



Local Government Performance Assessment

Ntungamo District

(Vote Code: 546)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	50%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	44%
Educational Performance Measures	41%
Health Performance Measures	32%
Water Performance Measures	62%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From MoFPED's inventory/schedule of LG submissions of performance contracts, check dates of submission and issuance of receipts and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If LG submitted before or by due date, then state 'compliant' o If LG had not submitted or submitted later than the due date, state 'non-compliant' • From the Uganda budget website: www.budget.go.ug, check and compare recorded date therein with date of LG submission to confirm. 	<p>Annual Performance Contract Submitted & received at MoFPED on 17/10/2018 which is outside the timeline date of 1st August 2018.</p>	No
Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY by 30th June (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From MoFPED's inventory of LG budget submissions, check whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The LG budget is accompanied by a Procurement Plan or not. If a LG submission includes a Procurement Plan, the LG is compliant; otherwise it is not compliant. 	<p>Consolidated Procurement Plan was embedded in the performance contract 2018/2019</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"> • If LG submitted report to MoFPED in time, then it is compliant • If LG submitted late or did not submit, then it is not compliant 	<p>Annual Performance report- Q4 was submitted to MoFPED and received on 28th August 2018 which is outside the timeline date of 31st July 2018</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY by end of the FY; PFMA Act, 2015).</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of quarterly reports submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the quarterly performance reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted all four reports to MoFPED of the previous FY by July 31, then it is compliant (timely submission of each quarterly report, is not an accountability requirement, but by end of the FY, all quarterly reports should be available). • If LG submitted late or did not submit at all, then it is not compliant. 	<p>Quarterly Budget performance report submitted as follows: Q1 dated 25/1/2018 Q2 dated 28/2/2018 Q3 dated 11/6/2018 Q4 dated 28/8/2018 which was outside the timeline date of 31st July 2018</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Audit</p>			

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and the Auditor General's findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action in line with applicable laws.</p>	<p>From MoFPED's Inventory/record of LG submissions of statements entitled "Actions to Address Internal Auditor General's findings",</p> <p>Check:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted a 'Response' (and provide details), then it is compliant • If LG did not submit a 'response', then it is non-compliant • If there is a response for all –LG is compliant • If there are partial or not all issues responded to – LG is not compliant. 	<p>The district provided and submitted information to the PS/ST on the implementation of Auditor General findings for the financial year 2016/2017 in a letter REF CR/103/02 dated 11th April, 2018 which was received by the Accountant General (MoFPED) on 19th April 2018 . All the 5 audit issues were responded to in that response letter. This was before the deadline of 30th April 2018 as required by the PFMA.</p> <p>The submission of responses against the audit findings of the Internal Auditor General were submitted in a letter REF No.AUD 251/2, dated 7th March 2018 and was received by the MOFPED (Both Accountants Office and Directorate of Internal Audit) on 9th March 2018. All the 38 internal audit findings were responded to by the LG.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>The external audit report for the FY 2017/18 was unqualified.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a district/ municipality has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 1. 	<p>There was functional physical planning committee as evidenced by :</p> <p>The formal appointment of the Physical Planning Committee, as found in a communication dated 11th May 2017 from the CAO appointing members to the Physical Planning Committee that was provided</p> <p>The physical planning committee minutes dated 9/3/2018 were availed for assessment</p>	1
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that district/ MLG has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD score 1. 	<p>There was no evidence that district had submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD</p>	0

<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All infrastructure investments are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan: score 1 or else 0 	<p>In the absence of a Physical Development plan, it was difficult to ascertain any consistency of planning with new infrastructure investments.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action area plan prepared for the previous FY: score 1 or else 0 	<p>There was no evidence availed</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2. 	<p>A copy of approved annual workplan for financial year 2018/2019 which was generated on 27/7/2018 was availed for assessment. However the LG didnt describe prioritised investments in the approved annual workplan and there fore it was difficult to establish the linkage with the budget conference priorities</p>	<p>0</p>
--	--	--	----------

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If differences appear, a justification has to be provided and evidence provided that it was approved by the Council. Score 1. 	<p>A copy of approved Annual workplan for financial year 2018/2019 that was generated on 27/7/2018 was availed for assessment. However the LG didnt describe capital investments in the approved annual workplan and there fore it was difficult to establish the linkage with the five year Development plan</p>	<p>0</p>
--	---	---	----------

