



## Local Government Performance Assessment

Napak District

(Vote Code: 604)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	83%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	70%
Educational Performance Measures	56%
Health Performance Measures	78%
Water Performance Measures	45%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<p>Napak District Local Government submitted the Final Performance Contract on 19th July 2018 and approved on 20th July 2018 as per the submission schedule of MoFPED, which was before the deadline of 1st August 2018.</p> <p>Note: The PFMAA LG Budget guidelines require the submission to be by 30th June. However, this date was revised to 1st August 2018 as per the request from MoFPED.</p>	Yes
Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			

<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY by 30th June (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<p>Napak District Local Government submitted a Budget for FY 2018/2019; including a Procurement Plan for FY 2018/2019 on the 19th July 2018 as per the submission schedule of MoFPED. The District Council approved the Budget under Min. 44/DLC/2018 during the Council meeting held on 31st May 2018.</p> <p>The submission of the Budget for FY 2018/2019; including a Procurement Plan for FY 2018/2019 was done before the deadline of 1st August 2018 as required.</p> <p>Note: The PFMAA LG Budget Guidelines require the submission to be by 30th June. However, this date was revised to 1st August 2018 as per the request from MoFPED.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
--	--	---	------------

Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports

<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<p>The Annual Budget Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 was submitted on 30th July 2018 (as per computer-generated date on the Q4 report submitted to MoFPED). Napak DLG was missing on the MoFPED Submission Schedule.</p> <p>The submission was made before the deadline of 31st July 2018</p>	<p>Yes</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>	<p>All the four Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for Napak DLG for FY 2017/2018 were submitted to MoFPED as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarter One Report was submitted on 24th February 2018 to MoFPED and approved on 25th February 2018 (as per Submission Schedule of MoFPED).</li> <li>Quarter Two Report was submitted on 22nd March 2018 to MoFPED and approved on 26th March 2018 (as per Submission Schedule of MoFPED).</li> <li>Quarter Three Report was submitted on 24th April 2018 to MoFPED and approved on 25th April 2018 (as per Submission Schedule of MoFPED).</li> <li>Quarter Four Report was submitted on 30th July 2018 to MoFPED (as per computer-generated date on the Q4 report submitted to MoFPED). Napak DLG was missing on the MoFPED Submission Schedule.</li> </ul> <p>The reports for the four quarters were submitted before the deadline of 31st July 2018</p>	<p>Yes</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</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</li> </ul>	<p>The Accounting Officer submitted to the PS/ST information regarding the status of implementation of all the 7 queries raised by the Internal Auditor General in FY 2016/2017 on 7th/12/2017 Ref: CR/101/1 later than the recommended date of 28th February 2018 contrary to provisions of the PFMA 2015</p>	<p>No</p>

lines with applicable laws.

'Response' (and provide details), then it is compliant

- If LG did not submit a 'response', then it is non-compliant
- If there is a response for all –LG is compliant
- If there are partial or not all issues responded to – LG is not compliant.

section 11 2g.

These findings were:

- Delayed payment of Pension and Gratuity Arrears.
- Stores.
- Youth Livelihood Program (YLP)
- Regional Pastoral Livelihoods Resilience Project.
- Lack of Value for Money for roads under Road Fund.
- Unauthorized excess expenditure of Shs. 6,838,600.
- Non-maintenance of Vote Books under NUSAF II Project.

In addition, the Accounting Officer submitted to PS/ST information regarding the status of implementation of 10 queries raised by the OAG for FY 2016/2017 on 27th/3/2018 Ref: CR/101/1 later than the recommended date of 28th February 2018 contrary to the provisions of the PFMA 2015 section 11 2g.

These findings were:

- Unaccounted for funds Shs.76, 732,264.
- Inadequate Controls Surrounding management of Domestic Arrears.
- Non-compliance with Commitment control procedures.
- Unpaid Pension Shs. 229,666,775.
- Failure to implement Budget as approved by Parliament.
- Low absorption/ unspent

		<p>balances: Shs. 72,733, 043 for Global Funds and Shs.37, 763,665 for UNICEF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under staffing.</li> <li>• Delayed deletion of staff that left service.</li> <li>• Low Recovery of YLP funds.</li> <li>• Lack of Land titles.</li> </ul>	
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>Napak DLG obtained Unqualified Audit Opinion for FY 2017/18</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a district/ municipality has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>• The members of the Napak District Physical Planning Committee were appointed by CAO as per letter of 'Even / Without Reference dated 20th July 2017'.</li> <li>• The committee had held four (4) meetings, and in three of these pertinent issues likely to affect district investments were discussed.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Meeting held on 29th June 2018 (under Min. 23/PPC/NDLG/06/2017-18 – Discussion on Issue of Titling Government Land).</li> <li>o Meeting held on 16th March 2018 (under Min. 17/PPC/NDLG/16/2017-18 – Discussion on Land Demarcation0.</li> <li>o Meeting held on 26th September 2017 (under Min4/PPC/NDLG/09/2017-18 – Orientation of Members).</li> <li>o The fourth meeting was held on 6th December 2017.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The Physical Planning Section did not have a book in which to record plans submitted for consideration by the DPPC.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, it was not possible to ascertain that the committee considered new investments on time.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that district/ MLG has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>The district had not submitted minutes of any of the meetings to the Permanent Secretary / MoLHUD. No reason was given for failing to submit.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All infrastructure investments are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan: score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>Napak DLG did not have a physical development plan. Therefore, it was not possible to ascertain whether all infrastructure investments were consistent with a Physical Development Plan which was non-existent</p>	<p>0</p>



<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action area plan prepared for the previous FY: score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There were no Action area plans prepared by Napak DLG during FY 2017/2018. The district was resource-constrained to undertake the activity.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The priorities in the Napak DLG AWP for FY 2018/2019 were based on the outcomes of budget conference that was held on 2nd November 2017.</p> <p>For instance, under:</p> <p>Education: 'Rehabilitation of Classroom Blocks at Longalom Primary School, Pilas Primary School, and Lobok Primary School' (Page 58 of AWP for FY 2018/2019) and Budget Conference Report - Presentation of Education &amp; Sports Department: 'Construction and Rehabilitation' - Page 13.</p> <p>Water: 'Design Iripi Piped Water Supply System' (Page 78 of AWP for FY 2018/2019) and Budget Conference Report - Presentation of Works and Technical Services Department: 'Construction of Piped Water System for Iripi and Lorengecora' - Page 14.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>The capital investments in the approved Annual work Plan for the FY 2018/2019 were derived from the Napak Approved Second District Development Plan (2015/2016 – 2019/2020).</p> <p>For example under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health: ‘Construction of Incinerators at Lorengachora HC III and Loopee HC III’ in AWP for FY 2018/2019 (Page 55) and ‘Construction of Incinerators’ in the DDP (Chapter 3: Section 3.6: Summary of Sectoral Programmes / Projects – Page 215).</li> <li>• Education: ‘Construction of Washroom for both boys and girls at Kalotom Primary School, Lokupoi Primary School, and Lopeei Primary School’ in AWP for FY 2018/2019 (Page 58) and ‘Construction of Girls’ Washrooms’ in the DDP (Chapter 3: Section 3.6: Summary of Sectoral Programmes / Projects – Page 217).</li> <li>• Water: ‘Borehole drilling and Rehabilitation – Boreholes drilled and constructed, boreholes rehabilitated, boreholes siting and drilling, and windmills repairs’ in AWP for FY 2018/2019 (Page 77) and ‘Drilling of 100 boreholes; Rehabilitation of 120 Boreholes; and Construction of 10 windmills’ in the DDP (Chapter 3: Section 3.6: Summary of Sectoral Programmes / Projects – Page 221).</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>	<p>Project profiles were developed and discussed by DTPC for all investments in the AWP for FY 2018/2019 as per LG Planning Guidelines as evidenced by the Minutes of the meeting held on 21st May 2018 (under Min. 05/DTPCNLG/2017/2018 –Discussion of Project Profiles for FY 2018/2019).</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<p>The Annual Statistical Abstract, with gender disaggregated data was compiled and presented to the DTPC to support budget allocation and decision-making as evidenced by the Minutes of the meeting held on 26th April 2018 (under Min. 06/DTPC/April/2018 – Presentation and Discussion of the Draft District Statistical Abstract FY 2018/2019).</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>The infrastructure projects implemented during FY 2017/2018 (as indicated in the Local Government Quarterly Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 (Vote 559 – Quarter 4), were derived from the Annual Work Plan and Budget Estimates for FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>For instance under:</p> <p>Education: '(1) Construction of 1 block of staff house at Morulinga PS - Matany Sub-County, Morulinga Parish' (LG Quarter 4 Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 – Vote 604 Napak - Page 74), and '1 Construction of 1 block of teachers' house in Morulinga PS housing 4 teachers in Matany SC, Morulinga Parish (rural model)' (Napak DLG AWP and Budget – Page 59).</p> <p>Water: '(1) One Production well drilled at Kaigwe in Irii Trading Centre, Irii Parish, Irii Sub-county' (LG Quarter 4 Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 – Vote 604 Napak - Page 88), and 'Construction of Irii – Lorengacora Piped Water System – Feasibility Study for the construction of Irii – Lorengacora Piped Water System' (Napak DLG AWP and Budget – Page 70).</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>o 100%: score 4</li> <li>o 80-99%: score 2</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Basing on the list availed by the PDU - Napak DLG, twenty four (24) out of Twenty six (26) district level investment projects implemented in FY 2017/2018 were completed by 30th June 2018. This was a completion rate of 92.2%.</p> <p>The two (2) uncompleted projects were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drilling of 9 deep boreholes (Procurement Reference No. Napa 604/WRKS/17-18/DWSCG/00005).</li> <li>Drilling of 2 production wells (Procurement Reference No. Napa 604/SUPLS/17-18/DWSCG/00007).</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>

