



## Local Government Performance Assessment

Ntoroko District

(Vote Code: 595)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	67%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	51%
Educational Performance Measures	55%
Health Performance Measures	35%
Water Performance Measures	54%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From MoFPED's inventory/schedule of LG submissions of performance contracts, check dates of submission and issuance of receipts and:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If LG submitted before or by due date, then state 'compliant'</li> <li>o If LG had not submitted or submitted later than the due date, state 'non-compliant'</li> </ul> </li> <li>• From the Uganda budget website: <a href="http://www.budget.go.ug">www.budget.go.ug</a>, check and compare recorded date therein with date of LG submission to confirm.</li> </ul>	<p>LG submitted APC on 1st August 2018 as per data at MOFPED and within the extended MOFPED deadline of 1st August 2018.</p>	Yes
Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY by 30th June (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>LG submitted the budget that includes the procurement plan for FY 2018/19 on 1st August 2018 as per data at MOFPED and extended deadline.</p>	Yes
Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			

<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted report to MoFPED in time, then it is compliant</li> <li>• If LG submitted late or did not submit, then it is not compliant</li> </ul>	<p>LG submitted APR on 15th August 2017 but this could not be verified as per data at MOFPED.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY by end of the FY; PFMA Act, 2015).</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/ inventory of LG submission of quarterly reports submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the quarterly performance reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>LG submitted the quarterly budget performance reports during FY 2017/2018 as hereunder:</p> <p>Quarter Date of submission Reference</p> <p>Quarter 01 21/ 12/2017 As per MOFPED Data</p> <p>Quarter 02 02/02/2018 “</p> <p>Quarter 03 10/05/2018 “</p> <p>Quarter 04 15/08/2018 “</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Audit</p>			
<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and the Auditor General's findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all find- ings where the</p>	<p>From MoFPED's Inventory/record of LG submissions of statements entitled "Actions to Address Internal Auditor General's findings",</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG submitted the responses on the Internal Auditor General's report for the FY2016/17 on 19th April 2018. The responses were received on 20th April 2018 by MOFPED, Accountant General, IGG,</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p>

Internal Auditor and the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action in lines with applicable laws.

Check:

- If LG submitted a 'Response' (and provide details), then it is compliant
- If LG did not submit a 'response', then it is non-compliant
- If there is a response for all –LG is compliant
- If there are partial or not all issues responded to – LG is not compliant.

MOLG and Auditor General.

• On the implementation of Internal Audit reports recommendations, for FY 2016/17 the issues raised were responded to adequately and hence all issues were all resolved as detailed below:

• Arrears of Local Revenue Collection

• Absenteeism of Staff in Health Centres

• Inadequate Housing for Health Staff

• Non availability of essential drugs in health facilities.

• Spare parts for vehicles not going through the Stores system

• Laxity in Launching and Commissioning Projects

• Un Accounted for funds

• Un shared Local Revenue Collected

• Irregularities in payment of staff allowances

• Salary Loan Deductions un remitted

• The LG submitted responses on the Auditor General's report for 2016/17 on 9th May 2018 which was received on 17th May 2018 by MOFPED, Auditor General and Parliamentary LGAC.

• There were three Queries Raised. These were responded too as detailed below:

• 1- Utilisation of Medicine

		<p>and Medical supplies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2-Mama KIT</li> <li>• 3-Stockouts of Medicine and Health Supplies</li> <li>• All the above issues and recommendations, the Accounting officer appreciated the issues raised and the advice given by the Auditor General and has taken appropriate action on issues raised for implementation in order to improve service delivery.</li> </ul>	
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>The report from the Auditor General for the FY 2017/18, Local Governments Unqualified Audit Opinion Schedule for Fort Portal Branch No.18, for December 2018.</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a district/ municipality has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>There was no basis of establishing whether the PPC is functional as only a formal appointment of the Physical Planning Committee found in a communication dated 28th July 2017 from the CAO appointing members to the Physical Planning Committee was provided as evidence.</p>	0
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>No evidence was provided during the time of assessment as the responsible officer was not on station.</p>	0

<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All infrastructure investments are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan: score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>Consistency could not be established in the absence of a Physical Development Plan.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action area plan prepared for the previous FY: score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence was provided due to the absence of a Physical Development Plan.</p>	<p>0</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

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.

• Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.

Priorities in the AWP/Approved Budget Estimates for FY 2018/19 were based on the outcomes of the Budget Framework Paper Conference Report of held on 11th October 2017 and submitted to CAO on 7th November 2017 as shown hereunder:

1. Education:

Construction of two 5 stance latrines at Bwizibwera and Umoja is a priority in the AWP (Page 101) with a budget of UGX. 54, 000,000/= and in the Budget Conference report(Page 3) .

2. Health :

Construction and equipping of maternity wards at Bweramule HC II is a priority as found in the approved AWP (Page 113) and budget estimates (Page 26).The same project is found in the budget conference report (Page 2).

3. Water:

Drilling of 6 boreholes for communities in Nombe to cost UGX. 95,525,000/= is a priority as found in the AWP (Pages 97) but not traced in the Budget Conference Report section of water(Page 2)



<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If differences appear, a justification has to be provided and evidence provided that it was approved by the Council. Score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Capital investments in the approved AWP for FY 2018/19 were derived from the 5year DDP(2015/2016-2019/2020) as shown hereunder:</p> <p>1. Education:</p> <p>Construction of two 5 stance latrines at Bwizibwera and Umoja is a priority in the AWP (Page 101) with a budget of UGX. 54,000,000/= and in the DDP(Page 123).</p> <p>2. Health :</p> <p>Construction and equipping of maternity wards at Bweramule HC II is a priority as found in the approved AWP (Pg.113) and in the DDP (Page 195).</p> <p>3. Water:</p> <p>Drilling of 6 boreholes for communities in Nombe to cost UGX. 95,525,000/= is a priority as found in the AWP (Pages 97) and in the DDP (Page 177).</p>	1
<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 for FY 2018/19 were developed and discussed by TPC at its meeting of DTPC held on 12th February 2018 under Min. 6/NTRK/DTPC/February/2018: Implementation of Capital Projects.</p>	2

<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>Annual Statistical Abstract of 2015/16 FY with gender dis-aggregated data is compiled and was presented to the DTPC at its meeting of 29th September 2017 under Min. 7/NTRK/DTPC/September /2017: Presentation of District Statistical Abstract (2014/15).</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>All Infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY 2017/2018 were derived from the approved Annual Work Plan and Budget as shown in the sampled projects hereunder:</p> <p>Education:</p> <p>Renovation of 2 classroom block and blown off roof at Kayamukura PS as found in the AWP(Page 60)and APR (Page 62).</p> <p>Water:</p> <p>Construction of a 2 stance VIP latrine in Rwamabale TC is in the AWP (Page 54) and in the APR (Page 76)</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.</li> </ul> <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>	<p>Out of the sampled investment projects (shown here-under), 4 out of 5 were implemented during the year under review representing 80% performance as found in the APR</p> <p>Works (2):</p> <p>Completion of the administration block-(Page 51) section of AWP and in the APR (Page 70).</p> <p>Rehabilitation of Wanka culvert bridge along Kacwamba-Itale-Wanka road in Nombe subcounty found in the AWP (Page 50) and APR (Page 103).</p> <p>Production (1):</p> <p>Completion of veterinary laboratory as found in the AWP (Page 42) and APR (Page 52).</p> <p>Education(1):</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Masojo PS as found in the AWP (Page 2) and in the APR (Page 62).</p> <p>Water (1):</p> <p>Construction of a 2 stance VIP latrine at Beweramule PS and Kiranga PS as found in AWP (Page 59) but not found in the APR. Masojo PS is what was implemented as found in the APR (Page 62).</p>	<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>According to the APR all investment projects were completed within approved budget range as shown from the 5 sampled projects and in the overall budget performance of -11.6% as derived from the figures hereunder:</p> <p>Works (2):</p> <p>Completion of the administration block, Budget (UGX. 15,000,000/=) Expenditure(UGX. 37,534,000/=)</p> <p>Rehabilitation of Wanka culvert bridge along Kacwamba-Itale-Wanka road in Nombe Budget (UGX.85,000,000/= ) and Expenditure(UGX.60,712,000/=)</p> <p>Production (1):</p> <p>Completion of veterinary laboratory Budget (UGX. 20,000,000/=) and Expenditure (UGX. 5,868,000/=).</p> <p>Education(1):</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Masojo PS Budget (UGX 16,000,000/=.) and Expenditure (UGX. 16,023,000/=).</p> <p>Water (1):</p> <p>Construction of a 2 stance VIP latrine at Rwamabaale Trading centre Budget (UGX. 13,933,000/=) and Expenditure (UGX. 12,093,000/=)</p>	2
<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>The LG has budgeted and spent at least 127.2 of its O&amp;M budget as shown hereunder:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reviewed assets and projects in need of maintenance as found in the approved AWP &amp; budget estimates FY 2017/18.</li> <li>The LG costed the maintenance of these assets in the various departments at UGX. 97,734,000/=</li> <li>The LG spent on the above roads UGX. 124,294,561 as found in the annual final accounts.</li> <li>The LG spent 127% of the O&amp;M budget as shown above.</li> </ol>	2
Human Resource Management			