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 2. 	<p>There was no evidence that project profiles were developed and discussed by the TPC</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual statistical abstract, with gender-disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum score 1. 	<p>Annual Statistical Abstract with gender disaggregated data was compiled and signed by the CAO on 11/7/2018 and was presented to the TPC on 26/6/2018</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2 	<p>There was 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 for example construction of 5 stance Vip lined Pitlatrines at Omukibaare RGC kibingo parish Nyakyera sub county at UGX 20,540,142,Protection of 3 ihunga and Ntungamo water springs at UGX 18,950,763,construction of two production wells in Ngoma sub county at UGX 102,787,440 Were some of the infrastructure projects implemented that show linkage with the approved budget by the Council.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>From the review of payments certificates for the following investments; Construction of water closet facility at District service commission at UGX 18,775,699, Construction of 5 stance Vip lined Pit latrines at Omukibaare RGC Kibingo parish Nyakyera sub county at UGX 20,540,142,Protection of 3 ihunga and Ntungamo water springs at UGX 18,950,763,construction of two production wells in Ngoma sub county at UGX 102,787,44,Protection of water springs in Rwemihanga,Ihema, and Irangara at UGX 13,587,685 in Itojo,Nyabihoko,and Kibatsi sub counties. All these investments were completed as per work plan by end of FY. The District has already issued final certificates of completion indicating 100% execution.</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	<p>From the District Annual budget performance report a number of projects have been reported completed within the budget and these include: Construction of 5 stance Vip lined Pit latrines at Omukibaare RGC Kibingo parish Nyakyera sub county at UGX 20,540,142, Protection of 3 ihunga and Ntungamo water springs at UGX18,950,763, construction of two production wells in Ngoma sub county at UGX 102,787,44, Protection of water springs in Rwemihanga, Ihema, and Irangara at UGX 13,587,685 in Itojo, Nyabihoko, and Kibatsi sub counties. All were completed within approved budget</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Human Resource Management</p>			
<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all HoDs positions are substantively filled at the LG of Ntungamo during FY 2017/18. As per approved staff structure, there are 13 HoDs and heads of units. In Ntungamo district, only 6 HoDs are substantively filled. This represents 46% of positions filled. Broken down as follows: <p>? Chief Finance Officer (Byaruhanga Andrew) – position is substantively filled as per appointment letter dated 30/9/2016 signed by Mwebembezi William under min DSC201/2016.</p> <p>? Head Statutory Bodies, Nuwagaba Gerard, (Clerk to Council) – position is not substantively appointed but only</p>	<p>0</p>

assigned as per letter dated 13.07.15 and signed by Katotoroma John with ref CR/153/1.

? District Education Officer (Aligye Ordormarch) – position substantively filled by appointment letter dated 2/2/2015, signed by Adongo R Luloni under minute DSC/6/2015.

? Principle HR Officer position (Katusiime David) –No personal file was presented for accessing documents. It was therefore not possible to obtain evidence that would enable ascertaining whether this officer was substantively appointed or not.

? District Internal Auditor position (Karugaba Lawrence) – not substantively appointed but only assigned duties as per letter dated 23/2/2009 and signed by G. W. Omuge.

? District Health Officer (Dr. Substantively appointed as per letter dated2012 and signed by under minute extract DSC..../2012.

? District Production & Marketing (Mwebembeze) – position is substantively appointed by letter dated 09.5.2018 signed by Kweyamba Rubemba under min DSC75/2018.

? Senior Procurement Officer (Makafu Moses) – position filled as per appointment letter 2/2/2015 and signed by Adongo Roselina under min DSC16/2015.

? Dist Community Development Officer (Turyatunga John) – It was not possible to ascertain if this officer was substantively appointed as there were no documents presented.

? Trade & Industry (Mutabarura Aman) – no personal file was available to the assessor for verification whether the staff was substantively appointed and no letter of assignment of duties therefore verified.

? District Engineer (Butubuula Prosper) – not substantively appointed but assigned duties of acting as per letter dated 1/7/2016 and signed by Betungura John, ref CR153/1.