<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 all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>For the 24 investment projects indicated as completed, the total budget was UGX 851,139,000, while the corresponding total expenditure was UGX890,628,475. This expenditure was 104.6% of the total budget for the completed projects. The examples of completed projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of two classroom block with office at Apeitolim Primary School (Procurement Ref: No. Napa 604/Wrks/17-18/SFG/00002). The budget was UGX 80,000,000 and the expenditure was UGX 90,239,565. This expenditure was 112.8% of the budget for the project.</li> <li>Construction of staff house at Morulinga Primary School (Procurement Ref: No. Napa 604/Wrks/17-18/DDEG/00004), The budget was UGX 120,000,000 and the expenditure was UGX 111,318,690. This expenditure was 92.8% of the budget for the project.</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
<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>	<p>Napak DLG budgeted UGX 146,325,000 on O&amp;M during FY 2017/2018, and spent UGX 138,216,725.</p> <p>This was 94.5% of the budget for O&amp;M as per Draft Final Accounts for the Year Ended 30th June 2018 (NOT page numbered BUT coded - GL Account Nos. 228002 &amp; GL Account Name: Maintenance – Vehicles; GL Account Nos. 228003 &amp; GL Account Name: Maintenance – Machinery; GL Account Nos. 228004 &amp; GL Account Name: Maintenance – Other).and Napak DLG Budget, Vote 604.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Human Resource Management</p>			

LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.

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

There were 10 HoDs at U1 salary scale in the approved establishment / organisation structure. Three (3) were substantively appointed as per their appointment letters;

1. D/CAO (date of appointment was not availed)
2. DEO – CR/156/2 dated 1st June 2012
3. D/CDO – CR/156/6 dated 1st June 2012

Seven (7) were performing duties of HoDs as follows;

4. Duties of the D/PO were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Principal Agriculture Officer (U2) as per his appointment letter CR/D/156/6 dated 1st June 2012

5. Duties of the D/NRO were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Environment Officer (U3) as per his appointment letter ,CR/D/0296 dated 1st June 2012

6. Duties of the CFO were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment Senior Accountant (U3) as per the appointment letter CR/D/10216 dated 4th January 2018

7. Duties of the D/Planner were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Principal Planner (U2) as per the appointment letter CR/10043 dated 19th June 2014

8. Duties of the District Engineer were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Supervisor of Works (U4S) as per the appointment letter CR/D/10311 dated 4th January 2018

9. Duties of the District Commercial Officer were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Commercial Officer (U3) as per the appointment letter CR/D/156/6 dated 1st June 2012

10. The duties of the DHO were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Medical Officer (U3S) as per the appointment letter CR/156/6 dated 1st June 2012

<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>There was evidence that nine (9) out of ten (10) HoDs were appraised on the following dates as per appraisal reports seen:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CFO – 23rd July 2018</li> <li>2. D/Planner – 12th July 2018</li> <li>3. D/Engineer – 10th July 2018</li> <li>4. DEO – 12th July 2018</li> <li>5. D/CDO – 13th July 2018</li> <li>6. D/NRO – 12th July 2018</li> <li>7. D/PO – 13rd July 2018</li> <li>8. D/Commercial Officer – 25th July 2018</li> <li>9. DHO – 12th July 2018</li> </ol> <p>There was no evidence that the D/CAO was appraised as head of the Administration Department</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>Fifty (50) positions were submitted to the DSC for recruitment of new employees as per the submission letter ARC//293/05 dated 31st October 2017, as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. District LG      22 posts</li> <li>2. Town Council    28 posts</li> </ol> <p>There was evidence that they were all considered during the DSC meetings held between 11th December 2017 and 3rd January 2018 as per DSC letter, DSC/156/6 dated 8th January 2018, minute serial number 1/2018</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Thirty (30) names of employees from two (2) departments were submitted to the DSC for confirmation of their appointment as per the submission letters of even reference, dated 12th October 2017, as follows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Education Department. 14</li> <li>2. Health Department 16</li> </ol> <p>There was evidence that they were all considered by the DSC during its meeting held on the 3rd January 2018, as per the Letter DSC/156/6 dated 9th January 2018, minute serial number 2/2018</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Four (4) disciplinary action cases were submitted to the DSC as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. School Teacher Lopeei P/S submission letter CR/157/1 dated 10th October 2017</li> <li>2. Driver, submission letter, CR/163/1 dated 20th November 2017</li> <li>3. Principal HR Officer, submission latter, CR/D/10125 dated 18th January 2018</li> <li>4. Deputy Head Teacher submission letter, CR/157/1 dated 12th February 22018</li> </ol> <p>There was evidence that they were all considered during the DSC meeting held on 8th June 2018 as per DSC letter CR/156/6, minute numbers 91/NDSC/2018</p>	<p>1</p>



Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.

• 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

Thirty three (33) new employees were appointed and recruited into the district service during the months of January as per the letter, DSC/156/6 of 8th January 2018 “Submission of DSC Instrument of Appointment, serial number 1/2018

Posting Instructions were issued during the month of February as well as the list of salary data capture for new employees contained in letter HRM/154/1 date 19th February 2018

There was evidence that they accessed the payroll during the Month of April, as per the letter HRM/154/1 dated 9th April 2018, “List of new staff who accessed the payroll.

Ten (10) names were sampled on the payroll and were identified on the April 2018 IPPS payroll by their names and payroll numbers as follows;

1. Chuna Shadrach Longiei, ICT Officer – 1018584
2. Victor Pulkol, Parrish Chief – 1018580
3. Aleper Reuben Rogers. Assistant Town Clerk – 1018578
4. Teeko Emmanuel Assistant Tax Officer – 1018579
5. Loret John, Enforcement Officer – 10185668
6. Florence Acheng, Accounts Assistant – 1022350
7. Longot Anthony, Assistant Engineering Officer – 1018558
8. Lemukol Abraham Aloka ICT Officer – 1018585
9. Ayomei Joseph, Parish Chief – 1018563
10. Lagos Josephine, Office Attendant - 1018586