<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>Only 12.5% of heads of department positions were filled substantively</p> <p>They are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- Mughuma Joan - Ag.Deputy Chief Administrative officer</li> <li>2- Dr.Bagonza Patrick- Ag District Production and Marketing officer</li> <li>3- Karungi Evalyn – Ag District community Development officer</li> <li>4- District Education officer - Is appointed substantively</li> <li>5-Dr Mugisha Rodgers - Ag.District Health officer</li> <li>6 -Ag. District Natural Resources officer's file was not accessed</li> <li>7- Ag.District Engineer's personal file was not accessed</li> <li>8- Ag. Chief Finance officer's personal file was not accessed</li> </ol>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district had appraised only 3 Heads of departments out of 9</li> <li>• Those appraised by CAO are:-</li> <li>• 1- Mughuma Joan - Ag.Deputy Chief Administrative officer - Appraised on 2/7/2018</li> <li>• 2- Dr.Bagonza Patrick- Ag District Production and Marketing officer - Appraised on 2/7/2018</li> <li>• 3- Karungi Evalyn – Ag District community Development officer – Appraised on 30/6/2018</li> </ul> <p>Which is 37.5% of the total number of departmental heads</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% of 138 vacancies submitted to DSC for recruitment during 2017-2018,</li> <li>• had been considered.</li> <li>• Reference made to CAO's submissions/declarations dated 8/6/17, 1/10/2017, 24/10/2017, 14/11/2017, 20/12 2017,</li> <li>• For the following vacancies:-</li> <li>• 7- Office attendants</li> <li>• 1- Senior Engineer</li> <li>• 40- Primary teachers and Deputy head teachers</li> <li>• 23- Road workers</li> <li>• 4 Porters</li> <li>• 1- Cold chain assistant</li> <li>• Plus an advert by Ministry of Education of 1/2017.</li> </ul> <p>Which was considered by the DSC in its 24th meeting held on the 19th /2/2018 and the 25th meeting held on the 27th /2/2018</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% of the 6 employees submitted for confirmation were considered.</li> </ul> <p>Reference is made to CAOs submission referenced as 156/1 dated 8/12/2018, considered by DSC in its 24th meeting held on the 19th /2/2018 and the 25th meeting held on the 27th /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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no disciplinary case submitted to the DSC in the FY 2017-2018</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>
<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100 % of the 135 staff recruited in previous financial year , accessed the pay roll with in two month as evidenced in the IPPS in relation to their appointment letters and posting instructions</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>
<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>No pensioner out of 14 staff who retired accessed pensioner's pay roll with in two month, during the FY 2017-2018, according to the pensioner's soft ware pay roll and pensioners register.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Revenue Mobilization</p>			

