headquarters (Q4/Annual report pg.113) though the AFA 2017/18 dated 10th/08/2018 indicated nil expenditure on maintenance - civil, and, 5,358,000= and 10,000= under maintenance –other (code 228001).</li> <li>There was however no evidence of systematic review of assets and infrastructure that required O&amp;M since the LG had only become operational in the same year that was under consideration (FY 2017/18)</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
<p>Human Resource Management</p>			
<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>There are (10) departments as per the approved and adopted structure for Namisindwa DLG dated 19/12/17.</p> <p>None (0%) of (9) positions of HoDs had been substantively filled. All the current HoDs are in-acting capacity including DEO, DPO, DCDO, CFO, D/Planner, District Engineer, DNRO, DHO and DCO.</p> <p>The position of District Engineer (DE) was advertised and nobody qualified-Min.04/25/4/2018</p> <p>All staff in- acting capacity were formally assigned duties by the CAO</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Only 22% (2 out of 9) of HoDs (administratively assigned duties) had been appraised for FY 2017/18.</p> <p>The annual performance reports for the Ag.DEO (Mabuya Patrick-appraised on 24/7/18) and Ag.DE (Mukelule Robert- appraised on 2/7/18) were on file, filled and signed by PAS.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>100% (All the 70) of posts submitted for filling had been considered by DSC as per the minute extract of:</p> <p>a) Namisindwa DSC 3rd meeting held on 23/5/18 under: Min.12/NAM/DSC/2018 (i)-(viii) &amp; Min.13-15/NAM/DSC/2018;</p> <p>b) NAM DSC 4th meeting held on 7/6/2018 under Min.No.19/NAM/DSC/2018;</p> <p>c) NAM DSC 2nd meeting held on 25/4/2018 under Min.04/25/4/2018 respectively.</p> <p>In FY 2017/18, the CAO submitted (70) posts to DSC for filling as per the declaration of vacancies letter dated 21/2/18</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"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>No confirmation files had been submitted by CAO for consideration by DSC in FY 2017/18. This was confirmed in writing by Ag.Secretary DSC (Mr.Timbiti Geoffrey) on 8/10/18</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"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>No staff had been submitted by CAO for disciplinary action by DSC in FY 2017/18</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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>From a list of staff recruited in FY 2017/18, it was found that none (0%) of (65) LG new staff appointed on 18/6/18 had accessed the salary payroll within two months after appointment. Failure to access the payroll was attributed to delays in creating position ID on the IPPS and approver.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>None (0%) of (17) LG staff who retired in FY 2017/18 had accessed the pension payroll not later than 2 months after retirement. Refer to the following IPPS numbers for evidence; 457461, 456845, 456839, 458289, 457973, 457955, 460086, etc.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Revenue Mobilization</p>			
<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG was nonexistent in the previous year but one i.e (2016/2017), therefore there were no OSR to be compared with that of the previous FY 2017/2018 amounting to shs 130,523,500. The LG started its operations in the FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within</li> </ul> <p>+/- 10 %: then score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0.</p>	<p>The LG local revenue collection ratio was +30.5%, whereas the standard variance against the budget required by the manual was +/-10% .This is demonstrated below:</p> <p>Total Local Revenue Planned/Budgeted for FY 2017/2018 was Shs 100,000,000(original budget), whereas the total actual local revenue collected was shs 130,523,500, more by shs 30,523,500, therefore, the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the FY 2017/2018 was 130,5% i.e.(130,523,500/100,000,000)x100%=130.5%), and the portion of local revenue collected over and above the budget was shs 30,523,500, representing +30.5% .</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The District had not remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues.</p> <p>Total revenue collected subject to sharing during the FY 2017/2018 amounted to shs 45,208,750 , therefore, the expected mandatory LLG share of local revenues was shs 29,385,688 i.e ( 45,208,750 x65%) = 29,385,688, but none was remitted. The LG was not compliant as far as local revenue administration, allocation and transparency was concerned.</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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had spent more than 20% of OSR on council allowances and emoluments (including from all sources) as demonstrated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total actual OSR collected in FY 2017/2018 was shs 130,523,500.</li> <li>Expected total expenditure on council allowances and emoluments during FY 2017/2018 was Shs 26,104,700 (130,523,500 x 20%), but instead was Shs 43,488,000, up in excess by shs 17,383,300.</li> </ul> <p>Total expenditure on council allowances and emoluments during FY 2017/2018 was therefore exceeded by shs 17,383,300..</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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<p>The LG has the position of Procurement Officer substantively filled. The LG has no Senior Procurement Officer</p> <p>Wanyenya Philis Cynthia, Procurement officer was confirmed into this position under DSC Minute No. 355/2016-3.9. Letter on this matter is dated 10/1/2017</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"> <li>Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>TEC met, produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee as evidenced by Contracts Committee Meeting minutes. For instance;</p> <p>(a) The Contracts Committee meeting of 30/10/2017 under agenda item 7- Approval of evaluation report of supply of motorcycle and renovation of former Bupoto S/C Headquarters- Min 031/NCC/2017/18, discussed the TEC report of 19/10/2018 and thereafter awarded the renovation of former Bupoto S/C Headquarters to M/S Muiana Engineering Works LTD at a bid price of UGX 9,376,353/=</p> <p>(b) The Contracts Committee meeting of 8/12/2017, under agenda item 5- Approval of evaluation report for open bidding- Min 050/NCC/2017/18, discussed the TEC report of 30/11/2017 and thereafter awarded the construction of the Namisindwa Administration Block to M/S African Construction Technician and Contractors (U) LTD at a bid value of UGX 642,795,678</p> <p>(c) The Contracts Committee meeting of 19/2/2018 under agenda item 5- Approval of Evaluation report- Min 064/NCC/2017/18, discussed the TEC report of 24/1/2018 and thereafter awarded the construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Bukhabusi P/S in Bukhabusi S/C to M/S Samlex Parts (U) LTD at a bid price of 27,715,132</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The Contracts Committee considered recommendations of TEC. For instance;</p> <p>(a) The Contracts Committee meeting of 30/10/2017 under Min 031/NCC/2017/18, awarded the renovation of former Bupoto S/C Headquarters to M/S Muiana Engineering Works LTD at a bid price of UGX 9,376,353 as recommended by TEC that sat on 19/10/2018</p> <p>(b) The Contracts Committee meeting of 8/12/2017, under Min 050/NCC/2017/18, awarded the construction of the Namisindwa Administration Block to M/S African Construction Technician and Contractors (U) LTD at a bid value of UGX 642,795,678 as recommended by TEC that sat on 30/11/2017</p> <p>(c) The Contracts Committee meeting of 19/2/2018, under Min 064/NCC/2017/18, awarded the construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Bukhabusi P/S in Bukhabusi S/C to M/S Samlex Parts (U) LTD at a bid price of UGX 27,715,132 as recommended by TEC that sat on 24/1/2018</p> <p>(d) The Contracts Committee meeting of 8/12/2017, under Min 050/NCC/2017/18, awarded the construction of a 2 classroom block at Tserono P/S in Magale S/C to M/S CIDO LTD at a bid price of UGX 54,837,000/= as recommended by TEC that sat on 30/11/2017</p> <p>(e) The Contracts Committee meeting of 8/12/2017, under Min 050/NCC/2017/18, awarded the rehabilitation of Buwabwala and Soono GFS to M/S Shelter Hi-Tech LTD at a bid price of UGX 62,234,350 as recommended by TEC that sat on 30/11/2017</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>The Procurement Plan for the LG is in draft form and is yet to be approved by CAO</p> <p>The draft Procurement Plan 2018/2019 captures infrastructure projects in the AWP of 2018/2019.</p> <p>For instance;</p> <p>(a) Classroom construction and rehabilitation is estimated at 123,000,000/= in the Procurement Plan and 123,000,000/= in the AWP</p> <p>(b) Latrine construction is estimated at 96,000,000/= in the Procurement Plan and 96,000,000/= in the AWP</p>	<p>2</p>