<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>There were no submissions for retirement</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Revenue Mobilization</p>			
<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>OSR collected in FY 2016/2017 (excluding sale of assets) was Shs. 132,835,988 whereas OSR collected in FY 2017/2018 was Shs. 164,125,883 which resulted into an increase of Shs. 31,289,895.</p> <p>Source: Final Accounts FY 2016/2017-page No.25 and Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/2018- page No. 29.</p> <p>The percentage increase was: 23.6%</p> <p>Workings:</p> $31,289,895/132,835,988 \times 100 = 23.6\%$ <p>This increase which complied with the provision of PFMA 2015 Section 45 (3) was attributed to the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG completed survey and plotting of its land in FY 2017/2018 and the local people/investors started buying land thus income to Council.</li> <li>The LG carried out an intensive cattle market survey in Ngoleriat, Matany &amp; Iriiri cattle markets which resulted into increased charges for sale of cattle from Shs. 5,000 to Shs. 10,000 per animal going out of the District borders and from Shs. 2,000 to Shs. 5,000 on cattle sold but remaining within the District thus an increase in revenue.</li> <li>The quarantine on cattle market in FY 2016/2017 was lifted in FY 2017/2018.</li> </ul>	<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 +/- 10 %: then score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>Original budget for local revenue in FY 2017/2018 was Shs. 220,000,000 against which Shs. 164,125,883 was collected representing a budget out-turn of 74.6%.</p> <p>Source: Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2017/2018- page No.3.</p> <p>Therefore the LG budget realization/ratio was 25.4% below the planned local revenue for FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>Workings:</p> $164,125,883/220,000,000 \times 100 = 74.6\%$ <p>Therefore, the Budget realization/ratio was:</p> $100\% - 74.6\% = 25.4\%$ <p>This budget realization which contravened the LGFAR 2007 section 32 was attributed to the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Halt on sale of land i.e. the local people went to court claiming that the District was selling their land thus the halt by court.</li> <li>Government Restocking Program through NUSAF, UWEP, and YLP enticed the locals to sell their animals within instead of outside the District thus limiting the revenue to Shs. 5,000 instead of Shs. 10,000 chargeable per animal sold and taken out of the District.</li> </ul>	<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 District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The LG collected Shs. 20,488, in FY 2017/2018 in respect of Local Service Tax.</p> <p>Source: Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/2018 page- 29.</p> <p>However, the LG transferred only Shs. 2,449,858 for July deductions and Shs. 2,497,000 for August deductions to the 8 LLGs.</p> <p>September and October deductions totalling to Shs. 4,860,900 were not transferred to the 8 LLGs contrary to LGA Cap 243 as amended, Regulation 85 (4).</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>Total Council expenditure on allowances and emoluments was higher than 20% as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Actual local revenue collected in FY 2016/2017 was Shs. 132,835,988 of which 20% equivalent of Shs. 26,567,198 was supposed to be the maximum expenditure for Council emoluments and allowances in FY 2017/2018.</li> </ul> <p>Source: Final Accounts for FY 2016/2017-page No.25.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>However, actual expenditure on Council emoluments and allowances in FY 2017/2018 was Shs. 42,978,000 representing 32% higher than the recommended maximum of 20% as per 1st Schedule Regulation 4 of the LGA Cap 243 as amended.</li> </ul> <p>Source: Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/2018-page No. (Annexes to Financial Statements FY 2017/2018: Trial Balance).</p> <p>Workings: <math>42,978,000/132,835,988 \times 100 = 32\%</math></p> <p>The District Chairperson wrote to the Minister of Local Government on 9th/2/2018 Ref. COU/212/7 seeking authority to over spend Shs. 67,551,000 on Council allowances and emoluments which the Minister granted vide his letter to the District Chairperson dated 28th/2/2018 Ref. ADM/F.55/01 to overspend Shs. 67,551,000.</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 district had no Senior Procurement Officer. Duties were performed by a Procurement Officer as per his appointment letter CR/156/6 dated 1st June 2012</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The LG TEC evaluated procurement items under both open and selective bidding on 15th November 2017 and submitted the report to the LG Contracts Committee. The evaluated projects included among others;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 2 classroom block with office at Opeitolim primary school</li> <li>• Construction of 2 classroom block at Kokorio primary school</li> <li>• Construction of staff house at Morulinga primary school</li> <li>• Construction of a dining hall and kitchen at the district headquarters.</li> <li>• Construction of a kitchen and store at Morulinga primary school.</li> </ul>	<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 LG Contracts Committee in a meeting held on 21st November and approved the evaluated projects under minute number 18/CC/2017-18. The Contracts Committee based its decisions to award contracts for projects on the recommendations of TEC.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 District procurement and Disposal plan for 2019/18 covered all the infrastructure projects as in the approved district annual work plan. Examples were the following infrastructure projects which were included; Drilling of 7 boreholes, Construction of staff house at St. Andrews secondary school, Renovation of education office block, Construction of a seed secondary school in Lorengechola sub county, Fencing of Nakucimet HCII and Rehabilitation of the health office block at district headquarters.</p> <p>The LG made procurements for 2017/18 FY in adherence to the procurement plan.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 district had prepared all bid documents for infrastructure / investment projects for 2018/2019 FY by 30th August. 2018. The LG was able to advertise for 6 open bidding projects on 24th August 2018 (New vision page 49) the small projects under restricted bidding were displayed on the district notice boards on 10th September 2018 and they included 17 investment /infrastructure projects.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The district had an updated Contract register book for all the projects implemented in 2017/18 FY</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects):</li> </ul> <p>score 2.</p>	<p>The LG adhered with procurement thresholds for the projects implemented in 2017/18 FY. This was evidenced through the following awarded sampled projects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Napa604/WRKS/17-18/DDEG/00002 Construction of 2 classroom block with office at Opeitolim primary school worth 90,239,565 (open bidding)</li> <li>2. Napa604/WRKS/17-18/SFG/00003 Construction of 2 classroom block at Kokorio primary school worth 78,557,320 (open bidding)</li> <li>3. Napa604/WRKS/17-18/DDEG/00004 Construction of staff house at Morulinga primary school worth 111,318,690 (open bidding)</li> <li>4. Napa604/WRKS/17-18/DDEG/00021 Construction of a dining hall and kitchen at the district headquarters. worth 48,932,625 (selective bidding)</li> <li>5. Napa604/WRKS/17-18/DDEG/00009 Construction of a kitchen and store at Morulinga primary school worth 31,489,500 (open bidding)</li> </ol>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates</li> </ul> <p>for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</p>	<p>The works projects implemented in 2017/18 were appropriately certified with certificates of completion or interim certificates as indicated in examples below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 2 classroom block with office at Opeitolim primary school, issued a certificate of completion on 12/9/2018</li> <li>• Construction of 2 classroom block at Kokorio primary school issued a certificate of completion on 12/9/2018</li> <li>• Construction of staff house at Morulinga primary school issued a certificate of completion on 27/7/2018</li> <li>• Construction of a dining hall and kitchen at the district headquarters issued an interim certificate on 21/6/2018.</li> <li>• Construction of a kitchen and store at Morulinga primary school issued a certificate of completion on 12/9/2018</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>There were no projects under implementation in 2018/2019</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management</p>			



The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.

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

The LG had not yet been rolled on IFMIS. They operated 21 bank accounts manually from which a sample of 5 was made as indicated below:

The monthly bank reconciliations for July 2017 – June 2018 FY 2017/2018 were duly prepared by the respective Sector Accountants, and Approved by the Head of Finance.

General Fund A/c: Bank Reconciliation for June 2018 was made on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per Bank Statement was Shs. 62,825,459 and Balance as per Cash Book was Shs. 4,027,320

UNICEF A/c: Bank Reconciliation for June 2018 was made on 30th/6/2018.

Balance as per Bank Statement was Shs. 117,797,841 and Balance as per Cash Book was Shs. 50,955,641.

UWEP A/c: Bank Reconciliation for June 2018 was made on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per Bank Statement was Shs.4,319,064 and Balance as per Cash Book was Shs. 285,064.

YLP Project A/c Bank Reconciliation for June 2018 was made on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per Bank Statement was Shs. 16,468,380 and Balance as per Cash book was Shs. 1,468,380.

Pastoralism Resilience A/c Bank Reconciliation for June 2018 was made on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per bank Statement was Shs. 45,133,135 and Balance as per Cash book was Shs. 32,188,135.

In addition, the monthly bank reconciliations for July and August 2018 had also been made as at the time of this assessment.