<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•• If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets) from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10 %: score 4.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The OSR revenue for 2016/17 was UGX 499,376,735 as shown in the Draft Financial statements prepared on 28th August 2018, and received by the Accountant General on 30th August 2018 and Office of Auditor General of Fort Portal Branch on 31st August 2018.</li> <li>• This was adjusted with a one off sale of Assets worth UGX 24,000,000 deduction, leaving a net revenue of UGX475, 376,736.</li> <li>• Page 7&amp;8, Statement of Financial Performance, Page 12, Statement of Appropriation Account and Page 20, Note 2: Local Revenue of the Final Accounts for FY 2017/18.</li> <li>• The Local revenue collected in FY 2017/18 was UGX. 425,600,872 this was a reduction of UGX 49,775,863 (475,736,736 – 425,600,872), which translates to 10.47% decrease. There was no increase rather a reduction in Revenue Collected hence the LG was not compliant.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the Draft financial statements 2017/18, page 7 &amp; 8 Statements of Financial Performance, page 12 Statement of Appropriation Account, page 20 Note 2: Local Revenue, and page 28 on Statement of Revenues Collected during the year, the Original Budget for Local revenue was projected at UGX 675,820,000 and the Actual local revenue collection realised was UGX 425,600,872. This translates into a revenue collection ratio of 62.9% with a variance of 37.1% which is outside the allowable range of +/- 10% range.</li> <li>• The LG is not compliant.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sec 85 of LGA (2) “In rural areas, revenue shall be collected by the sub county councils, and a sub county council shall retain 65 percent, or any other higher percentage as the district council may approve, of the revenue collected by it and pass the remaining percentage over to the district”</li> <li>• (4) “A district council may, with the concurrence of a sub county, collect revenue on behalf of the sub county council but shall remit 65 percent of the revenue so collected to the relevant sub county.”</li> <li>• In this regard to (4) above the DLG collected Local Service tax from District staff Payrolls and Private companies in the District which amounted to UGX 31,825,436, Page 20 of the Draft Financial statements.</li> <li>• However there was no evidence presented at the time of assessment of remittances to LLG.</li> <li>• LG was not compliant.</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 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>From the Draft financial statements of 2017/18 on page 20 (Note 2): Local revenue, page 28 Statement of Revenues collected during the year for 2016/17 was UGX 499,376,735 Less one off Disposal of Asset worth UGX 24,000,000 leaving a Net revenue of UGX475,376,735. (20% of this is UGX 95,075,347)</p> <p>The Actual Expenditure on Statutory bodies, page 8, Statement of Financial Performance and page 12, Statement of Appropriation Account, of the Draft financial statements, and Trial Balance, page 44, UGX 407,946,464 was spent in total. This figure includes the GOU Grants to this sector.</p> <p>However the amount spent from Local revenue Funding Source: Local Revenue 03, Vote Cost Centre: 030100, 030600 &amp; 030700 and Expenses Account: Allowances 211103: 81,358,000.</p> <p>Therefore <math>(81,359,000 / 475,376,735) = 17.1\%</math> is within the allowable limit of 20%. The LG is not spending above 20% and therefore is compliant.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>Whereas the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer (Christopher Friday) recruited on 04/02/2013 under DSC Min.43/DSC/2012, the position of a procurement officer is not in place.</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>Reports of the Evaluation Committee were submitted to the Contracts Committee during FY 2017/2018 on the following dates, 05/02/2018, 01/11/2017 and 03/11/2017.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>From the TEC and Contracts committee minutes, it was established that the Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC for example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Masojo P/S was recommended and awarded to Him services Ltd at a contract sum of UGX 30,300,768 under DCC Min.06/02/2017-18(4)(a) during TEC and DCC meetings that sat on 30/01/2018 and 05/02/2018 respectively.</li> <li>2. Drilling and construction of 4 deep boreholes was recommended and awarded to GIC Logistics and Engineering Ltd at a contract sum of UGX 102,583,500 under DCC Min.03/11/2017-18(5)(a) during TEC and DCC meetings that sat on 16/01/2017 and 01/11/2017 respectively.</li> <li>3. Rehabilitation of Wanka culvert bridge was recommended and awarded to K.Davids and Friends Co. Ltd at a contract sum of UGX 83,802,042 under DCC Min.03/11/2017-2018(5)(b) during TEC and DCC meetings that sat on 15/10/2017 and 01/11/2017 respectively.</li> <li>4. Construction of a 2 stance water borne toilet at Rwamabale RGC was recommended and awarded to Ntoroko United Contractors Ltd at a contract sum of UGX 12,865,500 under DCC Min.03/11/2017-2018(5)(C) during TEC and DCC meetings that sat on 16/10/2017 and 01/11/2017 respectively.</li> <li>5. Renovation of a 2 classroom block at Kanyamukura was recommended and awarded to Kamu-Kamu civil works Ltd at a contract sum of UGX 36,381,889 under DCC Min.06/02/2017-18(4)(C) during TEC and DCC meetings that sat on 22/01/2018 and 05/02/2018 respectively.</li> </ol>	<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</li> </ul> <p>the previous FY: score 2</p>	<p>a)From the procurement plan, budget and AWP for FY 2018/19, it was established that NOT ALL infrastructure projects are consistently covered in the 3 approved documents, For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of the district yard with a generator house, appears on page 3 of PDU plan, page 94 of AWP and isn't covered in the annual budget.</li> <li>2. Construction of a staff house in Kiranga P/S, appears on page 3 of PDU plan, page 35 of the annual budget but isn't covered in AWP.</li> </ol> <p>b) NOT All procurements in previous FY were implemented according to plan, for example;</p> <p>Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Masojo P/S and Renovation of a 2 classroom block at Kanyamukura P/S are both not reflected in the PDU plan.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 LG had prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30; All major projects' bid documents were submitted for approval to DCC on 15/08/2018 These include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rehabilitation of 2 bridges at Rwesenene &amp; Kakogha.</li> <li>2. Drilling of 4 boreholes.</li> <li>3. Construction of a staff house at Kiranga P/S.</li> <li>4. Renovation of a 2 classroom block at Masaka P/S.</li> </ol>	<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>Whereas the LG had an updated contract register, there was only one complete procurement activity file i.e. for Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Masojo P/S where engineer issued completion certificate on 25/09/2018, all other procurement files were incomplete with no project completion certificates.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG adhered with procurement thresholds as evidenced below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Masojo P/S - contract sum of UGX 30,300,768 – selective bidding.</li> <li>2. Drilling and construction of 4 deep boreholes - contract sum of UGX 102,583,500 – Open national bidding.</li> <li>3. Rehabilitation of Wanka Culvert Bridge - contract sum of UGX 83,802,042 – open national bidding.</li> <li>4. Construction of a 2 stance water borne toilet at Rwamabale RGC - contract sum of UGX 12,865,500 – selective bidding.</li> <li>5. Renovation of a 2 classroom block at Kanyamukura - contract sum of UGX 36,381,889 – selective 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>All works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim certification for all projects was based on technical supervision. For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Masojo P/S -Engineer certified on 09/05/2018 and completion certificate on 25/09/2018.</li> <li>Drilling and construction of 4 deep boreholes - Engineer certified on 17/05/2018</li> <li>Rehabilitation of Wanka Culvert Bridge - Engineer certified on 15/01/2018.</li> <li>Construction of 2 stance water borne toilet at Rwamabale RGC - Engineer certified on 18/04/2018.</li> <li>Renovation of a 2 classroom block at Kanyamukura P/S - Engineer certified on 11/04/2018.</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 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 was no project implemented yet at the time of assessment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management</p>			

<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DLG had prepared Bank reconciliations for June, July and August 2018 for all its Ten Bank Accounts at the time of assessment as detailed below:.</li> <li>• Ntoroko D General Fund Account</li> <li>• Ntoroko DLG Administration</li> <li>• Ntoroko DLG Finance</li> <li>• Ntoroko DLG Statutory</li> <li>• Ntoroko DLG Production &amp; Marketing</li> <li>• Ntoroko DLG Health</li> <li>• Ntoroko DLG Education</li> <li>• Ntoroko DLG Natural Resources</li> <li>• Ntoroko DLG Community Services</li> <li>• The reconciliations were on file and fully authenticated.</li> </ul> <p>The LG is compliant.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the sample of payments made during the financial year, Education department worth UGX 76,252,602 and Water and Sanitation Department worth UGX 118,463,105. These payments were made within one month of requisitions being raised. The LG was compliant in this area.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DLG has no substantial Senior Internal Auditor. The Section is headed by an Examiner of Accounts who was appointed on 27th June 2011 under minute DSC/155/DSC/2011. He has been acting since 2016.</li> </ul>	0
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG produced all Quarterly reports as follows :</p> <p>Quarter 1 on 23/11/2017</p> <p>Quarter 2 on 15/02/2018</p> <p>Quarter 3 on 22/05/2018</p> <p>Quarter 4 on 26/06/2018</p>	2
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports: score 2.</p>	<p>The LGPAC has considered only one quarterly reports on the following dates:</p> <p>Quarter 1 PAC Sitting on 26/09/2018</p> <p>Quarter 2 PAC Not yet reviewed</p> <p>Quarter 3 PAC Not yet reviewed.</p> <p>Quarter 4, PAC Not yet reviewed.</p> <p>The LG PAC has NOT produced any Report(s) for ALL the four Quarters, since they just started reviewing 2017/18 on 26th September 2018.</p>	0