? Natural Resources Officer (Mwebaze Dinner) – position not substantively appointed but assigned duties as per letter dated 1/7/2016 under ref. CR/153/1.

Only 6 out of 13 HODs were found to have been substantively appointed. This represents 46%.

<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appraisals during FY 2017/18: 9 HoDs and Units were found not to have been appraised during FY 2017/18 using standard guidelines from MoPS. Only 4 HoDs were appraised in Ntungamo Municipality e.g. Community Based Services was appraised by Kweyamba Ruhemba as per appraisal report found in his personal file and dated 3/7/2017. This represents 31% of HoDs appraised. 	<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"> • Evidence that 100 % of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to DSC minutes and submission lists viewed dated 6.11.2017, 2/11/2017 and 20/11/2017 in Ntungamo district, a total of 194 positions were submitted for recruitment at DSC during FY 2017/18. Reference number of the submission was: CR/163/3 and CR150/1. Some of the positions submitted include: IT Officer, Tourism Officer, Enrolled Nurses, Enrolled Midwife, Parish Chiefs, Education Assistants etc, Submission lists were consulted and contained all the 194 candidates considered. New Vision adverts of 6/1/2018, 26/7/2017, 24/1/2018 and internal adverts coded 2 of 2017 and 1 of 2017 all confirmed that all the 194 positions submitted were considered. In addition, minute extracts also used to consideration of these staff were as follows: DSC 49/2018 of 13/2/2018 also demonstrated that the 194 position submitted were considered for recruitment. That is 100% 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 49 staff were submitted for confirmation during FY2017/18 in Ntungamo district. Submission lists for confirmation viewed variously dated 29.09.2017, 6/11/17, 1/6/17, 1/11/17, 23/10/17 and 31/08/17 all presented the 49 staff to District Service Commission for confirmation. Some of the staff carried in these submission lists are: Education Assistant, Enrolled Midwife, Enrolled Nurse, Records Assistant, Parish Chief, Human Resource Officer, Town Agent etc. List of confirmed staff verified confirmed that all the 49 staff submitted were considered for confirmation. The DSC meetings of 23rd Oct 2017 and 31st Aug 2017 also confirmed staff some of whom were Kyosabira Abias, Nabimanya M, Kabirungu Eugenio, Bonabana Maclean, Nawera Juliet, Twesigye and Opio Nkwasi confirmed the confirmation consideration of the 49 staff. The list of confirmed staff in Ntungamo district during FY 2017/18 indicated that all 49 staff submitted were confirmed as per evidence explained above. This represents 100% of staff confirmed during FY 2017/18. 	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of positions submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 13 staff were submitted to DSC for disciplinary action. According to the submission list and minute extracts some of which were DSC58/2018 OF 28/3/2018 and DSC60/2018 of 28/3/2018, it is evident that all the 13 staff were considered for disciplinary action in Ntungamo district. This is 100%. 	<p>1</p>
<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Of the 97 staff verified as recruited during FY 2017/18, not all of them entered salary payroll within one month and others within 2 months of recruitment in Ntungamo district. This information is derived through payroll invoice register and IPPS numbers of the staff recruited verified from record of documents presented. For example, some of these 97 staff recruited accessed salary payroll as follows: Nuwabaire Adrine (Educ Asst) was recruited 5th / July 2017 and accessed payroll in August 2017 (1month later), Nomugisha Cremius, Education Asst. And Ashaba Julius, IT Officer wre both recruited on 5/7/2018 and accessed salary payroll in 28/8/2018. Kabagole Ameria – IPPS number 1024285 (Coom Dev Officer) was recruited on 19/2/2018 and accessed salary payroll on 28/8/2018 – (6 months later). Twinamatsiko Eunice – IPPS number 1019240 (Principal Parish Chief) was recruited on 20/2/2018 and accessed salary payroll on 28/9/2018 (7months later). Kyabagye Bwomire (Porter) was recruited on 9/5/2018 and accessed salary payroll on 28/8/2018 – (3 months later) Ashebwa Zippora IPPS 1022288 (Enrolled Nurse) recruited on 8/2/2018 and accessed salary payroll on 28/8/2018 – (6 months later). Therefore, payslips and salary payroll register plus appointment letters viewed indicated that only 6 out of the sample of 10 staff accessed salary payroll within 2 months of recruitment. This is 60% of compliance. 	<p>0</p>