<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</li> <li>– no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG made timely payments (within 60 days) of suppliers in FY 2017/2018 as indicated in the sampled payments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M/s Glotech Consults-Int. Ltd request for payment of Shs. 21,809,301 on 27th/3/2018 for construction of Kitchen &amp; Store at Morulinga P/S was recommended for payment on 27th/3/2018 and on 4th/4/2018 vide Payment Voucher No.1/4 within 8 days.</li> <li>• M/s Kadam Transtech Services Ltd request for payment of Shs. 64,954,280 dated 17th/4/2018 for construction of staff house at Morulinga P/S and Matany P/S was recommended for payment on 18th/4/2018 and paid on 8th/4/2018 vide Payment Voucher 1/4. Same day.</li> <li>• M/s Jolok Fast General Supplies request for payment of Shs. 27,800,000 dated 14th/6/2018 for supply of supply oh school desks &amp; Tables Chairs, was recommended for payment on 18th/6/2018 and paid on 19/6/2017 vide Payment Voucher No. 5/6 within 5 days.</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 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 a substantive District Internal Auditor (Ongom Francis Xavier) appointed by the District Service Commission on 25th/1/2018 under Min. 48/ NDSC/2017.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>All the 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/2018 were produced as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q1 dated 30th/10/2017 Ref: CR/250/1.</li> <li>• Q2 dated 29th/1/2018 Ref: CR/250/1.</li> <li>• Q3 dated 30th/4/2018 Ref: CR/153/1.</li> <li>• Q4 dated 31st/7/2018 Ref: CR/153/1.</li> </ul> <p>All were addressed to the District Chairperson and copied to LGPAC among others.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports: score 2.</p>	<p>The Accounting Officer had provided information to the Council and LGPAC on the status of implementation of internal audit queries for FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q1: CAO's unreferenced letter to PS/ST dated 28th/9/2018 entitled "Management Responses to Internal Audit Recommendations for 1st Quarter FY 2017/2018" copied to the District Chairperson and LGPAC among others.</li> <li>• Q2: CAO's unreferenced letter to PS/ST dated 28th/9/2018 entitled "Management Responses to Internal Audit Recommendations for 2nd Quarter FY 2017/2018" copied to the District Chairperson and LGPAC among others.</li> <li>• Q3: CAO's unreferenced letter to PS/ST dated 28th/9/2018 entitled "Management Responses to Internal Audit Recommendations for 3rd Quarter FY 2017/2018" copied to the District others.</li> <li>• Q4: CAO's unreferenced letter to PS/ST dated 28th/9/2018 entitled "Management Responses to Internal Audit Recommendations for 4th Quarter FY 2017/2018" copied to the District Chairperson and LGPAC among others.</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>There was evidence that all the 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/2018 were submitted to the Accounting Officer and LGPAC as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q1 dated 30th/10/2017 Ref: CR/250/1 copied to CAO and LGPAC.</li> <li>• Q2 dated 29th/1/2018 Ref: CR/250/1 copied to CAO and LGPAC.</li> <li>• Q3 dated 30th/4/2018 Ref: CR/153/1 copied to CAO and LGPAC.</li> <li>• Q4 dated 31st/7/2018 Ref: CR/153/1 copied to CAO and LGPAC.</li> </ul> <p>However, there was no evidence of review and follow-up by the LGPAC as required. No justifiable cause was given to the assessment team.</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 maintained an assets register up to 2nd/7/2017 but which was not in accordance with the recommended format in the Local Government Financial and Accounting Manual 2007-page 167 &amp; 168 and it was closed.</p> <p>The LG opened up a new Register for Fixed Assets – General in the recommended format but not up-dated and wrongly maintained as it included Motor cycles which were meant to be in Motor Vehicle &amp; Heavy Plants section.</p> <p>However, the other 2 sections of the assets register namely: Register for Fixed Assets – Land &amp; Building and Motor Vehicles &amp; Heavy Plants were not maintained.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unqualified audit opinion: score 4</li> <li>• Qualified: score 2</li> <li>• Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Napak DLG obtained Unqualified Audit Opinion for FY 2017/18</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>The District Council met and discussed service delivery related issues as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Min. 44/DLC/2018 – Approval of the Budget Estimates 2018/2019 by Council; and Min. 47/DLC/2018 – Presentation of Committee Reports to Council for Consideration (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 31st May 2018).</li> <li>Min. 33/DLC/2018 – Laying of the Draft Budget 2018/2019 before Council; and Min. 38/DLC/2018 – Final Approval of Napak Protection of Green Cover Ordinance, 2016 (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 30th April 2018).</li> <li>Min. 25/DLC/2017 – Review of Ordinances; and Min. 27/DLC/2017 – Presentation of Committee Recommendation Reports (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 22nd December 2017).</li> <li>Min. 17/DLC/2017 – Approval of 2017/2018 Work Plan Adjustment for Works and Production; and Min. 19/DLC/2017 – Presentation of Committee Recommendation Reports (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 3rd November 2017).</li> <li>Min. 9/DLC/2017 – Presentation of Committees Recommendation Reports (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 28th August 2017).</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/ complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<p>The CAO /Napak assigned Mr. Loduk Darius (Population Officer) 'Additional Assignment as Focal Person for Complaints Handling and Grievance Redress Mechanism in the District' as per letter Ref: CR/214/3 dated 15th March 2017.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<p>The district established structures at Sub-county, Parish, and village levels to address community conflicts and grievances; and also support collection of community concerns on service delivery, such as broken boreholes leading to shortage of water, land conflicts, and domestic violence. The officer assigned to handle complaints and grievances regularly liaises the sub-county structures to bring out issues requiring attention by higher authorities.</p> <p>At the district headquarters, a suggestion box was established outside the Administration Block.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The District Payroll and Pensioners Schedule for August 2018 were displayed at the Notice Board at Napak District Headquarters. The date of display was 22nd September 2018</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The procurement plan had not been displayed on any notice board at Napak District headquarters.</li> <li>• However, information on 'Record of Bid Opening' had been displayed on the Notice Board at the Administration Block Napak District Headquarters.</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>	<p>The District Annual Performance Assessment results for FY 2016/2017 were disseminated as per letter from CAO (Ref: Ref: CR/... dated 12th July 2018) to all HoD, and Sector Heads, and Sub-county Chiefs regarding 'Dissemination of Local Government Performance Assessment Results for FY 2017/2018'.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<p>The CAO / Napak communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during FY 2017/2018. For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter from CAO to Sub-County Chiefs and Town Clerk (Ref: CR/201/9 dated 13th September 2017) concerning 'Establishment of Local Council Courts in Your Jurisdiction'.</li> <li>• Letter from CAO to Sub-County Chiefs (Ref: CR/225/2 dated 30th August 2017) concerning 'Registration of Voters in the Newly Created Sub-counties'.</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 feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>The district conducted community dialogue meetings on different aspects of service delivery. For example:</p> <p>Community awareness and dialogue as evidenced by the 'Brief Report of Administration and Support Services Department to Finance and Administration Committee'. The report was on the 'Joint Dialogue Meeting by District Leaders (i.e. RDC, DPC, CID, DEC Members, CAO's Office, and UNRA Representative) with local leaders from Matany SC, and Nakicumet Community Leaders on the issue of drawing water from Arechek Dam, and also the issues of road compensation over the GTZ learning centre, and bakery at Kotipe'.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>The district Gender Focal Person provided guidance and support to sector departments on how to mainstream gender in their activities through activities like;</p> <p>Conducting training on gender responsive planning and budgeting for district heads of departments evidenced by a report dated March 2018, Assessment and mentoring on gender responsive budgeting and planning sector by sector evidenced by a report of August 2017, conducted district vulnerability assessment and a status report dated 17/7/2017 was generated.</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 gender focal person and the CDO had planned a number of activities according to the 2018/19 work plan to mainstream gender and they include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Women enterprise support.</li> <li>Mapping relevant partners and orienting them on gender based violence.</li> <li>Mentoring LLGs on gender and HIV/AIDS mainstreaming.</li> </ol> <p>The budget of 40,570,474 allocated for gender and related activities in 2017/18 FY was fully utilised as evidenced by some of the following vouchers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Under the item of supporting PWD groups, voucher number 4/6 worth 8,000,000, 10/6 worth 2000,000 , 1/5 worth 2,000,000, 6/17 worth 2,000,000, 4/12 worth 2,000,000</li> <li>- under facilitation of FAL Instructors ; vouchers 1/9 worth 1,640,000, 7/11 worth 1,640,000, 1/6 worth 2,913,000 voucher 5/12 worth 5,013,200 for training of FAL instructors, 8/9 worth 1,530,000 for NGO forum meeting,</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>Environmental screening was carried out for projects implemented in FY 2017/18 as evidenced by the screening forms completed for the five sampled projects as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Construction of 2 classroom block with office at Opeitolim primary school screened on 10/1/18</li> <li>-Construction of 2 classroom block at Kokorio primary school screened on 15/1/18</li> <li>-Construction of staff house at Morulinga primary school screened on 30/1/18</li> <li>-Construction of a dining hall and kitchen at the district headquarters screened on 15/1/18.</li> <li>-Construction of a kitchen and store at Morulinga primary school screened on 12/1/18.</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>



<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>There was evidence that the LG integrated environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents as evidenced by budget allocated for environmental management in the bid documents as follows; Construction of 2 classroom block with office at Opeitolim primary school (90,000 on pg. 2 of 13 BOQ), Construction of 2 classroom block at Kokorio primary school (50,000 on pg. 2 of 13 BOQ), Construction of staff house at Morulinga primary school (100,000 on pg. 2 of 21 BOQ), Construction of a dining hall and kitchen at the district headquarters (100,000 on pg. 2 of 11 BOQ), Construction of a kitchen and store at Morulinga primary school (500,000 on pg. 2 of 10 BOQ)</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>The projects sampled were implemented on district and community owned land but it was only the land on which the district headquarter is located that had a land title. This catered for only one project out of sampled five</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>The Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Forms were not completed for any of the sampled completed projects. The explanation was that it was not yet done but planning to do it.</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 payments vouchers for sampled projects had the endorsement of the Environment officer with signature and stamp as a requirement for payment.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><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 claimed to have visited the project sites but there was no written report to support his claims.</p>	<p>0</p>
---	---	---	----------

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>The LG Department of Education had 52 (28 government, 8 Private and 13 community) Primary schools. The 28 government schools had an enrolment of 22, 887 learners and 264 teachers.</p> <p>For FY 2018/19, under Vote 604, the LG budgeted for shs 76,502,923 ,000 for DDEG including Wages for teachers.</p>	4
<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>The Staff list obtained indicated that most of the schools had at least 7 teachers per school and 1 Head Teacher. However, 5 schools up to P7 had less than 7 teachers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kapuat P/S, only 5 teachers</li> <li>• Lomaratiot P/S, only 5 teachers</li> <li>• Pilas P/S, only 6 teachers</li> <li>• Lomuno P/S &amp; Kalokengel, only 6 teachers.</li> </ul> <p>Some schools without P7 had at least 1 teacher per class: Lorengechora P/S P/4, Kodik P/S P3, Nadwal P/S P5.</p>	0
<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100%: score 6</li> <li>o If 80 - 99%: score 3</li> <li>o If below 80%: score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The LG filled 264 positions of primary school teachers. And in the process of recruiting 6 on replacement basis (264+6=270). With a ceiling of 303 teachers, the LG filled 89% of the posts for primary school teachers</p>	3

<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>The LG Department of Education had filled both positions of Senior Inspector of Schools and inspector of schools as per the staff recruitment plan for FY 2017/18.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Talamoi Florence was senior inspector of schools. Appointed on 1/6/2012, ref no min.96/DSC/2012.</li> <li>• Mr. Lokeris Hellen was inspector of schools. Appointed on 1/1/2015. Ref. min. 97/DSC/2012.</li> </ul>	<p>6</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary Teachers: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for 232 Primary teachers on 11/5/2017</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Inspectors: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had fully recruited and filled the positions of inspectors of school as per the staff structure.</p>	<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</li> </ul> <p>3</p>	<p>The district had three (3) Inspectors of Schools. There was evidence that they were all appraised as per the Appraisal Reports seen</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Senior Inspector of Schools, appointment letter CR/156/6 dated 1st June 2012 – appraised on 30th June 2018</li> <li>2. Inspector of Schools appointment letter CR/156/6 dated 1st June 2012 - Appraised on 25th July 2018</li> <li>3. Inspector of Schools appointment letter CR/156/6 dated 1st June 2012 - Appraised on 8th August 2018</li> </ol>	<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>The district had twenty eight (28) primary schools and therefore 28 Head Teachers as per the district staff list.</p> <p>There was evidence that twenty one (21) Head Teachers were appraised as per the appraisal reports seen, representing 79% compliance</p> <p>The following twelve (12) Head Teachers' Appraisal Reports were sampled to establish the appraisal dates as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Napeyo Betty, Loodi PS - 4th May 2018</li> <li>2. Opel Joyce, Lomuno PS – 31st January 2018</li> <li>3. Mosing Isa, Alekilek PS – 15th February 2018</li> <li>4. Lolem Samson, Kaurikiakine PS – 15th February 2018</li> <li>5. Kotol William, Lotome PS – 20th May 2018</li> <li>6. Okurit Amos, Lomara PS – 24th May 2018</li> <li>7. Ochen Caesarino, Woloboko PS – 18th February 2018</li> <li>8. Abok Solomon, Cholichol PS – 18th February 2018</li> <li>9. Anyait Norah, Matany PS – 6th March 2018</li> <li>10. Achia Martin, Lopoko PS – 12th December 2017</li> <li>11. Apuru Roselliy, Moruking PS – 26th September 2017</li> <li>12. Apeot Festus, Lorengchora PS – 15th February 2018</li> </ol>	2
<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>The LG received and communicated the following circulars:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On 30/6/2017. ADM/203/255/01 on Teachers support supervision.</li> </ul> <p>19/7/2017. DES/14/2017; focus on School inspection for FY 2017/18.</p>	1