<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>The reports were submitted to the LG Accounting Officer and LGPAC on the following dates:</p> <p>Quarter 1 on 26/11/2017</p> <p>Quarter 2 on 19/02/2018</p> <p>Quarter 3 on 24/05/2018</p> <p>Quarter 4 on 26/06/2018</p> <p>The LGPAC has NOT reviewed any Quarter of the Previous FY. The first quarter review for FY 2017/18 started on 26th September 2018 which is already creating a backlog for FY 2018/19.</p> <p>Not reviewing Quarterly reports in a timely manner is making the role of PAC as an Accountability organ very irrelevant and incompetent.</p> <p>The LGPAC needs to improve on its performance so that they can contribute positively as an Accountability arm of the District as by law established.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DLG does not maintain a detailed and updated Asset register as per format in the Accounting Manual.</li> <li>All the Assets acquired during the FY2017/18 were not posted in the Register at the time of assessment. All additions during the year, from the Draft financial statements (Page 21 Note 8: Consumption of Property, Plant and Equipment (Fixed Assets) and page 35 of : Summary statement of stores and other assets (physical assets) as at end of the year- June 2018) detailed below were not included : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non Residential Buildings UGX 190,087,606, Roads and Bridges UGX 74,849,048 and Other Machinery and Equipment UGX 120,473,760. All cumulatively totalling UGX 385,410,414 were not on the Register at the time of assessment.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The LG was not compliant.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unqualified audit opinion: score 4</li> <li>• Qualified: score 2</li> <li>• Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The report from the Auditor General for the FY 2017/18, Local Governments Unqualified Audit Opinion Schedule for Fort Portal Branch No.18, for December 2018.</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 LG meets and discusses service delivery related issues. At the District Local Government Council meeting held on 11th April 2018, it met and discussed service delivery issues e.g. under</p> <p>i. Min. CM 43/04/ NDLG/NTOROKO/2018: Presentation and Discussion of the Ntoroko District Public Accounts Committee Report.</p> <p>ii. Min. CM 44/04/ NDLG/NTOROKO/2018: Presentation and Discussion of the Ntoroko District 2017 PLE Performance Report.</p>	<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>No evidence was provided during the assessment.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/ complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>No evidence was provided and/or found on display during the assessment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The payroll and pensioner schedule for September were found on display at the administration block noticeboard.</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>	<p>The procurement plan and notice of awarded contracts were found on display at the Administration notice board at the time of assessment.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>No evidence that the LG published the performance assessment results for FY 2016/17 was found on display at the main notice board at the District Administration Block.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 HLG communicated and explained national guidelines and circulars as found in the communication (dated 27th September 2017) from CAO to all HOD, Town Clerks and Sub-county chiefs providing guidance with regard to compliance with reporting within the newly introduced PBS system.</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 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>No evidence was provided during the time of assessment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>From the LG TPC minutes of FY 2017/18 for a meeting that sat on 28/02/2018, under Min.6/DTPC/Feb/2018, it was established that a presentation of gender mainstreaming concept was done to HoDs as evidence that CDO provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion into their activities.</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>From the AWP FY 2018/19 under the Community based services sector, it was established that the gender focal person and CDO had planned activities to strengthen women's roles and address vulnerability and social inclusions as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planned to carry out formation of women groups and support them with funds (UGX 200M) under UWEP.</li> <li>• Support women council executive &amp; council meetings, support disabled women groups with seed capital.</li> </ul> <p>However, the LG under performed at 65% on gender mainstreaming budget, i.e. budgeted UGX 3,000,000 and spent only UGX 1,950,000.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>EIA wasn't done appropriately for all the implemented projects last FY, the only projects screened were; Construction of VIP latrine at Bweramule P/S, Borehole construction at Butungama S/C and Rehabilitation of a bridge at Wanka, but the following projects were not screened; Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Masojo P/S, Drilling and construction of 4 deep boreholes, Renovation of a 2 classroom block at Kanyamukura P/S and Construction of a 2 stance water borne toilet at Rwamabale RGC.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Whereas some contract bid documents had environmental and social management, health and safety plans integrated there in, it wasn't the case in some bid documents, for example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of a 5 stance VIP latrine at Masojo P/S,</li> <li>• Construction of 2 stance water borne toilet at Rwamabale RGC and</li> <li>• Rehabilitation of Wanka Culvert Bridge. Etc...</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1</li> </ul>	<p>LG didn't provide any proof of land ownership to places where all projects were implemented.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Completed ESM form seen for the Rehabilitation of a bridge at Wanka was signed on 22/05/2018 by the Environment officer alone without the CDO. For the rest of the other implemented projects, no ESM forms were completed.</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 certificated for all implemented projects didn't include prior environmental and social clearance.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that environmental officer and CDO monthly report, includes a) completed checklists, b) deviations observed with pictures, c) corrective actions taken. Score: 1</li></ul>	<p>There wasn't any monthly report done for all the implemented projects.</p>	<p>0</p>
---	---	---	----------

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>The LG education de- partment has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>According to the performance contract 2018/2019, pg 14; and from the approved Budget pg 102, the LG planned and budgeted a wage of 2.4b for 355 teachers in 37 schools.</li> <li>On analysis, the average per school is <math>355/37 = 10</math> teachers, hence meets the minimum standards.</li> </ul>	4
<p>The LG education de- partment has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Schools/ Staff lists in DEOs office as at close of term 2, the LG operates with 306 teachers.</li> <li>On computation <math>306/37 = 8</math> teachers per school.</li> <li>However, the deployment staff list indicates that the LG does not meet the minimum standards of 8 teachers per school as evidenced on the random sampling done, as below; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bweramule p7- 10, Umoja p7- 7, Itojo p7- 11, Kiranga p7-7, Kamuge p6- 9, Ibanda p7- 9, Ntoroko p7- 11, Musandama p7- 9, Nombe P7- 10, Kyabandara p7- 8.</li> <li>From the 3 sampled schools visited to check and verify for deployment shows results as. (Key:- SL- Staff List, and PV- Physical verification on ground.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Makondo p7/sch SL- 8, PV- 8; Kamuhiigi p.7 SL- 8, PV- 8; Bugando p5 SL- 7, PV- 6.</li> </ul> </li> <li>However, Umoja p/s and Kiranga p/s do not meet the minimum.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	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</li> <li>o If 100%: score 6</li> <li>o If 80 - 99%: score 3</li> <li>o If below 80%: score 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The wage bill provision of 2.4 billion covers 306 teachers, yet the planned and budgeted structure for outpost staff is 355 as indicated in the approved budget 2018/19 pg.102.</li> <li>• <math>306/355 \times 100 = 86\%</math></li> </ul>	<p>3</p>
<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The approved and adopted structure of Ntoroko LG as advised by MoPS in a letter to implement within the staff establishment wage budget of 2016/17, dated 16/5/2017; indicate 1 position of Senior inspector of schools, and 1 Area Inspector of schools.</li> <li>• Both positions are filled by: SIS- Rev. Kibwona David and AIS- Mr. Ruhandika Timothy</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission of recruitment plan for FY 2018/19 to CAOs office indicates vacant posts as follows</li> <li>- Head teachers 21 vacancies</li> <li>- Deputy Head teachers 33 vacancies</li> <li>- Education Assistants II 55 vacancies</li> <li>- Senior education assistants 10 vacancies.</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Inspectors: score 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School inspectors' posts are filled up.</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
--	---	---	----------

Monitoring and Inspection

<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% school inspectors: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>All schools inspectors were not appraised by CAO and their personal files couldn't be accessed.</p> <p>Namely</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- Alinda Julius</li> <li>2- Atuugonza Hannington</li> </ol>	<p>0</p>
---	--	--	----------

The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.