(c) Construction of a Seed Secondary School is estimated at 402,000,000/= in the Procurement Plan and 402,000,000/= in the AWP

(d) Spring protection is estimated at 37,800,000/= in both the Procurement Plan and the AWP

(e) Construction of piped water supply system (extension of private connections, extension of the GFS to Bupoto, Buwabwala) is estimated at 318,142,000/= in both the Procurement Plan and the AWP

The LG adhered to the Procurement Plan of the previous FY. For instance, the following are captured in quarterly reports on procurement's made in 2017/2018;

(a) The construction of the Namisindwa Administration Block (NAMI 617/WRKS/17-18/00038) by M/S African Construction Technician and Contractors (U) LTD at a bid price of UGX 642,795,678 is captured in the 3rd Quarter report for FY 2017/2018 dated 13/4/2018

(b) The renovation of former Bupoto S/C Headquarters (NAMI 617/Supls/17-18/00032) by M/S Muiana Engineering Works LTD at a bid price of UGX 9,376,353 is captured in the 2nd Quarter report for FY 2017/2018 dated 15/1/2018

(c) The construction of a 2 classroom block at Tserono P/S (NAMI 617/Works/17-18/00041) in Magale S/C by M/S CIDO LTD at a bid price of UGX 54,837,000/= is captured in the 2nd Quarter report for FY 2017/2018 dated 15/1/2018

(d) The rehabilitation of Buwabwala and Soono GFS (NAMI 617/Works/17-18/00035) by M/S Shelter Hi-Tech LTD at a bid price of UGX 62,234,350 is captured in the 2nd Quarter report for FY 2017/2018 dated 15/1/2018

(e) The construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Bukhabusi P/S (NAMI 617/Works/17-18/00049) in Bukhabusi S/C by M/S Samlex Parts (U) LTD at a bid price of UGX 27,715,132 is captured in the 3rd Quarter report for FY 2017/2018 dated 13/4/2018

<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"> <li>• For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/ infrastructure by August 30: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The draft Procurement Plan 2018/2019 indicates that the LG is due to implement 17 Infrastructure projects as follows; Water-2 Education- 5 Projects at LLG level-10</p> <p>By August 30th, the LG had not prepared a single bid document for the infrastructure projects and neither was any ready by the time of assessment</p>	<p>0</p>
--	---	---	----------

The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.

• For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2

At the time of assessment the LG did not have a Contracts register. However the procurement activity files were complete as is required by the key records to check on the procurement file designed by PPDA, April 2008.

For instance;

(a) The procurement file for the project on the construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Bukhabusi P/S

Request for procurement dated 26/10/2017, Approval of procurement method dated 8/12/2017, Invitation to bid dated 8/12/2017, records of sale of bidding documents dated 8/12/2017, Copy of solicitation documents dated 8/12/2017, Bid Closing/ Opening dated 29/12/2017, Copies of bids evaluated-1 dated 24/1/2018, Evaluation report dated 24/1/2018, notice of the best evaluated bidder is dated 19/2/2018, date of bid acceptance is dated 7/3/2018

Contract agreement is dated 5/4/2018, appointment of contract manager is dated 12/3/2018

There were no contract amendments

(b) The procurement file for the rehabilitation of Bubabwala and Sonoo GFS

Request for procurement dated 16/10/2017, Approval of procurement method dated 2/11/2017, Published advert dated 2/11/2017, records of sale of bidding documents dated 2/11/2017, Copy of solicitation documents dated 2/11/2017, Bid Closing/ Opening dated 24/11/2017, Copies of bids evaluated-3, Evaluation report dated 30/11/2017, No bidder attended pre-bid meeting despite the invitation in the advert,

notice of the best evaluated bidder is dated 8/12/2017, date of bid acceptance from PDE is dated 27/12/2017

Contract agreement is dated 6/2/2018, appointment of contract manager is dated 27/12/2017.

There was no contract amendment but the contractor asked for an extension for extra works on 18/6/2018

<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"> <li>For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>For the previous FY, the LG adhered with procurement thresholds i.e. for procurement's over 50m, the LG used the Open Bidding method and the Selective Bidding Method for procurement's below 50m. For instance;</p> <p>(a) The construction of the Namisindwa Administration – awarded at UGX 642,795,678 under Open Bidding method,</p> <p>(b) The construction of 2 classroom block at Tserono P/S in Magale S/C awarded at 54,837,000/= under Open Bidding method,</p> <p>(c) Rehabilitation of Buwabwala and Soono GFS awarded at 62,234,350/= under Open Bidding</p> <p>Minute approving bidding method for the above-mentioned 3 investments was Min 029/NCC/2017/18 of the Contracts Committee that sat on 30/10/2017</p> <p>Advert in which all 3 investments appear posted in the New Vision of 2nd November 2017, also date of issue of the Bid document</p> <p>(d) Renovation of former Bupoto S/C Headquarters awarded at 9,376,353/= under Selective Bidding</p> <p>Minute approving bidding method for investment was Min 021/NCC/2017/18 of the Contracts Committee that sat on 3/10/2017</p> <p>Bid document was issued on 16/10/2017</p> <p>(e) The construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Bukhabusi P/S in Bukhabusi S/C awarded at 27,715,132/= under Selective Bidding</p> <p>Minute approving bidding method for investment was Min 043/NCC/2017/18 of the Contracts Committee that sat on 8/12/2017</p> <p>Bid document was issued on 8/12/2017</p>	2
<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The works projects implemented in the previous FY were certified based on technical supervision. However, certificates with significant amounts of money for 2 investments were not availed at the time of assessment and in the case of the construction of the administration block, 2 certificates were issued on the same day</p> <p>(a) The construction of the Namisindwa Administration- UGX 642,795,678</p>	0

Commencement: 14/6/2017

Completion: 26/6/2018

Interim valuation certificate No.1 issued on 25/6/2018 worth 235,045,220/=

Technical supervision report by Ag. District Engineer to CAO dated 25/6/2018 was compiled

Interim valuation certificate No.2 issued on 29/6/2018 worth 113,067,343/=

Technical supervision report by Ag. District Engineer to CAO dated 29/6/2018 was compiled

Interim valuation certificate No.3 issued on 29/6/2018 worth 69,327,879/=

Technical supervision report by Ag. District Engineer to CAO dated 29/6/2018 was compiled

NB\* the 2nd and 3rd certificates were issued on the same day. The Engineer explained in writing that in the morning of 29/6/2018, the contractor had not completed the form work in readiness to receive concrete. When the form work was completed in the afternoon, another certificate was issued

Interim valuation certificate No.4 worth over 200,000,000 misplaced at LG

(b) Renovation of former Bupoto S/C Headquarters - 9,376,353/=

Interim Valuation Certificate No.1 and report were not availed at the time of assessment

Interim Valuation Certificate No.2 was issued on 28/6/2018 worth 468,818/=(retention)