<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>Meeting with the head teachers on 27/9/2017, Agenda 5: Sharing of guidelines on school feeding and teachers support supervision.</p> <p>Meeting on 13/9/2018. Agenda 7, Sharing of policy, guidelines, and circulars from MoES.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all registered primary schools<sup>2</sup></p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100% - score 12</li> <li>o 90 to 99% - score 10</li> <li>o 80 to 89% - score 8</li> <li>o 70 to 79% - score 6</li> <li>o 60 to 69% - score 3</li> <li>o 50 to 59 % score 1</li> <li>o Below 50% score 0.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the LG department of Education inspected schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Term III inspection was done and report dated 13/12/17. 23 out of 52 schools were inspected according to the report.</li> <li>• Term II inspection was done and report written on 31/8/18. The inspection period was 9th-17th/8/2018. 19 schools out of 52 were inspected as per the inspection report</li> <li>• Term I inspection was done and reported on 23/5/2018. The inspection period was Jan-March 2018. 26 schools out of 52 were inspected.</li> </ul> <p>On average, 13.6 schools (23+19+26=68/3=22.6 approx. =23/52 =44.2%=0) were inspected.</p>	<p>0</p>



<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>Meeting of Head Teachers on 6/4/2018, Agenda 5&amp; 6: sharing of findings of school inspection report for quarter 1.</p> <p>Education staff brief meeting on 15/12/2017 min. 4.0 Educ/4/17 discussion on 3rd term 2017 inspection report.</p> <p>Education department meeting on 6/10/2017 min. 3.0 Educ 3/17 teachers gross negligence of duty.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 the LG Department of Education submitted School inspection report to DES on 16//7/2018 for term II &amp; I but the acknowledgement was not stamped</p> <p>However, the reports were submitted with grants acknowledgment receipts as part of the accountability for the inspection grant.</p> <p>The matrix of submission obtained from DES did not indicate that the reports were submitted.</p> <p>DES needs to clarify if reports submitted as accountability documents also serve as official submission of inspection reports.</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>The Head Teachers meeting of 6/4/2018 Agenda 6 was reaction to findings of the school inspection report</p> <p>Agenda 8 of the meeting on 13/9/2018 was following up on school inspection report of quarter 4 on low curriculum coverage</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>There was no evidence that the school list and the PBS generated lists were consistent and accurate as there was no PBS list provided at the LG for comparison at the time of the assessment. The list which the DEO provided was an OBT list.</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>Enrolment data from the 28 schools were not compared with the PBS list because the latter was not provided to the assessment team for review.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council

Maximum 4 for this performance measure

• 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

The General Purpose Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:

- Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 25th and 28th May 2018 (under Min. 4/GPC/28-5.2018 – Presentation of 2018/2019 Sector Budget Proposals for Discussion; and Min. 5/GPC/28-5.2018 – Recommendations).
- Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 18th December 2017 (under Min. 4/GPC/12.2017 – Review of 2nd Quarter Sector Reports; and Min. 5/GPC/12.2017 – Recommendations).
- Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 24th August 2017 (under Min. 4/GPC/8.2017 – Presentation of Sector Reports for 4th Quarter and Planned Activities for 1st Quarter; and Min. 5/GPC/8.2017– Summary of Committee Recommendations).

The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council

Maximum 4 for this performance measure

• Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2

The General Purpose Committee presented issues that required approval to the District Council during FY 2017/2018.

For instance:

- ‘Report of Standing Committees to Council Sitting Today 31st May 2018’. Also Min. 47/DLC/2018 – Presentation of Committee Reports to Council for Consideration (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 31st May 2018).

- ‘Report of Standing Committees to Council Sitting Today 22nd December 2017’. Also Min. 27/DLC/2017 – Presentation of Committee Recommendation Reports (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 22nd December 2017).

- ‘Report of Standing Committees to Council Sitting Today 28th August 2017’. Also Min. 9/DLC/2017 – Presentation of Committees Recommendation Reports (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 28th August 2017).

<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO/MEO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 evidence that SMCs' in sampled schools were functional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lotome Girls P/S held a meeting on 19/4/2018 Agenda 7 &amp; 8: school improvement plan &amp; UPE Budget approval.</li> <li>• Loodoi P/S held a meeting on 4/8/2018; Agenda 5 &amp; 6: Water crisis at the school &amp; preparation of candidates.</li> <li>• Matany P/S held a meeting on 26/9/201; Agenda was reading of draft budget.</li> <li>• Apeitolim P/Agenda 5 &amp; 6; on approval of school improvement plan &amp; updates on the school plans. The meeting was held on 25/9/2018.</li> <li>• Lotome Boys P/S meeting on 24/7/2017, Agenda 6-9: UPE grant utilisation, Review of school financial work plan, Updates on money from sale of cereals, and school land.</li> </ul>	<p>5</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non- wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</p>	<p>There was evidence on the notice board at the LG DEOs' office that the list of schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants was made public.</p> <p>The lists dated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 13/11/2017 for quarter 3 term 1</li> <li>• 26/6/2018 for term II</li> <li>• 12/09/2018 for term III</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The LG Education department has submitted input into the LG procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to the Procurement Unit that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>The procurement input dated 16/62017 was submitted to PDU but after 30th April 2018</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of a classroom block at Apeltolin P/S &amp; Kokorio P/S.</li> <li>• Supply of Furniture at Kokorio &amp; Apetiolim P/S</li> <li>• Construction of kitchen &amp; store at Morulings P/S</li> <li>• Construction of teachers house at Morulinga P/S</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
--	---	---	----------

Financial management and reporting

<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3.</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the LG made timely payments (within 60 days) of suppliers in FY 2017/2018 as indicated in the sampled payments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M/s Glotech Consults-Int. Ltd request for payment of Shs. 21,809,301 on 27th/3/2018 for construction of Kitchen &amp; Store at Morulinga P/S was certified under Certificate No. 1 dated 26th3/2018, recommended for payment on 27th/3/2018 and paid on 4th/4/2018 vide Payment Voucher No.1/4 within 8 days.</li> <li>• M/s Kadam Transtech Services Ltd request for payment of Shs. 64,954,280 dated 17th/4/2018 for construction of staff house at Morulinga P/S and Matany P/S was certified under Certificate No. 1, recommended for payment on 18th/4/2018 and paid on 8th/4/2018 vide Payment Voucher 4/4 on the same day.</li> <li>• M/s Jolok Fast General Supplies request for payment of Shs. 27,800,000 dated 14th/6/2018 for supply of supply of school desks &amp; Tables Chairs which were received in stores against Goods Received Note (GRN) No. 089 dated 28th/5/2018 was recommended for payment on 18th/6/2018 and paid on 19/6/2017 vide Payment Voucher No. 5/6 within 5 days.</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>
---	---	--	----------

<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<p>The Education Department submitted its annual performance report for FY 2017/2018 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner on 24th July 2018 (as per Email from the PBS – Re: Reg. Head of Department Validation’ dated 24th July 2018 alerting the Planner / Napak DLG about the submission by the DEO)</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline of 15th July 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If sector has no audit query score 4</li> <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> </li> </ul>	<p>The LG Education department had 3 internal audit queries in FY 2017/2018 of which only 1 (unaccounted for funds) had been cleared as at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>The 2 queries not cleared were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Books of accounts not updated in Kangole SSS, Kangole Boys P/S, Morulinga P/S and Lokupoy P/S.</li> <li>• Expired term of office for Moroto Technical School Board of Governors located in Longeriet Sub-county Napak District.</li> </ul>	<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>On 4/9/2017 a Training of 34 senior women /men teachers at Matany P/S from 10-12/8/2018 on Gender issues, menstrual hygiene management.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 in collaboration with gender department issued and explained guidelines on sanitation for girls and PWD in P/S. The head teachers meeting of 6/4/2018 dealt with issues of unclean latrines in schools but not guidelines on sanitation for girls and PWD</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>There was evidence from the sampled and visited schools that SMCs' met the gender requirement.</p> <p>The 5 sampled schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lotome girls P/S had 5 female members out of 9 members</li> <li>• Loodoi P/S had 7 female members out of 13</li> <li>• Matany P/S had 3 female members out of 9</li> <li>• Lokupoi P/S had 6 female members out of 13</li> <li>• Morulinga P/S had 4 female members out of /11</li> </ul>	<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>There was training for pupils, student leaders on positive supportive school environment at Kangole boys P/S on 13-14/7/201 for 71 learners: 34 girls, 37 boys &amp; 13 teachers.</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 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>There was evidence of project screening for construction of 2 classroom blocks at Kokorio dated 15/1/2017</p> <p>Screening forms for construction of teachers house at Morulinga P/S dated 30/1/2017</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>• 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>Site visit report of construction work at Apeitolim &amp; Kokorio of a 2 classroom block with office was available and reviewed.</p> <p>A report of construction work of the Kitchen &amp; store at Kalochoona &amp; Morulinga P/S dated 9/7/2018 was also available and reviewed by the assessment team.</p>	<p>1</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health care workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health care with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 Health department filled the structure for health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage FY 2018/2019 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Out of 207 health staff establishment for Napak LG as per the document from the Ag. DHO to the CAO entitled “Napak District PHC Staff Establishment FY 2018/2019 Ref: CR/161/3 dated 24th/7/2018, 153 had been filled representing 74% whereas 44 were not filled representing 26%.</li> </ul>	4
<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan for primary health care workers to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/re- quest to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of primary health care workers: score 6</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Health department had submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to HRM for FY 2018/2019 covering the vacant positions of primary health workers as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Ag. DHO’s letter to CAO entitled “Analyzed Wages for Health Workers for Replacement” dated 13th/9/2018 Ref: HEA/161/13 copied to the Principal Personnel Officer indicating 14 posts to be advertised.</li> </ul>	6