Maximum 6 for this performance measure

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

- Primary school head teachers o 90 - 100%: score 3

- o 70% and 89%: score 2

- o Below 70%: score 0

100% of primary schools head teachers had been appraised by the DEO

10 Primary school head teachers files were sampled out of 37 namely:-

1- Ninsiima Paul- Rwanga PS – Appraised on 2/1/2018

2- Baluku Jockus- Kyamutema PS- Appraised on 2/1/2018

3- Rusoke Kanyoro – Kabimbiri PS- Appraised on 25/8/2018

4- Mugabe Geoffrey- Haibale PS – Appraised on 9/6/2018

5- Kyomuhendo Erimosi – Kanyamukura PS – Appraised on 8/6/2018

6- Mutegeki Nathan – Rwamabale PS Appraised on 12/6/2018

7- Musabe Arkright – Bugando PS Appraised on 13/6/2018

8- Bamboine Alex – Musundama PS – Appraised on 12/12/2017

9- Bagonza Charles – Rwensenene PS – Appraised on 7/6/2018

10- Barekye Madern – Budiba PS - Appraised on 9/6/201

<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>circulars communicated from national level, include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Circular no.8/2017; Adherence to school calendar, dated 9/5/2017, signed PS. MOES.</li> <li>2. Enforcing closure of illegal schools, dated 26/3/2018, PS. MOES.</li> <li>3. Guidelines on school charges, dated 24/10/2017, signed PS.MOES.</li> <li>4. Un Authorized school charges and expenditure, dated 15/2/17, and received on 28/5/2017.</li> <li>5. Uganda spelling BEE- Competition, dated 1/4/2018, signed by PS.MOES.</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Among the school sampled and visited, the following circulars were found (Key for circulars- as serialized above)</li> <li>• Basing on schools that were sampled (Makondo,Kamuhiigi, and Bugando p/s) to verify receipt of circulars and guidelines; No physical/visible circular was seen, however, due to evidences on the next parameter, I gave a mark.</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Department means of communication include; Head teachers of primary schools association meetings (HOPSA), Phone calls, Radio talk shows, watsapp platform.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HOPSA meeting on 20/7/2018, Min. 4/7/2018; Disseminated Ball games circular, 17 teachers signed.</li> <li>• HOPSA meeting on 1/2/2018, Min. 4/2/2018; Dissemination of schools calendar; and Guidelines on school charges</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG Education De- partment 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>The LG operates both 37 government aided p/s and 12 private licensed and registered schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Term 1 inspection report on 5/5/2018, indicates 42 schools.</li> <li>• However term 3 reports of 10/12/ 2017 and term 2 report of 30/6/2018, inspection report did not have the list of schools inspected- misplaced.</li> <li>• As per term one inspection is:- <math>42/(37+12)*100= 86\%</math></li> <li>• However the schools sampled to verify on inspection minimum standards of once per term as seen below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Makondo p/s term 3 of 2017 inspected on 19/10/2017, by DIS; Term 1 on 19/4/2018 by DEO and AIS; Term 2 on 22/6/2018 by SEO. (3/3)</li> <li>- Kamuhiigi p/s term 3 on 14/11/2017; Term 1 on 20/2/2018, by DIS. Term 2 on 11/7/18 by SNEO. (3/3)</li> <li>- Bugando p/s term 3&amp;1 has no record of inspection. However term 2 inspections on 4/7/2018 by AIS. (1/3)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Average inspection <math>(3/3+3/3+1/3)/3 *100= 78\%</math></li> <li>• <math>(86\%+78\%)/2= 82\%</math></li> </ul>	<p>8</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Term 2 report on 16/6/2018; Observations and Recommendations no. 8: Drop out of girls from schools; Sensitizations against early marriage, child abuse, should be intensified by all stakeholders including politicians, school managers, development partners, religious leaders among others.</li> <li>• Department meeting on 18/1/2018; Min. 5/1/2018; to mobilise, and to sensitise stakeholders; Contacted Kabalore research-resource center radio, and it offered air time for talk shows to address these issues.</li> <li>• Inspection report on 16/7/2017, commented on poor accountability of funds by head teachers.</li> <li>• Department meeting on 27/9/2017, Min.6/sept/2017; Enforce accountability of UPE funds on time</li> </ul>	<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No authentic document like acknowledgement letter, or a copy of submitted and stamped report seen; and even on DES chart of submissions, Ntoroko has nothing</li> </ul>	<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 inspection recommendations are followed- up: score 4.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no evidence on follow up on inspection recommendations in sampled schools visited.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>List of government schools on PBS list for UPE IPFs for FY 2017/2018 as at closure of term 2 2018 indicates 37 schools;</p> <p>While the list from MOES also has 36 schools which is consistent.</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>Pupils census in gov't schools 2017/2018 in DEOs office gave enrollment of 5483 boys and 5612 girls, total 11,339 pupils;</p> <p>While the list from MOES puts enrollment at 11,984, which is not consistent.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG committee re- sponsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence was provided at the time of the assessment. It was reported the Committee minutes had been taken by the IGG.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG committee re- sponsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>At the District Local Government Council meeting held on 06th February 2018, it met and discussed recommendations from the Social Services District Standing Committee Recommendations under Min. CM 26/02/NDLG/COUNCIL 1): Presentation and Discussion of the District Standing Committee Recommendations. The Council considered the request for approval by the Social Services Standing Committee of varying the construction of a 3classroom block to 2 classroom block at Nyakasenyi PS to allow for reallocation of funds to renovate the two classroom block at Kyabandara PS where the roof was blown off.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (estab- lished, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO/ MEO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% schools: score 5</li> <li>• 80 to 99% schools: score 3</li> <li>• Below 80 % schools: score 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current new SMCs are established and appointed by DEO on 28/2/2018.</li> <li>• All schools sampled ( Bugando, Kamuhiigi, Makondo p/s) Held SMC meetings and discussed resource issues in all their meetings ranging from Fundraising, UPE budget approvals, Expenditures accountabilities for UPE, PTA, etc as indicated below. (Selected/Sampled one meeting (term 3, 2017 in all schools) as representative for SMC meeting, out of the 3 mandatory meetings in a year to check if resource related issues were discussed.)</li> <li>• Bugando p/s SMC meeting on 3/11/2017, Min. 7/11/2017: Discussed- parents to contribute 16,500 to support teachers' welfare.</li> <li>• Makondo p/s on 18/10/2017, Min.2/10/2017; parent to support UPE by providing lunch to candidates.</li> <li>• Kamuhiigi p/s SMC on 3/10/2017, Min. 4/2017; Accountability for PTA and SMC.</li> <li>• However, only few schools had submitted reports to DEOs office.</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>



<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non- wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ntoroko DLG p/s receives UPE grants and list of schools displayed on department notice board with 2018/19 budget of 53,011,027.</li> <li>Release for quarter 1- 2018/19 worth 139,191,589, was seen.</li> </ul> <p>Schools sampled to verify receipt of UPE release, had displayed records in staff rooms as evidenced below:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kamuhiigi p/s received 1.663m for each of the three terms.</li> <li>Bugando p/s received 1m for term 3&amp;2, and 900,000 for term 1</li> <li>Makondo p/s received 1.030m for term 3 of 2017, and 0,990m for term 1 and 2 of 2018.</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>Three projects were sampled to check for procurement requisitions at PDU.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procurement requisitions for renovations of Kanyamukura 2 classroom block with office worth 31.851m; was initiated and signed by SEO on 4/12/2017, CFO- on 4/12/2017, and CAO on 5/12/2017.</li> <li>Construction of 5 stance latrine at Masojjo p/s worth 25,135,950; Initiations made by SEO on 4/12/2017, signed by CFO on 4/12/2017, and finally CAO on 5/12/2017.</li> <li>Procurement requisitions for construction of 5 stance latrine at Bweramule p/s worth 25,054,170. Initiated by and signed by SEO and CFO on 4/12/2017 and CAO on 5/12/2017.</li> <li>All procurement requisitions were submitted in time before 30/April 2018</li> </ul>	<p>4</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the sampled payments made during the year to various vendors worth UGX 76,252,602, which was spent on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tostap Limited: Construction of a 5 stance lined up VIP latrine at Bweramule Primary School in Bweramure Sub County, VR.No.8562.</li> <li>Kamukamu Civil Works Ltd: Renovation of a two classroom Block with office and a Teachers House at Kanyamukaira Primary School, VR.No.8563.</li> <li>Him Services Ltd: Construction of 5 stances VIP Latrines at Masojo Primary School in Butungama Sub County (Presidential Pledge), VR.No.8566.</li> <li>All these payments were made on time and mostly within a week after requisition for payment was raised.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	3
<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>No evidence could be established during the assessment. Consistent with the submission date of the District's APR on 15/08/2018, it is concluded that they did not meet the stipulated timeline.</p>	0
<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>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</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Three Schools with various Queries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Kyabandara Primary School : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) No Approved work plan and budget by school management committee for academic year 2018.</li> <li>(b) No UPE Analysis cash book and Vote book for budget monitoring</li> <li>(c) No lightening arrestors on both Classrooms and teachers Houses</li> <li>(d) Un accounted UPE Funds</li> <li>(e) Dilapidated Pit Latrine and classroom Blocks</li> <li>(f) Lack of school Land title</li> <li></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	0