Technical report by Ag District Engineer to CAO dated 25/6/2018 was compiled

(c) Construction of a 2 classroom block at Tserono P/S in Magale S/C -54,837,000/=

Commencement: 6/1/2018

Completion: 9/5/2018

Interim Valuation Certificate No.1 worth 52,095,150/= was issued on 29/5/2018

Technical report by Ag District Engineer to CAO dated 29/5/2018 was compiled

(d) Rehabilitation of Buwabwala and Soono GFS- 62,234,350/=

Interim Valuation Certificate No.1 worth

		<p>55,715,543/= was issued on 13/6/2018</p> <p>Technical report by Ag District Water Officer to CAO dated 13/6/2018 was compiled</p> <p>(e) The construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Bukhabusi P/S in Bukhabusi S/C- 27,715,132/=</p> <p>Commencement: 14/3/2018</p> <p>Completion: 30/4/2018</p> <p>Interim Valuation Certificate No.1 worth 26,329,375/= was issued on 30/4/2018</p> <p>A technical report on the investment dated 30/3/2018 by the Ag District Engineer to the CAO through the Ag DEO was compiled</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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had not started implementing any works projects at the time of assessment. However a sample of 5 projects of 2017/2018 that are either not complete or not commissioned were checked for status of labelling. None of them was labelled at all.</p> <p>These were; The Namisindwa Administration Block, the GFS at Buwabwala and Sonoo, the 2 classroom block at Bukikayi P/S, 5 stance pit latrine at Bukhabusi P/S and the 2 classroom block at Bunambobi P/S</p>	0
Financial management			



<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>Although the LG had made monthly bank reconciliations for all the 16 bank accounts, they were not up-to-date at the time of this assessment. All monthly bank reconciliations for the 16 bank accounts were reconciled only up to 30/6/2018, 3 months late from the date of the assessment exercise which was conducted on 10/10/2018</p> <p>Examples of monthly reconciliations verified included:</p> <p>.(1) Bank of Baroda a/c 95040200001011, Mbale branch , in the names of " Namisindwa DLG Education ", was last reconciled and approved on 30/6/2018 , with balances as per cash book and bank statement of shs 472337 and "89,098,642" respectively.</p> <p>.(2) Bank of Baroda a/c 95040200001010 Mbale branch , in the names of 'Namisindwa DLG General Fund a/c ', was last reconciled and approved on 30/6/2018 , with balances as per cash book and bank statement of shs 1,805,205 and "33,406,705 respectively.</p> <p>.(3) Bank of Baroda a/c 95040200001013 Mbale branch , in the names of 'Namisindwa DLG Administration a/c ', was last reconciled and approved on 30/6/2018 , with balances as per cash book and bank statement of shs 1,847,868 and '382535614 respectively.</p> <p>.(4) Bank of Baroda a/c 95040200001016 Mbale branch , in the names of 'Namisindwa DLG CBS a/c ', was last reconciled and approved on 30/6/2018 , with balances as per cash book and bank statement of shs 186,069 and 5,186,069 respectively.</p> <p>.(5) Bank of Baroda a/c 95040200001015 Mbale branch , in the names of 'Namisindwa DLG Finance and planning a/c ', was last reconciled and approved on 30/6/2018 , with balances as per cash book and bank statement of shs 87,144 and 87,144 respectively.</p>	<p>0</p>
--	---	---	----------

The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

- If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2.

The LG had certified timely payments to suppliers. Our review of the relevant supporting documents e.g LPOs, D/N, GRN, TAX INVOICES, revealed that payments to suppliers were timely i.e not exceeding two months recommended by the assessment manual

Examples of Suppliers verified included the following;

(1) CIDO Ltd, contract no. Nami 617/supls/17 – 18/00004, pv-AD18/2/18 dated 19/2/18 of shs 5,640,000, receipt no.0151 dated 19/2/18 of shs 5,640,000, LPO. 0030 dated 16/10/2018 of 6,000,000, for supply of 3 printers , D/N 010 dated 27/11/2018, GRN 057 dated 27/11/17, call off order Nami 617/supls/17-18/00004/13, procurement minute no .018NCC/2017/18(E)

Requisition date for payment by supplier 24/1/2018.

Date of certification by CAO for payment 31/1/2018.

Duration of delay in certification by CAO was 7 days i.e ( 24/1/2018 to 31/1/2018 ) = 7 days.

.The mandatory requirement is that the delay period should not exceed 2 months, therefore payment was timely..

(2) Delta Communications and IT Ltd, contract no. Nami 617/supls/17 – 18/00004, pv-AD09/2/18 dated 5/2/18 of shs 15,228,000, receipt no.298 dated 7/2/18 of shs 15,228,000, LPO. 0014 dated 1/11/2017 of 18,000,000, for supply of 3 desk top computers, 3 laptops , D/N 446 dated 13/11/2017, Tax invoice 291 dated 13/11/2017 of shs 18,000,000, GRN 0040 dated 13/11/17 of shs 18,000,000, call off order Nami 617/supls/17-18/00004/01, procurement minute no .Nami 617 NCC/2017/18(E)

Requisition date for payment by supplier 13/11/2017

Date of certification by CAO for payment 23/11/2017.

Duration of delay in certification by CAO was 10 days i.e ( 13/11/2017 to 23/11/2017 ) = 10 days.

.The mandatory requirement iwas that the delay period should not exceed 2 months, therefore payment was timely...