The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital In-charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted

Maximum 8 points for this performance measure

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

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

The district had thirteen (13) health facilities and therefore 13 Officers in Charge of health facilities as follows;

Health Center IIIs 6

Health Center IIs 7

There was evidence that all 13 Officers in Charge of Health Centers were appraised as per the appraisal reports seen, representing 100% compliance

The 13 appraisal reports of Officers in Charge were checked to establish the dates of their appraisals as follows;

1. Anso Veronica, E/Midwife – 30th August 2018
2. Kawonye Peter, Senior Clinical Officer – 30th July 2018
3. Mwekeswe Aloysious Senior Clinical Officer – 1st July 2018
4. Ongom Patrick E/Hurse – 25th July 2018
5. Omilo Joseph, E/Nurse – 10th July 2018
6. Eeoi Jacob, E/Nurse – 12th July 2018
7. Lemukoi Amos Senior Clinical Officer, 12th July 2018
8. Abol Jonathan E/Nurse 31st July 2018
9. Ilukol Christine, Nursing Officer – 1st July 2018
10. Lomonyang Rose Nursing Officer – 6th July 2018
11. Langeth Magdalane, Nursing Officer – 7th September 2018
12. Langoli Lucy, Nursing Officer – 1st July 2018
13. Chemonges Isaac, E/Nurse – 12th July 2018

<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>There was evidence that the LG Health department had deployed health workers in line with the list submitted with the budget for FY 2018/2019 as indicated below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Kangole HCIII Approved 19 and filled 12.</li> <li>2) Lopeei HCIII Approved 19 and filled 13.</li> <li>3) Ngoleriet HCII Approved 9 and filled 4.</li> <li>4) Morulinga HCIII Approved 19 and filled 18</li> <li>5) Lokopo HCIII Approved 19 and filled 13.</li> </ol>	<p>4</p>
<p>Monitoring and Supervision</p>			

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

Maximum 6 for this performance measure

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

The DHO communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in FY 2017/2018 to all health facilities.

From the Ag. DHO's office the distribution record indicated that the in-charges of the 5 sampled health facilities of:

1. Kangole HCIII

2. Lopeei HCIII

3. Lokopo HCIII

4. Ngoleriet HCII

5. Morulinga HCII

Received copies of the 5 prioritized guidelines and signed for them. These guidelines were:

- Consolidated guidelines for prevention and treatment of HIV IN Uganda – 2016
- Uganda National Infection Prevention and Control Guideline – 2013.
- National Technical Guideline for Integrated Disease Surveillance and Response.
- Management of Medicines and Supplies Manual – March 2012.
- Cervical Cancer Manual – 2017.

Circulars issued included:

- Requisition for Drugs from NMS – 20th/7/2018.
- Detection of in the Active impurity Pharmaceutical Ingredient (API).
- Introduction of Rota Virus Vaccine into routine Immunization – 14th/4/2018.

<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>There was evidence that during support supervision, the Ag. DHO explained among others the guidelines, policies and circulars issued by the national level as indicated below based on the above sampled health facilities:</p> <p>The evidence was proved both in the supervisory reports and the specific supervisory log books at the health facilities as indicated below:</p> <p>Q1 meeting held on 27th/9/2017.</p> <p>Q2 meeting held on 9th/1/2018.</p> <p>Q3 meeting held on 1st /3/2018</p> <p>Q4 meeting held on 25th/6/2018</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: score 3</p>	<p>The LG neither had a HC IV nor District Hospital. However, they formed partnership with Matany PNFP Hospital to constitute a HSD known as Bokora which joined the DHT.</p> <p>Therefore, the constituted Bokora HSD in conjunction with DHT supervised 100% PNFPs which included St. Kizito Matany Hospital and Kangole HCIII both owned by Uganda Catholic Medical Bureau. .</p> <p>The supervision was carried out on quarterly basis as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Q1 supervision 27th/9/2017.</li> <li>Q2 s supervision was on 9th/1/2018.</li> <li>Q3 supervision was on 1st/3/2018</li> <li>Q4 supervision was on 25th /6/2018.</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>

<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>The LG did not have a HSD. However, the DHT in conjunction with the constituted Bokora HSD ensured that they supervised HCIIIs and HCIIIs including PNFPs within FY 2017/2018 as indicated in the 5 sampled lower health facilities below:</p> <p>Q1: 4 out of 5 sampled health facilities were supervised on 27th/9/2017 representing 80%. Ngoleriet HCII was not supervised.</p> <p>Q2: 4 out of 5 sampled health facilities were supervised on 9th/1/2018 representing 80%. Lopeei HCIII was not supervised.</p> <p>Q3: 2 out of 5 sampled health facilities were supervised on 1st/3/2018 representing 40%. Kangole, Lopeei and Ngoleriet were not supervised.</p> <p>Q4: All the 5 sampled health facilities were supervised on 25th/6/2018 representing 100%.</p> <p>Therefore on average <math>(300/4 \times 100) = 75\%</math> of the sampled lower health facilities were supervised.</p>	<p>1</p>
---	--	---	----------

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

Maximum 10 points for this performance measure

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

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

- Q1 supervision meeting held on 27th/9/2017 Min. 05 recommended that the DHO should follow-up with UNEPI on brocken fridges in Morulinga HCII, Ngoleriet HCII and Amedek HCII.
- Q2 supervision meeting held on 9th/12/2017 page 4 recommended that the faulty solar lighting system in Ngoleriet HCII should be handled by the DHO and CUAM.
- Q3 Supervision meeting held on 1st/3/2018 page 2 recommended that health care workers should ensure involvement of VHT during staff orientation.
- Q4 supervision meeting held on 25th/6/2018 Min. 8 recommended that the Ag. DHO should ensure that MCH services are undertaken by a qualified midwife.



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

Maximum 10 points for this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the recommendations were followed up and specific activities undertaken for correction as indicated below:

1. Q1: Morulinga HCI I& Ngoleriet HCII

Corrective action taken:

- Fridges were repaired and could function well so as to maintain cold chain for UNEPI.

2. Q2: Ngoleriet HCII.

Corrective action taken:

- The solar lighting system was repaired.

3. Q3: Morulinga HCII.

Corrective action taken:

- VHT were supported and could sensitize the community on health issues like good nutrition and environmental health.

4. Q4: Morulinga HCIII.

Corrective action taken:

- The Nursing Officer in-charge took over the MCH services.

<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>o List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Health department had submitted accurate / consistent data for all the 14 health facility lists which received PHC funding with both HIMS reports and PBS as per the 5 sampled lower health facilities and 3 PNFP health facilities indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FY 2018/2019 Kangole HCIII non- wage PHC grant allocation was Shs.10, 445,187.</li> <li>• FY 2018/2019 Lopeei HCIII non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs. 12,008,307.</li> <li>• FY 2018/2019 Lokopo HCIII non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs, Shs. 12,008,307.</li> <li>• FY 2018/2019 Morulinga HCII non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs.4, 664,153.</li> <li>• FY 2018/2019 Ngoleriet HCII non-wage PHC grant allocation was Shs. 4,664,153.</li> </ul>	<p>10</p>
--	--	--	-----------

Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented is- sues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>The General Purpose Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 25th and 28th May 2018 (under Min. 4/GPC/28-5.2018 – Presentation of 2018/2019 Sector Budget Proposals for Discussion; and Min. 5/GPC/28-5.2018 – Recommendations).</li> <li>• Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 18th December 2017 (under Min. 4/GPC/12.2017 – Review of 2nd Quarter Sector Reports; and Min. 5/GPC/12.2017 – Recommendations).</li> <li>• Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 24th August 2017 (under Min. 4/GPC/8.2017 – Presentation of Sector Reports for 4th Quarter and Planned Activities for 1st Quarter; and Min. 5/GPC/8.2017– Summary of Committee Recommendations).</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
---	--	--	----------

The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council

Maximum 4 for this performance measure

- Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2

The General Purpose Committee presented issues that required approval to the District Council during FY 2017/2018.

For instance:

- 'Report of Standing Committees to Council Sitting Today 31st May 2018'. Also Min. 47/DLC/2018 – Presentation of Committee Reports to Council for Consideration (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 31st May 2018).
- 'Report of Standing Committees to Council Sitting Today 22nd December 2017'. Also Min. 27/DLC/2017 – Presentation of Committee Recommendation Reports (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 22nd December 2017).
- 'Report of Standing Committees to Council Sitting Today 28th August 2017'. Also Min. 9/DLC/2017 – Presentation of Committees Recommendation Reports (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 28th August 2017).