<p>previous financial year: score 2</p> <p>o If all queries are not responded to score 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (2) Karugutu Secondary School</li> <li>• (a) Un updated USE Analysis cash book and Vote books</li> <li>• (b) The school runs ONE Account for PTA Contributions and teachers SACCO</li> <li>• (c ) Un accounted for funds of UGX 2,964,000</li> <li>• (d) Un remitted PAYE and NSSF deductions for Contracted staff</li> <li>• (e ) Non submission of Annual financial statements</li> <li>• (f) Understaffing at school</li> <li>• (g) No staff performance appraisal</li> <li>•</li> <li>• (3 ) Nyabusokoma Primary School</li> <li>• (a) No book keeping records</li> <li>• (b) No Lightening arrestors on Classrooms and teachers houses</li> <li>• (c ) Non preparation of Work plans and budget preparation</li> <li>• (d) Dilapidated Pit Latrine and Classroom blocks.</li> <li>•</li> <li>• There was no evidence shown for any action taken on all the above at the time of assessment. All the above queries were not responded to.</li> </ul>
--	---

Social and environmental safeguards

<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</li> </ul> <p>on how senior women/men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills, etc.: Score 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Department meeting on 7/9/2017, Min. 3/2017; Report on training of senior women teachers on how to make re-usable pads, to improve on the continuity of girls child in schools. Organised by Gender section on peace for girl children in schools.</li> <li>Journal of Guidance and Counseling; from MOES.</li> <li>Guidelines for implementing of three star approach for WASH in schools Oct 2017.</li> </ul>	<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Head teachers meeting on 29/5/2018, Min. 3.2018; DIS communication; Highlighted to heads of schools to pick circulars and manuals from department secretary, including WASH manual.</li> </ul>	<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 the School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basing on schools sampled and visited, the results indicate that SMCs do not conform to gender guidelines of 1/3 of members on the founding body to be females, as shown below.</li> </ul> <p>Kamuhiigi p/school had no list of members availed. Makondo p/s- 2/6, Bugando p/s – 2/6.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide- lines on environmental management are dissemi- nated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inspection report term 2, on 16/7/2018: DIS Observation and Recommendations; Over 200 trees were planted on school compound, but people, cattle and goats destroyed them.</li> </ul>	1
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide- lines on environmental management are dissemi- nated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only one project for construction of 5 stance latrine at Bweramule p/s was environmentally and socially sreened and signed by EO on 6/3/2018, while other not.</li> </ul>	0
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide- lines on environmental management are dissemi- nated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No monitoring reports by CDO or EO was seen for projects implemented 2017/2018</li> </ul>	0

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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MoH approved structure provides for 134 posts (Including DHO's Office) to operate at 100% capacity.</li> <li>• DHO's staff list with stamp dated 4th July 2018 showed 102 posts filled. This meant that 32 posts were vacant in relation to the approved MoH staffing norms. This is 76.1% posts filled</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>The recruitment plan wasn't comprehensive to cover the 32 vacant positions as per the MoH approved structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recruitment Plan for FY 2018/19 dated 25th September 2017 with CAO's stamp was availed. It listed only 6 positions</li> </ul>	0

<p>The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital In-charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100%: score 8</li> <li>o 70 – 99%: score 4</li> <li>o Below 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>100% of Health unit In charges had been appraised by DHO on the 27/6/2018 according to their personal files</p> <p>The District had 6 Health units</p> <p>Namely.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 –Kamukama Adam – For Karugutu HCIV</li> <li>2 - Bwambale Enock - For Musanda HCII</li> <li>3 – Badaka Richard - For Rwebisengo HCIII</li> <li>4 – Masereka Benon – For Bweramure HCII</li> <li>5 - Bahati Enock – For Rwangara HC II</li> <li>6 – Katto James – For Ntoroko HC III</li> </ol>	<p>8</p>
<p>The Local Government Health department has deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>Two of the sampled facilities had deviations in the number of staff in relation to the list availed at the DHO and no justification was given at the time of assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 Gov't facilities (1HCIV, 3HCIIIs, 2HCIIIs) exist in the district where staff on PHC Wage are deployed.</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Karugutu HCIV staff list dated 17th November 2017 was availed with 45 staff recorded as attached to the facility. The staff list availed at DHO's office recorded 39 staff as attached to this facility.</li> <li>2. Rwebisengo HCIII staff list was availed with 16 staff listed. Staff list at DHO's office showed 16 staff deployed to this facility.</li> <li>3. Bweramule HCII staff list was availed with 5 staff attached. DHO's staff list showed 5 staff deployed</li> <li>4. Musandama HCII staff list was availed with 6 staff recorded as attached. DHO staff list indicated 8 staff deployed to this facility.</li> </ol>	<p>0</p>
<p>Monitoring and Supervision</p>			

<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO/ MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None of the guidelines required were availed at the time of assessment</li> <li>No evidence from the Ag. DHO to show communication of the guidelines &amp; policies to facilities was availed at the time of assessment</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO/ MHO has held meetings with health facility in- charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence from Ag. DHO was availed at the time of assessment.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: score 3</p>	<p>The DHT did NOT supervise 100% of HCIV at least once in two of the quarters under review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district has 1 HSD (Karugutu) The total number of HFs (Including PNFPs) that receive PHC NWR herein are 7 (Gov't – 1 HCIV, 3 HCIIIs, 2 HCIIIs &amp; PNFP – 1 HCIII).</li> <li>Q1 support supervision report dated 23rd October 2017 was availed. 7 facilities were supported (1 HCIV, 2 HCIIIs, 3 HCIIIs &amp; 1 PNFP).</li> <li>Q2 support supervision report dated 3rd November 2017 was availed. Six facilities were visited 1 HCV, 2 HCIIIs and 3 HCIIIs were visited.</li> <li>Q3 and Q4 DHT supervision reports were never availed by the Ag.DHO at the time of assessment</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>



<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% supervised: score 3</li> <li>• 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2</li> <li>• 60% - 79% of the health facilities: score 1</li> <li>• Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Of the 7 facilities receiving PHC NWR, the HSD managed to supervise 5 in Q4. <i>This is 71.4% achievement</i></li> <li>• The district has 1 HSD (Karugutu) The total number of HFs (Including PNFPs) that receive PHC NWR herein are 7 (Gov't – 1 HCIV, 3 HCIIIs, 2 HCIIIs &amp; PNFP – 1 HCIII).</li> <li>• Q4 report conducted from 25th to 29th June 2018 was available. 7 facilities were supervised (1 HCIV, 2 HCIIIs &amp; 4 HCIIIs)</li> <li>• Q2 support supervision report dated 29/12/2017 was available. 3 facilities (2 HCIIIs &amp; 1 HCII) were visited.</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only recommendations for two quarters were available at the time of assessment</li> <li>• Gaps identified during the Q4 HSD supervision were discussed immediately and an action plan for each facility was developed with responsible persons &amp; timelines clearly stated.</li> <li>• Recommendations were made for each facility visited during the Q2 HSD supervision but no responsible persons &amp; timelines were identified.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the recommendations are followed</li> <li>– up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence was availed at the time of assessment</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district has 1 HSD (Karugutu) The total number of HFs (Including PNFPs) that receive PHC NWR herein are 7 (Gov't – 1 HCIV, 3 HCIIIs, 2 HCIIIs &amp; PNFP – 1 HCIII).</li> <li>List of facilities to receive PHC NWR FY2018/19 with DHO stamp dated 5th July 2018 was availed with 7 facilities (Including PNFPs) to receive a total of UGX 60,173,557</li> <li>The PBS LG Approved Budget Estimates FY 2018/19 generated on 01/08/2018 were availed. It listed 7 facilities on Page 25 and the total PHC NWR was UGX 60,173,000</li> <li>HMIS report as at 8th July 2018 was availed and it listed the 7 facilities among others that reported in Q4 FY 2017/18</li> </ul>	<p>10</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>No evidence was provided at the time of the assessment. It was reported the Committee minutes had been taken by the IGG.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>At the District Local Government Council meeting held on 06th February 2018, it met and discussed recommendations from the Social Services District Standing Committee Recommendations under Min. CM 26/02/NDLG/COUNCIL 1): Presentation and Discussion of the District Standing Committee Recommendations. The Council considered the request for approval by the Social Services Standing Committee to construct a mortuary at Karugutu HC IV.</p>	<p>2</p>

The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning

Maximum 6 points

Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):

- If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 6
- If 80-99 %: score 4
- If 70-79: %: score 2
- If less than 70%: score 0

**Only 1 out of 4 sampled facilities held the four mandatory HUMC meetings in the previous year. This is 25% achievement**

**1. Karugutu HCIV** HUMC list was availed with 8 members (3 females & 5 males). The minimum requirement as per the guidelines is 9 members.