<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2 	<p>Ntungamo District LG submitted 38 staff who retired during FY 2017/18. The list indicated that the 38 staff retired on different months within the FY17/18 and none only 2 out of 7 accessed pension payroll within 2 months of retirement. For example, Nuwagaba Jason (Education Asst) retired on 23.3.18 and has not yet accessed pension payroll about 6 months later, Kanyesigye Bonn, IPPS 295179 (Sen Educ Asst) retired on 1.4.2017 and has not yet accessed pension payroll by the time making this assessment in Sept., Mugumya Deogratius (Educ Officer., IPPS no. 700526) retired on 22.9.17 and accessed pension payroll on Feb. 2018 – (7 months later), Ntabizi Lilian, IPPS number 295158 retired on 3/3/2018 and accessed pension payroll in July 2018 – (4 months later), Tusasire Tusabire, IPPS number 700529 retired on (Tutor) retired on 5/8/2017 also accessed pension payroll in 11/5/2018 – (8 months later). Out of the sample of 7, only 2 were compliant by accessing pension payroll within 2 months of retirement. That is 29%.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Revenue Mobilization</p>			
<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets) from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10 %: score 4. If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 2. If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>The OSR for the district LG reduced by 22% from UGX 574,953,501 in the FY 2016/17 to UGX 472,849,969 in the FY 2017/18. This is much more than the acceptable variance of 10%. (Source: District financial statements for FY 2017/18). The major cause of the shortfall in revenue collection was the creation of 3 Town Councils of Rwentobo- Rwahi, Rwoho and Kafunjo-Mirama whose revenues were no longer part of the District collection.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within <p>+/- 10 %: then score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0.</p>	<p>The actual/budget revenue collection ratio for the FY 2017/18 was 86% (UGX 472,849,969/552,298,857). This resulted in a budget variance of 14% which is higher than 10 %.(Source: budget and financial statements for FY2016/17).</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	<p>The financial statements for the FY 2017/18 indicated that Local Service Tax (LST) amounting to UGX 129,875,490 was collected at the District Level, out of which the UGX 76,407,548 was remitted to Lower LGs including 3 divisions, 5 Town Councils and 16 Sub-Counties. The Municipal Divisions and Town Councils got their full amount of their entitled funds of LST (100%) and the Sub-Counties were given 65%. However the District deducted UGX 15,500,000 from Sub-Counties for printing of accountable stationery as required by section 85(8) of the LGA. (Source: DLG accounts and the LST remission schedule dated March 12, 2018 signed by the CFO.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the total Council expenditures on allowances and emoluments- (including from all sources) is not higher than 20% of the OSR collected in the previous FY: score 2 	<p>The LG spent UGX 227,779,200 in the FY 2017/18 on Council allowances and emoluments compared to UGX 574,953,501, collected in the FY 2016/17 (as computed from the in the FY 2017/18 final accounts). This constituted 40 % of OSR for the FY 2016/17 (more than 20%) as per Section 4 of the Local Governments Act.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2 	<p>The district had substantively appointed senior procurement officer (Makafu Moses) appointment letter dated 02/02/2015 under minute DSC 16/2015 and procurement officer (Ahabwe Armyline) appointment letter dated 28th July 2017 under DSC minute number 197/2016 both appointment letters were signed by CAO.</p>	<p>2</p>
---	---	--	----------