<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p>	<p>There was evidence that health facilities had functional HUMCs established, meetings held and discussion of budget and resource issues on quarterly basis as per the 5 sampled health facilities indicated below:</p>
<p>Maximum 6 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kangole HCIII had 8 members of HUMC and held their meetings on 27th/7/2017, 11th/4/2018 and 24th/6/2018 representing 75%. Issues discussed included lack of incinerator.</li> <li>• Lopeei HCIII had 7 members of HUMC and held their meetings on 15th/7/2017, 11th/11/2017, 30th/1/2018 and 18th/6/2018 representing 100%. Issues discussed included lack of facility personnel.</li> <li>• Lokopo HCIII had 7 members of HUMC and held their meetings on 24th/8/2017, 12th/12/2017, 25th/1/2018 and 19th/4/2018 representing 100%. Issues discussed included lack of job description for staff.</li> <li>• Morulinga HCII had only 5 members of HUMC and held their meetings on 10th/8/2017, 14th/11/2017 and 20th/1/2018 representing 75%. Issues discussed included lack of facility in-charge.</li> <li>• Ngoleriet HCII had 5 members of HUMC and held their meetings on 25th/7/2017 and 2nd/3/2018 representing 50%. Issues discussed included broken facility gate which needed repair.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore on average <math>(400/5) = 80\%</math> of randomly sampled facility HUMCs was functional.</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>There was evidence that the LG had published all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants as was indicated at the Ag. DHO's notice board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kangole HCII (PNFP) Shs. 10,445,187 for PHC non-wage recurrent grant for FY 2018/2019.</li> <li>Lopeei HCIII Shs. 12,008,307 for PHC non-wage recurrent grant for FY 2018/2019.</li> <li>Lokopo HCIII Shs. 12,008,307 for PHC non-wage recurrent grant for FY 2018/2019.</li> <li>Morulina HCII Shs. 4,664,153 for PHC non-wage recurrent grant for FY 2018/2019.</li> <li>Ngoloreit HCII Shs. 4,664,153 for PHC non-wage recurrent grant for FY 2018/2019.</li> </ol>	<p>4</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 did not submit input to procurement plan to the PDU by 30th April 2018 as required and there was not even a late submission in the PDU from the health department</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG Health department submitted form PP1 to the PDU on 24/7/ 2018 for the following projects; the chain link fencing of Nakicumet HCII, Rehabilitation of the health office block, and Construction of a pit latrine at Ngoloriet.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO/ MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4.</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the LG Health department had timely certified and recommended suppliers for payment as per the sampled payments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M/s Cab Uganda Ltd request for payment of Shs. 16,534,110 dated 2nd/5/2018 for construction of OPD at Apeitolim HCII was certified under Certificate No.4 dated 10th/1/2018, recommended for payment on 2nd/5/2018 and paid on the same day vide Payment voucher No. 2/5.</li> <li>M/s BMK Uganda Ltd request for payment of Shs. 30,634,146 dated 12th/2/2018 for completion of staff house at Nabwal HCII was certified under Certificate No.2 dated 17th/1/2018, recommended for payment on 12th/2/2018 and paid on the same day vide Payment Voucher No. 1/3.</li> <li>M/s MURYAGAZ request for payment of Shs., 2,244,000 dated 2nd/5/2018 for supply of fuel to the department was recommended for payment on 2nd/5/2018 and was paid on 7th/5/2018 vide Payment voucher No. 1/5 within 5 days.</li> </ul>	<p>4</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<p>The Health Department submitted the annual performance report for FY 2017/2018 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner on 30th July 2018 (as per Email from the PBS – Re: Reg. Head of Department Validation’ dated 30th July 2018 alerting the Planner / Napak DLG about the submission by the DHO)</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline of 15th July 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 LG Health department had 4 internal audit queries in FY 2017/2018 of which only 2 (unaccounted for funds under UNICEF, and unaccounted for funds of Shs. 1,392,000 by Dr. James Lemukol) had been cleared as at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>The 2 queries not cleared were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unused donation of Shs. 45,000,000 to Murulinga HCIII for the last 2 years.</li> <li>Books of accounts not updated and monthly bank reconciliations not made.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			

<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>The HUMCs did not meet the gender composition as per guidelines as seen in the 5 sampled lower health facilities below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kangole HCIII HUMC had 8 members of which 4 were men and 4 were female representing 50%</li> <li>Lopeei HCIII HUMC had 7 members of which 5 were male and 2 were female representing 28.6%.</li> <li>Lokopo HCIII HUMC had 7 members of which all were male and none female representing 0%.</li> <li>Morulinga HCII HUMC had 5 members of which 1 was male and 4 were female representing 80%</li> <li>Ngoloriet HCII HUMC had 5 members of which 3 were male and 2 were female representing 40%.</li> </ul> <p>Although on average <math>(198.6/5) = 39.7\%</math> of the sampled facility HUMC met the gender composition, Lopeei HCIII &amp; Lokopo HCIII did not as indicated above.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>The LG issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities from 25th /7 – 30th/8/2017 during the supervision visits by DHT as indicated in the 5 sampled health facilities below:</p> <p>1. At Kangole &amp; Lopeei HCIII the guidelines issued were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Posters on use of the 4 color coded bins with bin linings – 2014.</li> <li>Posters on proper use of pit latrines with covers - 2014</li> <li>Siting of where to construct pit latrines – 2012.</li> <li>Guidelines on use of pit latrines by PWDs – 2016.</li> <li>Bathe shelter with proper drainage and soak pit.</li> </ul>	<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>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 were 3 Health facility infrastructure projects implemented in 2017/18 FY and environmental screening was done to the projects as follows; construction of Placenta pit and incinerator at Lopeei HCII was screened on 10/1/18, construction of staff house at Kailikong HCII screened on 8/1/18 and construction of 3 stance pit latrine at Nakicumet HCII was screened on 10/1/18</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 checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence of site visits by the environmental officer and community development officer. The environment officer visited the sites together with the district engineer but there was no report written in support of the fact.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>There was evidence that the LG had issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal as indicated in the 5 sampled health facilities below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidelines on use of color coded bins with lining - 2014 were issued on 9th/1/2018 to the 5 sampled health facilities.</li> <li>• Guidelines on use of incinerator for burning highly infectious medical waste were issued on 9th/1/2018 to the 5 sampled health facilities.</li> <li>• Integrated management of malaria training – 2015 issued 25th/6/2018 to the sampled health facilities.</li> <li>• Guidelines on integrated acute malnutrition – 2016 issued on 25th/6/2018.</li> <li>• Uganda Clinical Guidelines- 2016 issued on 25th/6/2018.</li> <li>• Facilitators' Manual for training VHT on community based newborn care – August 2011 issued on 25th/6/2018.</li> </ul>	<p>4</p>
---	--	--	----------

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>From the review of the AWP and data from MoWE indicated that, Napak District safe water coverage average was at 82%. There were three (3) sub counties that were found to have safe water coverage below the district average. These were;</p> <p>Iriiri S/C 58%, Lokopo S/C 79% and Napak T/C 54%.</p> <p>AWP and Budget for FY 2018/19 indicated that Sector Development grant of Ushs 287,395,472 was planned.</p> <p>A design project worth Ushs 35,768,302 was planned in Iriiri S/C and 3 boreholes each at a cost of Ushs, 22,114,000 which makes it a total of Ush.66,342,000 were planned in Lokopo S/C. Therefore the total amount allocated to Sc below district average is Ush 35,768,302 + Ush. 66,342,000 making a total of Ush. 102,110,302.</p> <p>Therefore the percentage allocated to subcounties below district average is Ush 102,110,302 divided by a total budget of Ush. 287,395,472 making it 35.5%.</p> <p>Napak T/C which was among the sub counties with safe water coverage below District average was not covered under the sector development grant. A letter from the MoWE dated 25th July 2018 addressed to CAO Napak District revealed that Napak T/C was to be considered under the new project from MoWE “ Karamoja Small Towns and Rural Growth Centres Water Supply and Sanitation Project- KSWSSP” which was to construct 6 production wells in the Town council. The total allocations to the sub counties with coverage below district average was found to be 35.5%, however the other district were covered under other funds. Despite the fact that the funding was from other sources, all the sub counties below the district average were covered.</p>	0

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)

Maximum 15 points for this performance measure

- Evidence that the district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.

- o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs:

Score 15

- o If 80-99%: Score 10

- o If 60-79: Score 5

- o If below 60 %: Score 0

The review of the AWP and budget for FY 2017/18 submitted by the District Water Department and MIS reports from MoWE revealed that 7 new boreholes, Rehabilitation of 13 boreholes and a design project were planned for in FY 2017/18.

The review of Annual progress reports submitted to MoWE (Quarter 1 to Quarter 4 reports) revealed that:

- First Quarter Reported dated 16th October 2017, only software activities (Planning and Advocacy meetings) were implemented.
- Second Quarter Report dated 01st February 2018, 3 rehabilitation projects were implemented.
- Third Quarter report Dated 23rd April 2018, 1 new borehole was drilled, 4 boreholes were rehabilitated and the feasibility study was carried out.
- Fourth Quarter report dated 13th August 2018, 6 boreholes were drilled and 6 boreholes rehabilitated.

However by the time the assessment team visited sample projects on 5th October 2018, the Contactor had just commenced installation of the drilled boreholes with one borehole at Lokalumok ECD - Ngoleriet Sub county completed and another one at Kololo -Matany Sub county where the contractor was found on site.