<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"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor: 1 point.</li> <li>• LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had no substantive senior internal auditor, as per the DSC appointment minute ref: 172/2009(ii), appointment letter ref: CR 156/2 dated 15/7/2009, in the names of Manghall Joel Wateya, for the post of "Internal Auditor" with a salary scale U4 upper, signed by Mr Kanyarotoke Moses (CAO , Manafwa).</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"> <li>• LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had produced all quarterly Internal Audit Reports for FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarter 1 internal audit report was dated 30/10/2017.</li> <li>• Quarter 2 internal audit report was dated 24/1/2018</li> <li>• Quarter 3 internal audit report was dated 17/4/2018</li> <li>• Quarter 4 internal audit report was dated 18/7/2018.</li> </ul>	<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>The LG had provided all the information to the council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year.</p> <p>LGPAC and Council received all quarterly Internal Audit Reports which also included status of implementation of the previous quarters as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarter 1 internal audit report ref: CRN AMD 226/2 was delivered and stamped received by clerk to council on 30/10/2017.</li> <li>• Quarter 2 internal audit report ref: CRN AMD 226/2 was delivered and stamped received by clerk to council on 24/1/2018.</li> <li>• Quarter 3 internal audit report ref: CRN AMD 226/2 was delivered and stamped received by clerk to council on 17/4/2018.</li> <li>• Quarter 4 internal audit report ref: CRN AMD 226/2 was delivered and stamped received by clerk to council on 18/7/2018.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG Accounting Officer and LG PAC had received the quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY 2017/2018, but were not reviewed and followed up.</p> <p>Information availed to us during the assessment suggested that DPAC had not been sitting to discuss the quarterly internal audit reports submitted by the office of the chief internal auditor ever since it was established in 2017. Reference was made to the 4th quarter internal audit report, page 12, item no..4.3.1, titled "Non Functionality of PAC" which highlighted the issue for the attention of CAO and other stake holders.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had not updated the assets register, though the correct format prescribed in the accounting manual was in use .</p> <p>For example, the following assets selected for verification lacked information as indicated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Register for Land and buildings was in place, but blank.</li> <li>The following m/vehicles had no cost/valuation; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M/V Reg No. UG 2091W, wheel loader 250-5 komatch, engine no SA46D102E-2, Chassis no. KMTNA020AHAO72976, diesel, acquired on 20/12/2017, located at MOW</li> <li>M/V UG3567M at Magale HCIV, acquired on (no details), model (no details), description (no details), tyre size(no details).</li> <li>M/V UG 2067W, Grader CD663A-2, engine no. 6D125-117522, Chassis no.KMTGDO28THA001849, Diesel, date of acquisition 20/12/2017, description(no details), tyre size(no details), capacity(no details)</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unqualified audit opinion: score 4</li> <li>Qualified: score 2</li> <li>Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement was unqualified</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>Review of 7 sets of minutes of Council for FY 2017/18 for 12th/07/2017, 11th/10/2017, 3rd/11/2017, 22nd/12/2017, 20th/03/2018, 29th/03/2018, and 9th/05/2018 indicated that though some service delivery issues had been considered, Council had not discussed LG PAC reports.</p> <p>Examples of issues discussed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In meeting of 3rd/11/2017 recommended members of District Land Board, DSC and PAC under DLG Min 23/11/2017/18 and approved customised staff structure under DLG Min. 25/11/2017/18.</li> <li>• In meeting of 22nd/12/2017 approved supplementary budget worth 427,610,505= for support to polio immunisation, GAVI -MoH and Agricultural extension under Min. 36/12/2017/18</li> <li>• In meeting of 29th/03/2018 discussed Committee reports under DLG Min 52/03/2017-18.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG had not designated a person to coordinate response to feedback as at time of assessment.</li> <li>• However some responses had been made e.g. complaint on non-payment of teachers' salaries raised by UNATU Namisindwa branch dated 27th/11/2017 addressed to the CAO had been responded to in CAO's letter dated 5th/12/2017</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG had not specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to complaints as at time of assessment.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the Pensioner schedule was on display on wall at district H/Q the Payroll September 2018 was not.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement plan FY 2018/19 and awarded contracts were not published/displayed as at time of assessment. On display was an invitation to bid for framework contracts, management of revenue resources and pre-qualification for works, services and supplies for FY 2018/19 dated 27th/06/2018</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Namisindwa DLG had not displayed/published performance assessment results for FY 2017/18 because OPM had not published them.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E-mail dated 19th/02/2018 from Planner to SASs communicated DDEG guidelines FY 2018/19. Further to that, DDEG guidelines FY 2018/19 had been explained in TPC meeting of 30th/01/2018 attended by SASs.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• Evidence that LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation: score 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG had conducted discussions with the public as evidenced by reports on radio talk shows prepared by Ag. DHO dated 7th/09/2017 and another dated 14th/06/2018 where polio immunisation and rota virus vaccine against diarrhoea in children had been discussed.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p>To support sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities, the Gender focal point/CDO held a gender mainstreaming training for Sub-County Technical Staff and Councillors in January 2018. A report of the activity was availed at the time of assessment</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"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p>The DCDO/Gender focal person has planned several activities for 2018/2019 to strengthen women's roles and address vulnerability and social inclusion.</p> <p>These include; Gender Mainstreaming training for TPC members, implementing UWEP, implementing YLP, Supporting women groups ( 6 women groups are due to be given 10 goats each under DDEG), Support to 4 PWD Groups- Each will receive 2 million shillings, compiling an inventory of service providers for OVCs, handling juvenile and GBV cases among others</p> <p>According to the Financial Statement of the LG for the FY ended 30th June 2018, the approved budget for the Community Based Services Department in the LG was 505,730,000/= and the actual was 382,628,734/=. This translates into 75.6% of the budget implemented</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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of assessment the LG did not present any environmental screening form for any of the projects implemented in 2017/2018</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"> <li>• Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence produced to prove that there was deliberate integration of environmental and social management, health and safety issues into the bid documents</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"> <li>• Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Some of the projects implemented in 2017/2018 were on land owned by the district while others were on church, community/private land. The status as provided by the physical planner for this sample of 5 projects is as follows;</p> <p>(a) The construction of the Namisindwa Administration (District land-Processing land title, recommended to District Land Board for grant of free hold)</p> <p>(b) Renovation of former Bupoto S/C Headquarters (District land-Processing land title, recommended to District Land Board for grant of free hold)</p> <p>(c) Construction of a 2 classroom block at Tserono P/S in Magale S/C (Status of land ownership not clarified)</p> <p>(d) Rehabilitation of Buwabwala and Soono GFS (No agreements with private land owners in whose land the GFS passes done)</p> <p>(e) The construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Bukhabusi P/S in Bukhabusi S/C (On church land-no agreement with the church on this investment)</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"> <li>• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of assessment, the Environment officer and CDO had not filled any Social Mitigation Certification Form for any completed project for 2017/2018</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"> <li>• Evidence that the contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance (new one): Score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The contract payment certificates in the LG had no provision for environmental and social clearance</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"> <li>• Evidence that environmental officer and CDO monthly report, includes a) completed checklists, b) deviations observed with pictures, c) corrective actions taken. Score: 1</li> </ul>	<p>The Environmental Officer and CDO did not present a single report on environmental and social mitigation efforts in the LG</p>	<p>0</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>The LG education de- partment has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</p>	<p>Approved budget in the performance contract FY 2018/19, the LG Work Plan (page 51) indicates budget provision of 8,030,348,000(~8 bn shillings) for 1320 teachers in 95 government-aided primary schools. The updated list of schools in the office of the DEO indicates that 1040 of 1394 teachers are in post in 95 schools. Assuming 95 schools, each with 7 teachers and a head teacher, all at starting pay as per salary schedule 2018/19, their total budget would be 4,547,765,520. Therefore a wage bill of 8bn shillings is sufficient to cater for at least 8 teaching staff with a head teacher inclusive.</p>	4
<p>The LG education de- partment has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</p>	<p>On the school list in the office of DEO, not all 95 schools have 7 or more teachers in post for the current FY 2018/19. Some primary schools such as Kutsuyi , a primary six level school with only 3 teachers , Bunamuntsu , a primary five level schools with only 4 teachers and Bunaganda with 5 teachers. Basically, the understaffed schools do not have a teacher per class, as per the guidelines. Of the 95 headteachers, only 69 are substantive.</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>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision</p> <p>o If 100%: score 6</p> <p>o If 80 - 99%: score 3</p> <p>o If below 80%: score 0</p>	<p>Of the 1320 teachers with a wage bill, 1040 teachers are in post in 95 primary schools. This translates into 79% of the structure filled with teachers in primary schools.</p>	0