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	<p>For the 5 sampled projects there was evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the contracts committee as shown below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction and rehabilitation of a mini veterinary lab with two offices at the District headquarters, the TEC produced the evaluation report on 5th December 2017 at 115,763,841Ushs price and submitted to the contracts committee on 06/12/2017 which approved and awarded on the same day under minute Min/096/December/2017. • Construction of classrooms, administration block and BCP block (Kategaya memorial Technical Institute), the TEC produced the evaluation report on 11th May 2018 at 465,723,344Ushs price and submitted to the contracts committee on 01/06/2018 which approved and awarded on the same day under Min/046/June/2018. • Construction of 3 classroom block at St. Francis Kasana P/S, the TEC produced the evaluation report on 5th December 2017 at 113,200,751Ushs price and submitted to the contracts committee on 06/12/2017 which approved and awarded on the same day under minute number Min/096/December/2017. • Construction of 2 block classrooms at Kihanga public P/S the TEC produced the evaluation report on 11th May 2018 at 197,175,286Ushs price and submitted to the contracts committee on 15/05/2018 which approved and awarded on the same day under minute number Min/038/May/2018. • Construction of five stance VIP latrine at Ruhaama P/S, the TEC produced the evaluation report on 5th December 2017 at 20,011,660Ushs price and submitted to the contracts committee on 06/12/2017 which approved and awarded on the same day under minute Min/096/December/2017. 	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	<p>The contracts committee considered the recommendations of the TEC as per evaluation reports and approved the award of the contracts without any deviations for all the five sampled projects as evidenced above 12(iii).</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2 	<p>There was no evidence that the procurement and disposal plan for FY 2018/2019 availed which was signed by the CAO on 15/08/18 and received by PPDA on 29th August 2018 covers all Infrastructure projects in the approved AWP for the current FY 2018/2019. The availed AWP generated on 27th July 2018 and signed by CAO on 27/07/2018 did not show any infrastructure projects planned.</p> <p>However the LG procured as per the procurement plan in the previous FY 2017/18, all the sampled projects that were implemented existed in the procurement plan of the FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/ infrastructure by August 30: score 2 	<p>According to the procurement plan for the FY 2018/2019 which was signed by the CAO on 15th August 2018 and received by PPDA on 29th August 2018, there were 33 infrastructure projects (exclusive of road maintenance) and the LG had only prepared the bid documents for 7 projects (21%) by 30th August 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2 	<p>The LG had an updated contracts register for the previous FY 2017/2018 with all the sampled projects registered and procurement activity files were complete.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	<p>According to PPDA guidelines 2008, all works projects above 50 million open bidding should be used while those below 50 million selective bidding should be used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction and rehabilitation of a mini veterinary lab with two offices at the District headquarters was budgeted 115,254,691Ushs and the procurement method used was open national bidding. • Construction of classrooms, administration block and BCP block (Kategaya memorial Technical Institute) was budgeted 350 million Ushs and the procurement method used was open national bidding. • Construction of 3 classroom block at St. Francis Kasana P/S was budgeted 113,831,178Ushs and the procurement method used was open national bidding. • Construction of 2 block classrooms at Kihanga public P/S was budgeted 200 million Ushs and the procurement method used was open national bidding. • Construction of five stance VIP latrine at Ruhaama P/S was budgeted 20 million Ushs and the procurement method used was selective bidding. <p>The above indicated that the LG adhered to procurement thresholds for all the sampled five projects.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates <p>for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</p>	<p>For all the infrastructure projects implemented there was evidence of certification though not all projects were issued with both interim and completion certificates as indicated;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction and rehabilitation of a mini veterinary lab with two offices at the District headquarters only one certificate was filed dated 12/03/18, amount due 42,148,288Ushs approved and signed by the CAO on 12/03/18. Construction of classrooms, administration block and BCP block (Kategaya memorial Technical Institute) two certificates were filed dated 22/06/18, amount 211,104,001Ushs and another dated 13/08/18 with total amount of 80,490,804Ushs the two did not have CAO's signature. Construction of 3 classroom block at St. Francis Kasana P/S only one certificate was availed dated 13th March 2018 with total amount of 113,200,751Ushs signed for district engineer Ntungamo. Construction of 2 block classrooms at Kihanga public P/S only one certificate was availed dated 22/06/18 with total amount due 101,621,917Ushs but did not have CAO's signature. Construction of five stance VIP latrine at Ruhaama P/S only one certificate was availed dated 01/03/18 with total amount of 19,099,825Ushs approved and signed by the CAO. <p>The above indicated that projects were not appropriately certified.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2 	<p>Two of the sampled projects had site boards showing the project name, contractor, client/employer, source of funding and the FY but the contract value and expected duration were not indicated. However the other three did not have site boards.</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"> • Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4 	<p>The monthly bank reconciliation statements (BRS) for the FY 2017/18 were updated but were not verified and approved. There were no reconciliation statements for the months ended July and August. The CFO explained that the introduction of the new IFMIS (tier 1) had not stabilized and made them fail to produce them. The CFO further indicated that the MOFPED had delayed to support the district in perfecting/stabilizing the new system.</p>	<p>0</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"> • If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2. 	<p>In the education, health and water sectors, all the 15 sampled payments were cleared on time (within 30 days) as provided for in the contracts ie there were no overdue payments.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor: 1 point. • LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2. 	