<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>The monitoring plan presented to the Assessment team which was part of the Annual Work plan indicated that the District Water Department intended to carry out two activities under monitoring and supervision; Regular Data collection and analysis and Inspection of Water points after construction.</p> <p>From the review of Form 1 which had been submitted with the Annual progress reports revealed that all the Water sources had been monitored.</p> <p>Supervision and inspection Reports dated 25th June 2018 and 20th August 2018 for ongoing projects were found on file of DWO and revealed that the projects were monitored.</p>	<p>15</p>
<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>The data contained in the District Annual Work Plan was similar to the information obtained from the Ministry of Water and Environment</p>	<p>5</p>

<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>The water facilities listed in the MIS report provided by the MoWE reflected 7 New Deep boreholes, 13 boreholes for rehabilitation and Design study 1 Piped Water supply scheme. This was consistent with the list in the AWP, PBS and Performance contract 2018/19.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The district Water department has submitted input for district's procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted input for the district procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	<p>The procurement plan that covers all the investment items in the approved sector AWP and budget was submitted to PDU on 18th July 2018 which was passed the required deadline of 30th April 2018.</p> <p>The investment items in the procurement plan were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sitting and Drilling of 7 boreholes</li> <li>Feasibility study of Piped water scheme</li> <li>Rehabilitation of 6 Boreholes</li> </ul>	<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>The district CAO appointed Mr. Omara Patrick O as the contract manager for WSS projects in the district as evidenced by the appointment letter dated 22nd December 2017 presented to the Assessment team.</p> <p>A contract management plan which involved Regular data collection and analysis, and inspection of Water point after construction was included in the AWP 2017/18. Monthly site visits were conducted and site issues reported in the site supervision and progress reports.</p> <p>BoQ for drilling of 7 boreholes as part of the contact document for the contract Napa 604/Wrks/17-18/DWSCG-DDEG/00008 were reviewed by the assessment team and found that the projects were constructed as per contract management plan.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There were no drawings incorporated in the contract documents. The DWO had copies of drawings of boreholes in a file at his office which the Assessment team could not verify their authenticity because there were neither stamped nor signed.</p> <p>Five Sample projects were sampled and visited by the Assessment team and found out that the installation was ongoing on two boreholes whereas the rest were yet to start.</p> <p>Therefore the fact that there were no authentic drawings and since the projects were incomplete, the Assessment team could not verify whether, they were constructed as per design.</p> <p>The sampled water facilities were,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lokalumok ECD BH (Ngoleriet S/C)</li> <li>Kololo BH (Matany S/C)</li> <li>Kongkwa BH ( Matany S/C),</li> <li>Lokitella Akeemun BH (Matany S/C) and</li> <li>Kaigwe Production Well (Iriiri S/C).</li> </ul> <p>The assessment team could not verify whether the facilities were constructed as per design due to lack of drawings for reference.</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>The installation activities for the boreholes were still ongoing by the time this assessment was carried out.</p> <p>Therefore the contractor had not yet completed the projects hence no hand over.</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>All the projects were still ongoing by the time of this Assessment. Therefore there were no completion reports prepared and no completion certificates were issued.</p> <p>However Interim certificates had been prepared as part payment of works.</p> <p>For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M/S Icon Projects Ltd requested for payment of Ushs 33,019,350 dated 18th April 2018 for siting and drilling of production wells, and DWO certified the payment under certificate No: 01 on 18th April 2018.</li> <li>M/S Icon Projects Ltd submitted requested for payment of Ushs 80,844,800 dated 18th April 2018 for siting and drilling 4 boreholes and DWO certified the payment under certificate No: 01 on 17th April 2018.</li> </ul>	<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>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO had certified and recommended suppliers for payment as per sampled payments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M/s ICON PROJECTS Ltd request for payment of Shs. 33,019,350 dated 18th/4/2018 for Siting &amp; Drilling of Production Wells in Napak District was certified under Certificate No. 1 dated 18th/4/2018, recommended for payment on 18th/4/2018 and paid on the same day vide Payment voucher No. 15/4.</li> <li>M/s ICON PROJECTS Ltd request for payment of Shs. 80,844,800 dated 18th/4/2018 for Siting &amp; Drilling &amp; Installation of 4 Deep Bore holes in Napak District was certified under Certificate No. 1 dated 17th/4/2018, recommended for payment on 18th/4/2018 and paid on the same day vide Payment voucher No. 14/4.</li> <li>M/s KUTONAK 2015 QUICK SUPPLIES request for payment of Shs. 11,735,533 dated 2nd/5/2018 for supply of Bore holes Rehabilitation Kits under LPO No. 160 &amp; GRN 001 was recommended for payment on 2nd/5/2018 and paid on 10th/5/2018 vide Payment voucher No. 10/5 within 8 days.</li> </ul>	<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>	<p>The Water Department submitted the annual performance report for FY 2017/2018 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner on 25th July 2018 (as per Email from the PBS – Re: Reg. Head of Department Validation' dated 25th July 2018 alerting the Planner / Napak DLG about the submission by the DWO)</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline of 15th July 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The District Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>o If sector has no audit query score 5</li> <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 3</li> <li>If queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The District Water department had 4 internal audit queries in FY 2017/2018 of which 3 (unaccounted for funds of Shs. 4,800,000, Shs. 2,110,000 and Shs, 923,000 by the Water Officer and Assistant Water Officer) had been cleared as at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>The query not cleared was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of Value for Money (VFM) on Drilling 9 Hand pumps totaling to Shs. 218,523,704.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
--	---	--	----------

Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<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>The General Purpose Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 25th and 28th May 2018 (under Min. 4/GPC/28-5.2018 – Presentation of 2018/2019 Sector Budget Proposals for Discussion; and Min. 5/GPC/28-5.2018 – Recommendations).</li> <li>• Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 18th December 2017 (under Min. 4/GPC/12.2017 – Review of 2nd Quarter Sector Reports; and Min. 5/GPC/12.2017 – Recommendations).</li> <li>• Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 24th August 2017 (under Min. 4/GPC/8.2017 – Presentation of Sector Reports for 4th Quarter and Planned Activities for 1st Quarter; and Min. 5/GPC/8.2017– Summary of Committee Recommendations).</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>
--	--	--	----------

<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>The General Purpose Committee presented issues that required approval to the District Council during FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Report of Standing Committees to Council Sitting Today 31st May 2018'. Also Min. 47/DLC/2018 – Presentation of Committee Reports to Council for Consideration (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 31st May 2018).</li> <li>'Report of Standing Committees to Council Sitting Today 22nd December 2017'. Also Min. 27/DLC/2017 – Presentation of Committee Recommendation Reports (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 22nd December 2017).</li> <li>'Report of Standing Committees to Council Sitting Today 28th August 2017'. Also Min. 9/DLC/2017 – Presentation of Committees Recommendation Reports (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 28th August 2017).</li> </ul>	<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>Water development Grant releases for FY 2017/18 amounting to Ushs 93,131,825 was displayed on the noticeboard and an Advocacy meeting to discuss the release and WASH resource allocations was held on 20th September.</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>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>The WSS projects visited were not clearly labelled indicating name of contractor, Name of project, date of construction and source of funding since installations were still ongoing.</p> <p>The visited facilities were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lokalumok ECD BH (Ngoleriet S/C)</li> <li>Kololo BH (Matany S/C)</li> <li>Kongkwa BH ( Matany S/C),</li> <li>Lokitella Akeemun BH (Matany S/C) and</li> <li>Kaigwe Production Well (Iriiri S/C).</li> </ul>	<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>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The information on tenders and contract awards had been removed from the District Notice board by the time of the assessment and no copies had been kept on file.</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>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>Application letters together with receipts for proof of contribution by the community towards the construction of boreholes were presented to the Assessment team.</p> <p>The sampled applications included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kololo Ward- Matany S/C dated 02nd July 2018 requesting for a borehole and receipt No: 1732 of Ushs 200,000 paid to Napak District Local Government as contribution towards the construction of borehole.</li> <li>Kangole Village- Matany S/C dated 20th August 2018 requesting for a borehole and Cash deposit slip of Ushs 200,000 paid to Napak District through Centenary bank as contribution towards construction of the Borehole.</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>

<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>On file, there were copies of receipts of contributions by the Communities towards the siting and drilling boreholes; for instance Kololo Ward- Matany S/C dated 02nd July 2018 requesting for a boreholes and receipt No: 1732 of Ushs 200,000 paid to Napak District Local Government</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>The Environment screening reports for all WSS projects implemented were duly filled and available on file. The environmental screening reports for the sampled facilities were completed on different dates as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nakoreete BH- Lorengecora S/C dated 30th March 2018</li> <li>Kaigwe Production well- Iriiri S/C dated 8th April 2018</li> <li>Kangkwa BH- Matany S/C dated 4th April 2018</li> <li>Nakwankwa BH- Lorengecora S/C dated 4th April 2018.</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>All the WSS projects were still ongoing, therefore environmental concerns that had been mentioned in the screening reports for instance planting of trees around the boreholes had not yet been assessed.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Item 1 Preliminaries section (D) and (E) of BOQ, indicates the clause of Environmental management by planting of trees and maintaining them, clearing away rubbish, waste construction materials and handing over environmentally sound site.</p> <p>Contracts documents sampled were for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Siting and drilling of two Production wells Contract ref: Napa604/Wrks/17-18/DWSCG-DDEG/00008.</li> <li>Construction of 2 class room blocks with office in Kokoroi primary school- Matany S/C Contract ref: Napa604/Wrks/17-18/DDEG/00003.</li> <li>Construction of Staff House at Morulinga P/S in Matany S/C Contract Ref: Napa604/Wrks/17-18/DDEG/00004.</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>
<p>The district Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 lists of members of WSCs were provided in the software progress reports of the District Water Office. All committees had 9 members of whom 4 were women making it 44.5% which is less than the recommended 50%. The sampled facilities were Lokalumok ECD BH (Ngoleriet S/C), Kololo BH (Matany S/C), Kongkwa BH (Matany S/C), Lokitella Akeemun BH (Matany S/C) and Kaigwe Production Well (Iriiri S/C). However in all the committees sampled at least two women occupied a key position of Vice chairman, Secretary, Treasurer or care taker.</p>	<p>0</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 DWO revealed to the assessment team that due to limited funds, the Water department did not plan of any Sanitation facilities. The Department had prioritized on Water supply projects.</p> <p>Therefore there was no sanitation facility that was available for sampling to verify gender and special needs sensitivity in public sanitation facilities.</p>	<p>0</p>