<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>Namisidwa Local Government approved and adopted staff structure (19/12/17) provides for Senior Inspector of Schools and an Inspector of Schools. Substantively, both positions of Inspectors of Schools are not yet filled.</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"> <li>• Primary Teachers: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There is evidence that LG Education department submitted a recruitment plan on 27th/9/2018 to fill 349 positions of teachers in primary schools.</p> <p>The following are the details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Headteachers - 26 positions</li> <li>(2) Deputy Headteachers - 37 positions</li> <li>(3) Senior Education Assistants - 25 positions</li> <li>(4) Education Assistants - 261 positions</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Inspectors: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There is evidence that LG Education department submitted a recruitment plan on 27th/9/2018 to fill 2 positions of Inspectors of Schools in the LG education department.</p> <p>The details in plan included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 Senior Inspector of Schools</li> <li>• 1 Inspector of schools.</li> </ul>	<p>2</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"> <li>• 100% school inspectors: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>The approved and adopted staff structure for Namisindwa DLG (19/12/17) provides for Senior Inspector of Schools and Inspector of Schools. Both positions are not yet substantively filled.</p> <p>100% (All the 2) of Acting Inspectors of Schools had been appraised for FY 2017/18.</p> <p>a) Ag.Senior inspector of schools (Ms.Namutosi Sophia-assigned duties on 1/12/17) had been appraised on 2/7/18 by PAS and the annual performance report was on file.</p> <p>b) Ag.Inspector of Schools (Lusayi William-assigned duties on 8/2/18) had been appraised on 24/7/18 by PAS</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary school head teachers o 90 - 100%: score 3</li> <li>o 70% and 89%: score 2</li> <li>o Below 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Namisindwa DLG has (95) Government aided primary schools. There are (95) head teachers (substantive and caretakers). None (0%) of (95) HTs had been appraised during calendar year 2017.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>Despite the fact that documents (circulars, policies and guidelines) received by the department could not be traced in sample schools, a series meetings held with headteachers to explain issues in the related circulars was evident that the documents were issues. The head teacher of Situmi Primary School claimed that he receives information by Whatapps.</p> <p>The following were some of the circulars that were received by Department.</p> <p>(1) Guidelines on school charges received on 4/11/2017</p> <p>(2) Enforcing closure of illegal schools on received on 28/03/2018</p> <p>(3) Un-licensing of illegal/unregistered schools received on 6/9/2017</p> <p>(4) Guidelines for registration of 2018 PLE candidates received on 24/03/2018.</p>	<p>1</p>
--	--	--	----------

<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>Namisindwa DLG is a new district that formerly part of Manafwa district, and it was inaugurated a year ago. There was evidence that LG education department held a series of meetings with headteachers in primary schools to discuss and explain circulars, guidelines and policy issues. For example,</p> <p>(1) On 11/07/2017, the department held a meeting to orient the headteachers and their deputies about the operations of the new district.</p> <p>(2) On 01/08/2017, the department held a meeting with headteachers to issue discuss and explain the support supervision tools.</p> <p>(3) On 26/09/2017, held a planning meeting with headteachers to discuss the issue of PLE 2017 timetable</p> <p>(4) On 18/10/2017, together with the CAO the department met headteachers to explain the issue of missing salaries of teachers, and eventually called upon teachers to present their bank statements, TIN and IPS numbers.</p> <p>(5) On 14/11/2017, the department met private school proprietors to explain guidelines for likening/registering a private school based on BRMSI - March 2010.</p> <p>(6) On 01/02/04/2018, held a meeting with proprietors of Nursery schools to explain guidelines</p> <p>(7) On 17/04/2018, the department held a meeting with headteachers of private schools to remind them of SMC policy and qualification of teachers.</p> <p>The department has a good practice of registering headteachers who attend meetings chronologically in the book, and the evidence was easily traced for assessment.</p>	
--	--	--	--



The LG Education De- partment has effectively inspected all registered primary schools2

Maximum 12 for this performance measure

• Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced:

- o 100% - score 12
- o 90 to 99% - score 10
- o 80 to 89% - score 8
- o 70 to 79% - score 6
- o 60 to 69% - score 3
- o 50 to 59 % score 1
- o Below 50% score 0.

The overall school inspection coverage of public and private primary schools per term stands at 63%. There are 120 (95 government & 15 private) schools.

(a) School inspection coverage from inspection reports

- Term I 2018 submitted on 10th/09/2018 indicated that 107schools were inspected (89%)
- Term II 2018 submitted on 10th/09/ 2018 indicated 95 schools were inspected (79%)
- Term III 2017 submitted on 10th/09/ 2018 stated that 99 schools were inspected (83%)

Average school inspection from reports =  $(89 + 83 + 79)/3 = 251/3 = 83\%$

(b) There was evidence of inspection coverage from sample schools as follows:

(1) In Magale Boarding Girls P/S, 1 inspection feedback report on (05/02/18) in FY 2017/18. Inspection coverage at Magale Boarding Girls P/S was 33%.

(2) In Situmi P/S, 2 inspection feedback reports on 10/11/17 and 27/03/2018 in FY 2017/18. Inspection overage at Situmi P/S was 67%.

(3) In Lwandubi P/S, 1 inspection feedback report on 28/03/18 in FY 2017/18. Inspection overage at Lwandubi P/S was 33%.

(4) In Namirama P/S, 1 inspection feedback report on 28/03/18 in FY 2017/18. Inspection overage at Namirama P/S was 33%.

(5) Magale Mixed PS, 1 inspection feedback report on 28/03/18 in FY 2017/18. Inspection overage at Magale Mixed P/S was 33%.

Average inspection coverage from sample schools =  $(67 + 33 + 33 + 33 + 33)/5 = 199/5 = 40\%$

Overall school inspection =  $(83 + 40)/2 = 63\%$

<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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that school inspection reports 2017/2018, were discussed in the department meetings held on: 26/02/2018, march/2018, under min4/STF/3/2018, 19/09/2018, to recommend on as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Many teachers were missing salaries and it affected the motivation of teachers in schools. The department recommended that the CAO should handle the salary issue as soon as fast .</li> <li>(2) Comprehensive joint supervision and inspections with political leaders in schools.</li> <li>(3) Stepping up safety and security in schools through awareness meetings.</li> <li>(4) SMC members had little knowledge on school governance. There was need to organize SMC induction and sensitization workshop</li> <li>(5) Time management and supervision of teachers by headteachers was low and unplanned. In private schools, the situation was worse. There was need for a refresher workshop and follow- up meetings.</li> </ol>	<p>4</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that Okiror John Robert and Obua Jimmy of DES acknowledge receipt of Inspection reports: term II 2018, on 9th July 2018 and both term I 2018 on 25th May 2018, Term III 2017 on 10/09/2018.</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"> <li>• Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed- up: score 4.</li> </ul>	<p>(1) On the issue of missing salaries of teachers, there was evidence of meetings with PHRO , DEO and CAO , for on 15th /5/2018, PHRO and DEO to explain the issue of missing salary, and currently, most of the teachers accessed the payroll.</p> <p>(2) On the issue of inadequate teaching/learning especially in private schools, both DIS and CAO moved out to close illegal private schools in April 2018. Some of the closed schools include: Green Valley PS, Little Angels PS, God’s Glory and High Way PS.</p> <p>(3) On the issue of poor supervision of teachers by headteachers, on 1st /08/2017, the department held a meeting with headteachers to issue, discuss and explain the support supervision tools.</p> <p>(4) Special meetings on 17/4/2018 and 24th /05/2018 by the Department were held with headteachers private schools to discuss quality of teaching and learning , and formation of SMC as governance tool and reminded them to recruit qualified teachers</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The list of schools in the LG education department has 95 government schools which was not consistent with EMIS report obtained in MoES, having record 80 schools.</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"> <li>• Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>Enrollment data in EMIS report obtained from MoES and PBS are not accurate and consistent. Notably, The records of the MoES EMIS report indicate 56,766 pupils enrolled in government schools, which is contrary 75144 pupils recorded in the PBS</p>	<p>0</p>
---	--	--	----------

Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<p>The LG committee re- sponsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>Review of minutes of Education and Health Committee for FY 2017/18 indicated that though some service delivery issues had been considered, LG PAC reports had not been discussed by the committee. Examples of some of the issues discussed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In meeting of 23rd/11/2017 committee discussed Education progress report for quarter I under SCEH/03/11/2017/18 – need to strengthen monitoring of teachers attendance, need to rectify payroll anomalies, need to post at least one female teacher to Busambatsa PS.</li> <li>• In meeting of 26th/02/2018 discussed Education report for quarter II under SCEH Min 04/02/2017/18– need to strengthen inspection of schools to curb absenteeism; recommended persons to SMCs</li> <li>• In meeting of 26th/03/2018 discussed Education Department proposed workplan FY 2018/19 under SCEH Min 03/03/2017/18 – identified unfunded priorities to include latrine construction in Masaaka, Bumwalye, Mulondo, Bukhayaki, Bumumali, Buwabwala, Sibembe and Kaboole PSs; classroom construction in Bulumera, Makunya, Kaboole, Sibembe PS; supply of furniture to Butemulani PS.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
--	---	--	----------

<p>The LG committee re- sponsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Education and Health Committee had presented to Council in meeting of 29th/03/2018 under DLG Min 52/03/2017-18 Committee report and recommendations for approval e.g. recommended institution of new SMCs since the other had been dissolved, and, recommended 7 schools for coding under Min 45/03/2017/18</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (estab- lished, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO/ MEO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% schools: score 5</li> <li>• 80 to 99% schools: score 3</li> <li>• Below 80 % schools: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was some evidence of functionality of SMCs in the 5 sample schools, in FY 2017/18</p> <p>(1) Kaboyi P/S submitted minutes of 3 meeting of 10/07/17, 06/9/2017 and 19/5/17 having evidence of budget discussions</p> <p>(2) Buwandyambi P/S submitted minutes of 3 meetings of 01/08/17, 24/11/17 and 28/3/18 with evidence budget approval and discussions.</p> <p>(3) Makunya P/S submitted minutes of 1 meeting on 14/2/18 with no evidence of budget discussions</p> <p>(4) Situyi P/S submitted minutes of 2 meetings on 3/7/17 and 2/2/18 with budget discussions</p> <p>(5) Lwandubi P/S had not submitted minutes of any meeting at all</p> <p>Therefore the score of elements of functionality:</p> <p>(i) Establishment of SMC = 5/5(100%),</p> <p>(ii) Mandatory meetings = 9/15(60%)</p> <p>(III) Budgeting and resources = 4/5(80%)</p> <p>(iv) Submission of minutes = 4/5(80%)</p> <p>Functionality = (100 +80+80+60)/4 =320/4 = 80%</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non- wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</li> </ul> <p>e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</p>	<p>There was evidence that LG had published all schools receiving non-wage grant on the notice board of the CAO office for public review.</p>	<p>3</p>
---	--	---	----------

Procurement and contract management

<p>The LG Education department has submitted input into the LG procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements,</p> <p>to the Procurement Unit that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>By April 30th, the LG Education Department had not submitted an input into the Procurement Plan for 2018/2019 as is required</p>	<p>0</p>
---	---	---	----------

Financial management and reporting

The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time

Maximum 3 for this performance measure

• Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3.

• The LG Education department timely certified and recommended suppliers for payment as per the contract terms and conditions.

Examples of contracts verified included:

(1)-Procurement Ref:Nami 617/Wrks/17-18/00094, by Muaina Engineering Works ltd, for construction of 2 stance VIP latrine at Mutsasa p/school, with a contract price of shs 12,955,692, date of completion and requisition for payment 28/6/2018, date of certification by CAO 28/6/2018,payment voucher no.PV-13/06, dated 29/6/2018 of shs 11,702,358.Delay period- nil

Payment was therefore timely.

(2)-Procurement Ref:Nami 617/Wrks/17-18/00051, by Gido ltd, for construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Bumakhame p/school - Bukokho GRC , with a contract price of shs 24, 687,252, date of completion and requisition for payment 29/6/2018, date of certification by CAO 29/6/2018,payment voucher no.PV-17/06, dated 29/6/2018 of shs 22,299,007.Delay period- nil

Payment was therefore timely.

(3)-Procurement Ref:Nami 617/Wrks/17-18/00050, by Pearl of cliffs Investments & construction ltd, for construction of 5 stance latrine at Bumbo p/school – Bumwoni s/county , with a contract price of shs 25,709,000, date of completion and requisition for payment 28/6/2018, date of certification by CAO 28/6/2018,payment voucher no.PV-19/20, dated 29/6/2018 of shs 15,355420.

Delay period- nil.

Payment was therefore timely.

<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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PBS system administrator messages indicated that though quarter I-III reports had been submitted on time by Education department to Planning unit for consolidation, the quarter IV/Annual performance report was submitted past the deadline of 15th July 2018 as follows:</li> </ul> <p>Quarter I report: 23rd/01/2018</p> <p>Quarter II report: 9th/03/2018</p> <p>Quarter III report: 27th/05/2018</p> <p>Quarter IV/Annual report: 29th/08/2018</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If sector has no audit query</li> </ul> <p>score 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> <li>o If all queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG Education sector had not provided any documented information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the year 2017/18.</p> <p>The internal audit department explained that there were responses, but not communicated in writing. We were therefore unable to get evidence to justify the claim.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			



<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG Education Department in collaboration with the Gender Focal Point had disseminated guidelines on how senior women and men teachers could engage girls and boys in school</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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG Education Department in collaboration with the Gender Department had issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools</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"> <li>• Evidence that the School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The SMCs in all sample schools meet the gender composition guidelines based on education ACT 2008.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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:</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of assessment, the LG Education Department in collaboration with the Environment Department had not issued guidelines on environmental management to schools</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<p>The School infrastructure projects for 2017/2018 were not screened and therefore no mitigation actions were identified</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to check whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The Environment Officer and CDO did not screen school infrastructure projects so they could not monitor the sites for compliance with mitigation actions</p>	<p>0</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health care workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health care with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than 80% filled: score 8</li> <li>• 60 – 80% - score 4</li> <li>• Less than 60% filled: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG Performance contract 2018/19 FY indicates the PHC wage bill provision of UGX 1,938,415,000 and the wage bill for staff in post of UGX 745,178,448 before the salary enhancement. The staff structure has 314 positions of which 198 are filled i.e. 63% staffing level.</p>	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/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of primary health care workers: score 6</p>	<p>A recruitment plan was submitted to HRM in a letter dated 4th June 2018 obtained from DHO's office covering 15 staff.</p>	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"> <li>o 100%: score 8</li> <li>o 70 – 99%: score 4</li> <li>o Below 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Namisindwa DLG has one HCIV-Magale. There is no general hospital.</p> <p>None (0%) of health facility in-charge had been appraised during FY 2017/18.</p> <p>The annual performance report (Dr.Nakami Lukia-appointed under DSC Min.342/2016 (1) as medical officer and assigned as in-charge for Magale HCIV on 8/7/16) was not on file at the time of the assessment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The Local Government Health department has deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>All 13 Health facilities were submitted with the performance contract (PBS). The deployed staffs in the sampled health facilities were as per the staff list in the performance contract. A few mismatches were due to migration from Manafwa District.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Monitoring and Supervision</p>			
<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no letter communicating policies, circulars or guidelines to health facilities. The DHO however claimed that they were communicated by Implementing Partners like RHITES-E.</p>	<p>0</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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no report or minutes of a meeting convened in which policies, circulars or guidelines were explained.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: score 3</p>	<p>The District has one HCIV (Magale HCIV- PNFP) and no hospital. At the time of assessment, there was no report for support supervision obtained from the DHO's office or at the health facility.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% supervised: score 3</li> <li>80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2</li> <li>60% - 79% of the health facilities: score 1</li> <li>Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no report for supervision of lower facilities by the HSD obtained.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no minute of a meeting held obtained at DHO's office implying that the LG did not discuss any quarterly supervision report during the FY.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</li> </ul>	<p>Minutes of meetings that discussed quarterly reports were not available hence could not easily establish follow up actions.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>List of all health facilities was submitted as part of the performance contract 2018/19 FY and all facilities were included.</p> <p>HMIS forms 105, 108, 012 and 033b for July 2018 were submitted through DHIS2 online systems with 100% submission rates.</p>	<p>10</p>

Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<p>Review of minutes of Education and Health Committee for FY 2017/18 indicated that though some service delivery issues had been considered, LG PAC reports had not been discussed by the committee. Examples of some of the issues discussed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In meeting of 23rd/11/2017 committee discussed Health progress report for quarter I under SCEH/03/11/2017/18 – need for additional funding to Magale HC IV being the only HCIV in the district, fees charged in Magale HCIV were high and needed to be revisited, need for lighting in all HCs to enable attendance to patients in the night.</li> <li>In meeting of 26th/02/2018 discussed Health report for quarter II under SCEH Min 04/02/2017/18 – need to lobby MoH for establishment of HCs in LLGs that lacked them, need to check the high absenteeism of health workers and informal hiring of volunteer health workers.</li> <li>In meeting of 26th/03/2018 discussed Health Department proposed workplan FY 2018/19 under SCEH Min 03/03/2017/18 –upgrading of Bupoto HC III to HC IV to include construction of a theatre, and, health department was to plan for construction of facilities in HCs in phases given inadequate funding to the sector.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Education and Health Committee had presented to Council issues for approval for example in Council meeting of 29th/03/2018 presented Committee report under DLG Min 52/03/2017-18 –recommended stocking of Mukoto Aid post with drugs so as to support community there.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 6 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 6</li> <li>• If 80-99 %: score 4</li> <li>• If 70-79: %: score 2</li> <li>• If less than 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Only one of the five sampled facilities held all the mandatory meetings i.e. Bupoto HCIII. The other four did not .i.e. Bumbo HCIII, Magale HCIV and Bumwoni HCII held two meetings each while Bupoto C.O.U HCII (PNFP) did not hold any meeting during the previous FY implying that 20% of HUMCs were functional.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence of displaying the health facilities receiving PHC non- wage on the notice board.</p>	<p>0</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"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has submitted input to procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The LG Health Department does not have any project to implement in 2018/2019 and therefore could not make a submission to PDU for an input into the Procurement Plan for 2018/2019 by April 30th as required</p>	<p>2</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

Maximum 4 for this performance measure

- Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2.

In the previous FY, the LG Health Department did not submit procurement requests by the end of the 1st Quarter because the Department did not have any Health Project to implement.

The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time

Maximum 4 for this performance measure

- Evidence that the DHO/ MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4.

- The DHO certified and recommended suppliers for payment timely .A sample of contracts verified to determine terms of payment were:

(1)-Procurement Ref:Nami 617/Wrks/17-18/00053, by FREMATEX SERVICES LTD, for construction of Magale Hans Medical Centre (Domitory, OPD, and 3 stance water born toilets), with a contract price of shs 83,145,934, date of completion and requisition for payment 20/6/2018, date of certification by CAO 20/6/2018,payment voucher no.PV-22/06, dated 29/6/2018 of shs 18,983,051, receipt no 011 dated 29/6/29/6/2018, cheque no 100101.

Delay period- nil (Requisition and certification by CAO was done on the same day 20/6/2018).

Payment was therefore timely.

(2)-Procurement Ref:Mana 566/Wrks/12-13/00004, by African Construction Technicians & Contractors ltd, for construction of Maternity and General Ward at Bukhabusi HCIII, with a contract price of shs 112,523,483 (balance taken over from Manafwa DLG), date of completion and requisition for payment 8/6/2018, date of certification by CAO 8/6/2018,payment voucher no.PV-13/06, dated 8/6/2018 of shs 6,901,416, cheque no 100097, receipt no 0053 dated 8/6/2018 of shs 6,901,416.

Delay period- nil (Requisition and certification by CAO was done on the same day 20/6/2018).

Payment was therefore timely.

<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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PBS system administrator messages indicated that though quarter I-III reports had been submitted on time by Health department to Planning unit for consolidation, the quarter IV/Annual performance report was submitted past the deadline of 15th July 2018 as follows:</li> </ul> <p>Quarter I report: 6th/02/2018</p> <p>Quarter II report: 13th/03/2018</p> <p>Quarter III report: 31st/05/2018</p> <p>Quarter IV/Annual report: 29th/08/2018</p>	0
<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"> <li>If sector has no audit query: Score 4</li> <li>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</li> <li>If all queries are not responded to Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Health sector had not provided any documented information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the year 2017/18.</p> <p>The internal audit department explained that there were responses, but not communicated in writing. We were therefore unable to get evidence to justify the claim.</p>	0
Social and environmental safeguards			
<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"> <li>Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30 % women: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>From the sampled facilities, three (3) facilities (Bupoto COU HCII- 33.3%, Bumwoni HCIII- 37.5% and Magale HCIV- 33.3%) meet the gender composition requirement on the HUMC). The other two stand at 14.3% each i.e. Bupoto HCIII and Bumbo HCIII. Implying that overall, the gender requirement was not met.</p>	0

<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"> <li>Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>Three of the five sampled facilities have sanitation facilities labelled for male and females. The other two do not have.</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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<p>There was no district Health projects for 2017/2018 therefore there was no need for screening of projects</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"> <li>The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to check whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The Environment Officer and CDO did not monitor district health infrastructure projects in 2017/2018 because there were no projects implemented during the FY.</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"> <li>Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal: score 4.</li> </ul>	<p>Three (3) of the five (5) sampled facilities have segregation charts i.e. Bumbo HCIII, Bumwoni HCIII and Magale HCIV. The other two (Bupoto COU HCII and Bupoto HCIII) do not have.</p>	<p>0</p>
---	--	--	----------

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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"> <li>o If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below average coverage: score 10</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 7</li> <li>o If 60-79: Score 4</li> <li>o If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Namisindwa LG safe water coverage stands at 64%.</p> <p>The district has seventeen sub counties; six of them are below the district average.</p> <p>DWO FY 2018/19 budget UGX. 467,906,000.</p> <p>Budget allocation to sub counties below district average was UGX. 467,906,000.</p> <p>Sub counties targeted below the district average included magale, bumbo, namboko, bupoto and buwabwala. Water project</p> <p>Lirima GFS (namboko s/c) 256,572,000</p> <p>Borehole rehabilitation (3 sub counties) 22,680,000.</p> <p>Therefore FY 2018/19 budget allocation to sub counties below district average was 60%.</p>	4
<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"> <li>• 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"> <li>o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 15</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 10</li> <li>o If 60-79: Score 5</li> <li>o If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>As par Q4 report FY 2017/18, targeted sub counties below district safe water coverage water projects were implemented in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bumbo S/C – 45%, one borehole rehabilitated.</li> <li>• Magale S/C – 53% two boreholes rehabilitated, seventy connections under extension of lirima GFS.</li> <li>• Mukoto S/C – 58%, two spring protection and five tap stands.</li> <li>• Tsekululu S/C – 38%, forty three tap stands.</li> <li>• Bukiabi S/C – 51%, two boreholes rehabilitated.</li> <li>• Namboko S/C – 30%, one borehole rehabilitated.</li> </ul>	15