<p>The District Internal Auditor (Mr Karugaba Lawrence) was substantively appointed a Senior Internal Auditor (scale U3) by the District Service Commission under minute DSC285/2009 as per appointment letter dated 22nd January 2008 signed by the Chief Administrative Officer (Tibihika Theo). This position is as per the LGPA Manual.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2. 	<p>The DIA produced 4 quarterly Internal Audit reports. First quarterly report was signed on 20th October 2017. The Second quarter report was dated 6th February 2018. The 3rd quarter report was dated 17th April 2018 and the 4th quarter report was dated 14th August 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports: score 2.</p>	<p>There was adequate evidence of information to LGPAC and Council on the implementation of the implementation of Internal Audit findings. The Internal Audit had a section that highlighted the status of implementation of previous audit issues for LGPAC and Council to note.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1. 	<p>There was evidence that internal audit reports for the FY 2017/18 were submitted to both AO and LGPAC on the following dates respectively : : 1st quarter report on 25th /10/2017 and 25th /10/2017</p> <p>2nd quarter report on 20th /01/2018 and 20th /01/2018.</p> <p>3rd quarter report on 20th /04/2018 and 20th /04/2018</p> <p>4th quarter report on 17th /08/2018 and 17th /08/2018.</p> <p>However, there was no evidence of review and follow up of all internal audit issues for the FY 2017/18. The LGPAC minutes presented to the consultant were only in respect of 1st Quarter internal audit report. All the rest of internal audit reports for the FY 2017/18 were not considered/ discussed by the LGPC.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG maintains an up- dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	<p>There assets registers were in place and in a prescribed format. In addition there was evidence of an updating them. For example a number of assets put in place by the LGs in the FY 2017/18 could be traced in the assets registers eg. 3 classrooms block at Mpnga PS, a 3- classroom block at St Francis Kasaana PS, 5 stance latrines at Kaina PS, 4 protected springs.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unqualified audit opinion: score 4 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0 	<p>The external audit report for the FY 2017/18 was unqualified.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2 	<p>The district availed a set of council minutes for the FY 2017/2018 as follows: 27/7/2017; 19/9/2017; 12/12/2017,25/01/2018,24/5/2018 and all the sets of minutes provide proof that Council met and discussed service delivery related issues including; Performance and absenteeism of staff monitoring of health facilities</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"> Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 1. 	<p>There was no evidence that LG had designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/ complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which should be displayed at LG offices and made publically available: score 1 	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2 	<p>The payroll for July 2018 and the pensioner schedules for August 2018 were found on the public notice board at the administration block.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1. 	<p>Procurement plan for 2018/2019 was found published at the District Notice Board. Notice of awarded contracts for 2017/2018 was found on display</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"> • Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1. 	<p>There was no evidence that the LG published the performance assessment results for FY 2016/17 on public Notice board</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1 	<p>There was no evidence that planner communicated and explained national guidelines and circulars and policies issued by the National level to LLGS during previous FY</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1. 	<p>There was no evidence that LG during the previous FY conducted discussions with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG gender focal person and CDO have provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion into their activities score 2. 	<p>The CDO provided guidance to sector departments as evidenced in the report on mentoring sector and subsector heads on gender mainstreaming dated 22nd June 2018 signed by Gender Focal Person.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the gender focal point and CDO have planned for minimum 2 activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and address vulnerability and social inclusions and that more than 90 % of previous year's budget for gender activities/ vulnerability/ social inclusion has been implemented: score 2. 	<p>The LG CDO had planned for FAL classes and meetings, court follow ups, resettlement of abandoned children, monitoring of YLP among others as activities for the current FY 2018/2019 as provided by the Gender Focal Person.</p> <p>The previous year's budget was 910,397,000Ushs as evidenced in the budget of the FY 2017/2018. The total expenditure as provided by the district community development officer and signed by CAO on 2nd October 2018 amounts to 382,626,655Ushs which was 42% of the previous year's budget. This showed that less than 90% of the previous year's budget was 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"> • Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 1 	<p>No evidence of environmental screening was availed for all the sampled projects and there was no proof that mitigation measures were planned and budgeted for.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	<p>There was no proof of integration of environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents for all the sampled projects that were implemented in the FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1 	<p>For all the sampled five projects only one had proof of ownership Kategaya memorial Technical Institute (there was a memorandum of understanding made on 11th May 2018). For the other four there was no evidence that they were implemented on land where LG had proof of ownership.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO: score 1 	<p>For all the sampled projects there was no evidence that environmental and social mitigation certification forms were signed by the environmental officer and CDO.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance (new one): Score 1 	<p>There was no evidence that environmental and social clearance was done for all the sampled projects.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that environmental officer and CDO monthly report, includes a) completed checklists, b) deviations observed with pictures, c) corrective actions taken. Score: 1	<p>There was no evidence that the environmental officer and CDO report monthly therefore no completed check lists and observed deviations for all the four projects implemented.</p>	<p>0</p>
---	---	--	----------