*Q1 HUMC minutes for meeting held on 28/09/2017 were availed. Resource & budget issues were discussed under Min 4, 6 & 7.*

*Q2 minutes for meeting held on 3/10/2017 were availed. Resource & budget issues were discussed under Min 4 & 5.*

*Q3 minutes dated 14/03/2018 were availed. Resource & budget issues were discussed under Min 2 & 3.*

*Q4 minutes for meeting held on 28th June 2018. Resource & budget issues were discussed under Min 4 & 6.*

**2. Rwebisengo HCIII** HUMC list with 7 members (2 females & 5 males. 6 of these (2 females & 4 males) are approved by the guidelines. **No HUMC minutes were availed at the time of assessment.**

3. Bweramule HCII HUMC list was availed with 5 members (1 female & 4 males) but one of them isn't approved by the guidelines which leaves 4 members (0 females & 4 males). The approved members as per guidelines are 6. **No HUMC minutes were availed at the time of assessment.**

4. Musandama HCII HUMC list with 5 members (2 females & 3 males) was availed.  
*Q1 minutes for meeting held on 29/09/2017 were availed. Resource & budget issues were discussed under Min 15/2017 & Min 16/2017*  
*Q2 minutes for meeting held on 14/11/2017 were availed. Resource issues were discussed under Min 22/2017.*  
*Q4 HUMC minutes for meeting held on 09/05/2018 were availed. Resource issues were discussed under Min 03.*

<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A list of 7 facilities (Gov't – 1 HCIV, 3 HCIIIs, 2 HCIIIs &amp; PNFP – 1 HCIII) to receive PHC NWR FY 2018/19 with CFO's stamp was displayed on the public notice board.</li> </ul>	<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Procurement Plan for FY 2018/19 was availed dated 07/03/18. It had 7 investment items listed (4 under PHC NWR and 3 under PHC Dev't)</li> </ul>	<p>2</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One PP1 form for FY 2018/19 investment menu items was availed i.e. Fuel Supply of UGX 1,000,000 dated 15/08/18</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO/ MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were no Projects carried out during the financial year and therefore no payments were made.</li> </ul>	0
Financial management and reporting			
<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>No evidence could be established during the assessment. Consistent with the submission date of the District's APR on 15/08/2018, it is concluded that they did not meet the stipulated timeline.</p>	0
<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If sector has no audit query: Score 4</li> <li>If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: Score 2 points</li> <li>If all queries are not responded to Score 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three Health Facilities with various queries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Karugutu Health Centre IV <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Poor sanitation and Hygiene at facility-latrines filled up and those open very dirty.</li> <li>(b) Medical Waste Management- Placenta pit open &amp; incinerator not effective</li> <li>(c) Disposal of non-medical waste poor</li> <li>(d) Un accounted for PHC Funds worth UGX 4,743,877.</li> <li>(e) Discrepancies in drugs orders and receipts</li> <li>(f) Stock out of Drugs</li> </ul> </li> <li>(2) Rwangara Health Centre II <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) No cash books for PHC Funds</li> <li>(b) No fence</li> <li>(c) Non witnessing of deliveries of medical</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	0

supplies.

- (d) Assets donated to the facility not in the Asset Register.

- 

- (3) Rwebisengo Health Centre III

- (a) No cash books and no bank reconciliation

- (b) No Asset register

- (c ) Advance worth UGX 4,467,167 Not accounted for

- (d) Facility has 116% staffing level but service delivery doesn't match the level of staffing.

- ( e ) Staff Houses occupied by Non-medical works hence leaving medical staff rent and stay outside

- (f) Staff on leave without permission

- (g) Condemned Maternity ward

- (h) Health Management committee non functional

- (i) Person in Charge of stores not formally appointed.

- 

At the time of Assessment there was no evidence availed to show any action taken to respond to the queries or implementation of Auditors recommendations.

Social and environmental safeguards

<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30</li> </ul> <p>% women: score 2</p>	<p>1 out of the 4 facilities sampled failed to meet the minimum gender composition required</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Karugutu HCIV HUMC list was availed with 8 members (3 females &amp; 5 males). The minimum requirement as per the guidelines is 9 members. <i>Thus this puts the gender composition at 33.3%</i></li> <li>Rwebisengo HCIII HUMC list with 7 members (2 females &amp; 5 males. 6 of these (2 females &amp; 4 males) are approved by the guidelines. <i>Thus this puts the gender composition at 33.3%</i></li> <li>Bweramule HCII HUMC list was availed with 5 members (1 female &amp; 4 males) but one of them isn't approved by the guidelines which leaves 4 members (0 females &amp; 4 males). The approved members as per guidelines are 6. <i>Thus this puts the gender composition at 0%</i></li> <li>Musandama HCII HUMC list with 5 members (2 females &amp; 3 males) was availed. This is 40% composition</li> </ol>	<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence was availed at the time of assessment.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were no infrastructure projects done last financial year under government funding.</li> <li>The procurement plan FY 2017/18 dated 01/03/17 was availed with 7 investment items and no infrastructure project was listed therein</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>The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to check whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not applicable since no infrastructure projects were done in the previous FY.</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal: score 4.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence was available at the time of assessment</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the district Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below average coverage: score 10</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 7</li> <li>o If 60-79: Score 4</li> <li>o If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe water coverage in Ntoroko averages 65%</li> <li>• Two sub-counties Kanara (19%) and Karugutu (41%) fall short of district coverage</li> <li>• As per FY 2018/19 approved workplan and budget (dated August 28, 2018), no projects were allocated to the two low-coverage sub-counties</li> <li>• The FY 2018/19 budget for water and sanitation conditional grant is UGX 194m</li> <li>• Nonetheless, the central government-managed, AfDB-funded Rwebisengo-Kanara gravity flow scheme (GFS) project, when completed, will serve Kanara sub-county</li> </ul>	0
<p>The district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 15</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 10</li> <li>o If 60-79: Score 5</li> <li>o If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ntoroko LG reported all its FY 2017/18 achievements in the Q4 report submitted August 24, 2018</li> <li>• As per aforesaid progress reports, four capital projects were implemented in FY 2017/18, viz.:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Construction of a public sanitation facility at Rwamabale</li> <li>o Installation of 4 No. deep boreholes (DBHs)</li> <li>o Rehabilitation of 3 No. DBHs and 2 No. shallow wells</li> <li>o Design of Rwamabale GFS</li> </ul> </li> <li>• As per aforesaid report, none of the WSS investments was implemented in the two low-coverage sub-counties</li> </ul>	0