## 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"> <li>• If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15</li> <li>• 80% - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10</li> <li>• 70 - 79%: score 7</li> <li>• 60% - 69% monitored: score 5</li> <li>• 50% - 59%: score 3</li> <li>• Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Namisindwa DWO monitoring reports on file were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 21-29th Dec 2017, DWO namisindwa monitored the functionality of the GFS, deep boreholes, and springs in twelve sub counties of buwasiba, makhola, buneembe, nabutoro, bumwanga, magale mixed P.S, buwabwala, bikhaweka, bukhabusu, mukoto and bututo.</li> <li>• Q4 monitoring report dated 23rd May 2018, DWO, technical officers and works committee members monitored the functionality of water sources for sixteen sub counties bumwoni, bubutu, namboko, bumwani, bukiabi, lwakhakaha T/C, bukokho, magale, buwabwala, bukhaweka, bukhabusu, bupoto, mukoto, and bupoto.</li> <li>• Q3 23rd – 27th March 2018, a team of works committee of the district council and the district staff from other departments monitored the functionality of all water sources of bupoto, namboko, bumwoni, bukiabi, lwakhakaha, magale, buwabwala, bukhaweka, bukhabusu and namabya.</li> <li>• Inspection report for the extension of lirima GFS to sub counties of buputu, magale and bumwoni dated 29th June 2018.</li> <li>• The status report on rehabilitation of buwabwala GFSs dated 13th June 2018.</li> <li>• DWO Inspection report for springs under DWSCG FY 2017/18. Dated 4th, 7th &amp; 21st June 2018</li> <li>• Monitoring functionality for water and sanitation facilities in the district by works standing committee during Q.3, FY 2017/18.</li> </ul> <p>Out of 724 water sources 450 water sources were monitored and supervised leading to 62%.</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"> <li>Evidence that the district has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: Score 5</li> <li>List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>Namisindwa LG OBT has 64%, and MIS/TSU update puts it at 70%, hence there was no consistency.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>According to DWO records and OBT 120 tap stands, 17 borehole rehabilitation, six protections of springs and MIS update had the same corresponding facilities.</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>There was no information on file concerning submission of procurement plan at the time of assessment.</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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of assessment DWO not did avail the contract management plan FY 2017/18 for the different water sources and sanitation infrastructure projects</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"> <li>If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2</li> </ul>	<p>out of four projects two had the were filed with BOQs;</p> <p>BOQ dated 24/11/2017 for soona GFS and buwabwala GFS was filed.</p> <p>BOQ dated 20/6/2018 for lirima GFS.</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"> <li>If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was no information on file concerning contracts for all projects at the time of assessment</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"> <li>If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>DWO did not provide information concerning project certification at the time of assessment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has certified and initiated payment for works and supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DWO certified and recommended suppliers for payment timely .</li> </ul> <p>Examples of contracts verified to determine terms of payment included:</p> <p>(1)-Procurement Ref:Nami 617/Wrks/17-18/00035, by Shelter HI-Tech Ltd, for rehabilitation of Buwabw andala and Soono GFS, with a contract price of shs 62,234,350, date of completion and requisition for payment 11/6/2018, date of certification by CAO 22/6/2018,payment voucher no.PV-65/06, dated 28/6/2018 of shs 55,715,542 net.</p> <p>Delay period- 11 days (11/6/2018 upto 22/6/2018).</p> <p>The assessment manual recommends that any delay, necessary, should not exceed 2 months.</p> <p>Payment was therefore timely.</p> <p>(2)-Procurement Ref: Nami 617/Wrks/17-18/00036, by KAMS Contractors ltd, for extension of Lirma GFS, with a contract price of shs 238,164,000, date of completion and requisition for payment 28/6/2018, date of certification by CAO 29/6/2018,payment voucher no.PV-70/06, dated 29/6/2018 of shs 215,120,925.Delay period 1 day(28/6/2018 upto 29/6/2018).</p> <p>The assessment manual recommends that any delay, necessary, should not exceed 2 months.</p> <p>Payment was therefore timely.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

<p>The district Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PBS system administrator messages indicated that though quarter I-III reports had been submitted on time by Water department to Planning unit for consolidation, the quarter IV/Annual performance report was submitted past the deadline of 15th July as follows:</li> </ul> <p>Quarter I report: 7th/02/2018</p> <p>Quarter II report: 20th/03/2018</p> <p>Quarter III report: 4th/06/2018</p> <p>Quarter IV/Annual report: 29th/08/2018</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"> <li>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</li> <li>If sector has no audit query score 5</li> <li>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</li> <li>If queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG water sector had not provided any documented information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the year 2017/18.</p> <p>The internal audit department explained that there were responses, but not communicated in writing. We were therefore unable to get evidence to justify the claim.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<p>Review of minutes of Works and Technical Services committee for FY 2017/18 indicated that though some service delivery issues had been considered, LG PAC reports and submissions from District Water and Sanitation Coordination committee had not been discussed by the committee. Examples of some of the issues discussed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In meeting of 27th/02/2018 committee discussed Water sector report –Q2 2017/18 under SCWTS Min: 4/02/2017/18 sought update on progress of water quality testing and noted the need to sensitise community against vandalism of water facilities.</li> <li>In meeting of 27th/03/2018 considered Water department proposed workplan for FY 2018/19 under SCWTS Min: 3/03/2017/18 – recommended the greater Buwabwala, Buwuma, Kiswayi and Namboko SCs to benefit from safe water sources. Recommended construction of more latrines in GRCs when funds are available.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>Works and Technical Services committee had presented to Council issues that required approval in meeting of 20th/03/2018 under Min.44/03/2018/19 where Committee report on performance for Oct-Dec FY 2017/18 and recommendations were considered. Recommendations for Council approval included expediting of procurement of motorcycle for the Water department, need to pass bye-law on tree species to be planted in catchment areas, and monitoring visits to Water projects should be carried out by Committee members to keep them informed.</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of assessment, water department did not display AWP, budget and water development grants on the notice board.</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"> <li>All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>All water sources visited in the sub counties of magale, bumoni, and buputu were labeled.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>No information on tenders and contract awards was displayed on the district notice board.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If communities apply for water/ public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was no application file produced at the time of 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"> <li>Water and Sanitation Committees that are functioning evidenced by either: i) collection of O&amp;M funds, ii( carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, iii) facility fenced/protected, or iv) they an M&amp;E plan for the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul> <p>Note: One of parameters above is sufficient for the score.</p>	<p>Water user committees are active this is evidenced by correction of O&amp; M of UGX. 25000 in Bubutu sub county and two water facilities were under school management of magale mixed primary school and namisindwa technical school, and lastly a tap stand at the district head quarter.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence was provided for all project screening.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence was provided for all project screening.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>No information was provided to score this indicator.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<p>The facilities visited were one tap stand was at the district head quarter managed by the district, another at magale mixed primary school, managed by the school, a borehole at bubuyu s/c buwambwa soi village, and the facility the committee yet to be formed, lastly a borehole at namisimbwa technical school.</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"><li>• If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3</li></ul>	<p>The public sanitation facility visited in Bukwo central town had separate stances for men and women, and had a ramp for the PWDs.</p>	<p>3</p>
--	--	--	----------