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>The LG education de- partment has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</p>	<p>Some P7 schools in Ntungamo District did not meet the minimum requirement: for example, Kyaruhuga P.S, has 7 classrooms but budgeted for 6 teachers and no head teacher, Nkwanzu P7 is budgeted for 4 teachers and a head teacher. Bwihira P.S had four classes but the budget caters for 2 teachers and head teacher, Nyakabare P.S is a p.5 school but the budget had only 2 teachers and a head teacher. This was according to the PBS generated on for 2017/2018.</p>	0
<p>The LG education de- partment has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</p>	<p>According to the evidence from the PBS generated for 2017/2018, deployment of teachers and head teachers fell below the minimum requirements. : for example, Kyaruhuga P.S, has 7 classrooms but budgeted for 6 teachers and no head teacher, Nkwanzu P7 is budgeted for 4 teachers and a head teacher. Bwihira P.S had four classes but the budget caters for 2 teachers and head teacher, Nyakabare P.S is a p.5 school but the budget had only 2 teachers and a head teacher.</p>	0

<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100%: score 6 o If 80 - 99%: score 3 o If below 80%: score 0 	<p>The staff ceiling for Ntungamo District for Primary Schools according to the wage bill is 2,298 but currently the staff structure is filled at 2,140 teachers thus a difference of 158 staff. This translates to a 93% structure filling.</p>	<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"> • Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	<p>According to the staff structure approved by Ministry of Public Service in January 2017, Ref:ARC135/306/01, for Ntungamo District, the local government is supposed to have three school inspectors. Indeed the three positions were filled with 1 senior inspector appointed on 14th April 2014 by DSC Minute number 31/2014 and 2 inspectors of Schools appointed on 2nd February 2015, under DSC minute number 7(2)/ 2015</p>	<p>6</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary Teachers: score 2 	<p>The education department submitted a recruitment plan on 14th May 2018 and a replacement plan for FY 2018/19 which was received on 6th September 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Inspectors: score 2 	<p>The education department submitted a recruitment plan on 14th May 2018 and a replacement plan for FY 2018/19 which was received on 6th September 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
--	---	---	----------

Monitoring and Inspection

<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% school inspectors: score 3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 3 School Inspectors in Ntungamo district, as shown by the list of inspectors and personal files verified. It is evident through the appraisal reports, personnel files and list verified all of the 3 school inspectors were appraised during FY 2017/18. Appraisal reports were found in their personal files with dates as follows: 3/7/2018 and 3/10/2017 all signed by Kiiza Fidelis. This therefore represents a percentage of 100. 	<p>3</p>
---	--	--	----------