Monitoring and Supervision			
<p>The district Water department carries out monthly monitoring of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the district Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation monitoring reports for the FY 2017/18 WSS investments (presented in PM #2) were reviewed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Installation of 4 No. DBHs (by GIC Logistics and Engineering): monitoring and inspection report authored May 14, 2018 by DWO</li> <li>o Rehabilitation of 2 No. DBHs in Butungama and Kirama (by Ntoroko HPMA): progress report dated June 26, 2018 by DWO</li> <li>o Rehabilitation of 2 No. shallow wells and 1 No. DBH in Kanara TC and Rwebisengo sub-county (by Ntoroko HPMA): report dated January 16, 2018 prepared by DWO</li> <li>o Public VIP latrine at Rwamabale (by Ntoroko United Ltd): inspection report dated April 18, 2018 prepared by DWO</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 4 out of 4 Projects: 100%</li> </ul>	<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As intimated in preceding section, Ntoroko LG reported its FY 2017/18 achievements in Q4</li> <li>• The Q4 report dated August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2018 highlighted achievements in relation to construction of new WSS facilities (DBHs, public sanitation facility) and rehabilitation of existing ones (DBHs and shallow wells)</li> </ul>	<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The list of FY 2017/18 achievements is consistent with both MWE and PBS records as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Installation of 4 No. deep boreholes (DBHs)</li> <li>o Rehabilitation of 3 No. DBHs and 2 No. shallow wells</li> <li>o Design of Rwamabale GFS</li> <li>o Construction of a public sanitation facility at Rwamabale</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The relevant MoWE MIS file: Quarterly Achievements FY 2017/18</li> </ul>	<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The following WSS investments are planned for FY 2018/19: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Construction of 2-stance VIP at Butungama market</li> <li>o Installation of 4 No. DBHs in Rwebisengo and Nombe sub-counties</li> <li>o Rehabilitation of DBHs (2No.) and shallow wells (2 No.) in Bweramule and Nombe sub-counties</li> <li>o Preliminary design of 2 No. piped water systems in Kanara TC and Rwebisengo TC</li> </ul> </li> <li>• All procurement requisitions for FY 2018/19 investments were raised by DWO on August 15, 2018; approved by the CFO and confirmed by CAO</li> <li>• PDU records confirm PRs were submitted well-past the April 30 deadline</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence was availed with respect to contract management – in form of either a plan or appointment of responsible officers to manage WSS projects</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 water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contracts for DBH installation (Ntor595/2017-18/0017) and public sanitation facility (Ntor595/2017-18/0018) were reviewed and entailed design specifications</li> <li>Field assessment was conducted for four DBHs in Kibuku TC and Butungama sub-county, and two public sanitation facilities at Rwamabale market and Kachwankumu RGC, respectively</li> <li>It was established the WSS facilities were built as per designs</li> <li>Details of assessed WSS facilities are presented in Performance Measure 11</li> </ul>	<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 contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At the time of assessment, the sampled WSS facilities were within defects liability period</li> <li>Measurement sheets, which indicate WSS facilities are “practically” completed – and due for handover to the LG – were assessed as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measurement for 4 No. DBHs – prepared May 15, 2018</li> <li>Public sanitation facility – prepared April 18, 2018</li> </ul> </li> <li>Field assessment ascertain the aforesaid facilities are now managed by beneficiary communities</li> </ul>	<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 DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DWO ascertained WSS facilities were practically completed – and prepared interim certificates for payment as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Installation of 4 No. DBHs (by GIC Logistics) – May 15, 2018</li> <li>o 2-stance public sanitation facility at Rwamabale (by Ntoroko United) – April 18, 2018</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district Water department has certified and initiated payment for works and supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the sampled payments made during the year worth UGX 118,463,105 to various vendors here below : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gic Logistics &amp; Engineers Ltd: For drilling, construction, test pumping and installation of five boreholes in Ntoroko at Kibuku Trading Centre, Makindo- Muska Primary School, Kitogota, Kiranga 1 &amp; Kiranga II.</li> <li>VR. No.8403 &amp; 8725.</li> <li></li> <li>Scan Water Contractors and Consultants Ltd: Payment for feasibility study for borehole sitting and drilling fees in these areas, Kibuuku II, Kamurabara, Nakasenyi, Kabale and Mirambi Villages in Bweramure, Butungama, Kibuuku Trading Centre and Nombe Sub County. VR.No.8688.</li> <li>All these payments were made on time and mostly within a week after requisition for payment was raised.</li> <li></li> </ul> </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 Plan- ning 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>No evidence could be established during the assessment. Consistent with the submission date of the District's APR on 15.08/2018, it is concluded that they did not meet the stipulated timeline.</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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If sector has no audit query score 5</li> <li>If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3</li> </ul> </li> <li>If queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Queries were raised in this sector.</li> </ul>	<p>5</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence was provided at the time of the assessment. It was reported the Committee minutes had been taken by the IGG.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>At the District Local Government Council meeting held on 15th February 2018, it met and discussed recommendations from the Social Services District Standing Committee Recommendations under Min. CM 26/02/NDLG/COUNCIL (2): Presentation and Discussion of the District Standing Committee Recommendations. The Council considered the request for approval by the Works, Technical Services, Production, Marketing and Natural Committee to allocate UGX. 3,000,000/= out of the UGX. 8,000,000/= from the sector capacity development grant towards the assessment of the gravity water flow scheme in Itojo/Kyamutema village in Krugutu sub-county.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At the time of assessment, expenditure limits for the water grant (dated September 3, 2018) were displayed as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Q1: UGX 64.9 million</li> <li>Annual: UGX 194 million</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sampled projects are furnished with required details as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DBH #1: Kabale village, Kibuku TC; Date: April 24, 2018</li> <li>DBH #2: Butungama P/S, Butungama sub-county; Date: June 2018</li> <li>DBH #3: Nyakasenyi market, Butungama sub-county; Date: April 26, 2018</li> <li>DBH #4: Kamurabara village, Butungama sub-county; Date: May 15, 2018</li> <li>2-stance VIP: Not labelled</li> </ul> </li> <li>Details of contractor and source of funding were missing at all the sampled WSS projects</li> </ul>	0
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At the time of assessment, the record of bid opening for installation of 4 No. DBHs in FY 2018/19 was displayed (dated September 18, 2018)</li> <li>Responsive bids from the following firms were received: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GIC Logistics and Engineering</li> <li>Mama Wells</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applications for WSS facilities considered for implementation by the LG include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Butungama P/S, Butungama sub-county: requested dated July 7, 2017 for new DBH</li> <li>Butungama sub-county LG: request dated November 27, 2017 confirming location of DBHs at Nyakasenyi and Kamurabara</li> <li>Bwerambule sub-county LG: request dated November 26, 2017 confirming location of VIP at Rwamabale market</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	1

<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 have 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None of the sampled WSS facilities were fenced, while no other evidence of functionality of WSCs was available</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Of the WSS projects implemented in FY 2017/18, environmental screening was done for only one DBH (Nyakasenyi village)</li> <li>Report for the DBH in Nyakasenyi was dated June 4, 2018</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence of follow-up with regard to environmental concerns was available</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contracts for DBH installation (Ntor595/2017-18/0017) and public sanitation facility (Ntor595/2017-18/0018) have provisions for environmental protection</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The report on training of WSCs dated May 28, 2018 was assessed</li> <li>Training of WSCs is done before they are constituted</li> <li>The report details composition and position of the WSCs</li> <li>Of the sampled facilities, women constitute at least half of the 8-member WSCs</li> <li>All the sampled WSCs have a woman in the treasurer role – as it is believed women have better financial management ethics than male colleagues</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>
<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/</p> <p>RGCs provided by the Water Department.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ntoroko LG budgets for at least one public sanitation facility every financial year</li> <li>The public sanitation facilities (2-stance and urinal) at Kachwankumu RGC and Bundimasoli are sex-separated, and have adequate access for PWDs</li> <li>The LG has planned for public sanitation at Butungama market in FY 2018/19</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>