<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary school head teachers o 90 - 100%: score 3 o 70% and 89%: score 2 o Below 70%: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 240 Primary Schools in Ntungamo district. A sample of 10% of 240 Primary schools was made to make 24 Primary Schools. Thus personal files of 24 Head Teachers of these schools were presented and analysed. Reviewing these personal H/Teachers' files, 24 appraisal reports were found. These included for example, for H/Teacher of Buhanama Pr. School Mr. Nduhukire Gordon, H/Teacher of Butare P School – Mr Koryagenda Eva, Kakanena P School – Mr Nkwasiwohe Robert etc. For all the teachers' personal files presented, no appraisal report was found in them. This means failure to present evidence of appraisal meant that no primary school head teacher was appraised during FY 2017/18 in Ntungamo district. That is 0 out of 24 is equivalent to 0 %. 	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1 	<p>None of the three circulars circular were available at the DEO's office. Therefore there was no evidence of communicating them to schools.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 2 	<p>No evidence was found to show dissemination of the circulars to the schools.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all registered primary schools²</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59 % score 1 o Below 50% score 0. 	<p>The district has 113 licenced schools. Inspection reports presented for licensed schools were less than 50% of the schools. In 3rd term 2017, the Inspectors visited 12 schools, in 1st term of 2018 they visited 14 private schools and in 2nd term 2018 they visited one school. Moreover, the schools visited were different; therefore this does not allow any score. The district attributed limited inspections to logistical challenges.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	<p>Although the district did not visit 50% of the licensed schools, there were minutes of the department meetings dated 15th May 2018 which showed that recommendations from inspection reports of the schools that were inspected were indeed discussed and corrective actions have been put in place.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 	<p>The district submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES. Acknowledgement letters dated 30th August 2017, 4th May 2018 and 26th June 2018, were seen in the District Submission files.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed- up: score 4. 	<p>There was evidence that the recommendations were followed up, for example, the two teachers; Ayebare Judith and Natumanya Dorcus, who went to school without written authorization were submitted to the Rewards and sanctions committee for disciplinary action.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>The list of schools in the PBS had a difference with that provided by the MoES: the PBS had 242 while the MoES list had 232. The schools missing in the MoES list are: Ihunga P.S, Kamunyiga P.S, Katenga Model P.S, Rujumo P.S, Rutahweire P.S, Rutunguru P.S, Kagamba P.s, Kyabwato P.S and Kabasheshe Moslem P.S</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS: score 5 	<p>The enrolment data for 2017/2018 according to the district PBS records was 94,190, while enrolment from the MoES list was 87,991. This gives a variance of 6,199 pupils which is a significant difference. However, the difference is attributed to the schools that were missed out on the MoES list.</p>	<p>0</p>

Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<p>The LG committee re- sponsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>The district availed a set of council minutes for the FY 2017/2018 as follows: 27/7/2017; 19/9/2017; 12/12/2017,25/01/2018,24/5/2018 and all the sets of minutes provide proof that Council met and discussed service delivery related issues including; Performance(PLE results), and absenteeism of staff,Monitoring of schools</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG committee re- sponsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>There was no evidence</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO/ MEO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80 % schools: score 0 	<p>A file with approved SMCs was accessed at the DEO's office with minutes from SMCs and the sampled schools had their meetings as follows:</p> <p>Rwengoma P/S: 27th September 2017, 21st February 2018, 14th June 2018</p> <p>Rwera P/S: 4th June 2017, 13th February 2018, 19th June 2018, 27th September 2018</p> <p>Kitembe P.S: 5th Dec 2017, 26th June 2018</p> <p>Ruhama P/S: 21st December 2017, 21st January 2018, 23rd February 2018.</p> <p>Kahungye P.S: 2nd March 2018, 14th March 2018, 05th June 2018.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non- wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non- wage recurrent grants <p>e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</p>	<p>There was no posting on the notice boards or walls of the district of the non-wage recurrent grants.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The LG Education department has submitted input into the LG procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements,</p> <p>to the Procurement Unit that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	<p>There was a procurement prepared and submitted to the procurement unit and received on 16th April 2018.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3. 	<p>The LG education department certified and recommended payments to suppliers on time because the 6 sampled contracts (agreements) were paid for within 30 days stipulated in the contracts as indicated below: 1.Nuatu Consult Ltd –PV.EDUC036959 UGX 8,500,000 for construction of 3 classroom block at Mpanga SDA PS was invoiced on 13/06/2018 and paid on 18/06/2018 (5days). 2. CEDAR Hotels ltd-PV.EDUC-036967 for UGX 80Million was invoiced on 25/04/2018 and paid on 09/05/2018(15days) 3. Pepper Publications Ltd-PVEDUC-036953 for UGX 2,112,150 for advert run on 6/03/2018 was invoiced on 11/04/2018 and paid on 12/04/2018 (1 day) 4. SA&SU Contractors Ltd-PV.EDUC-036970 for UGX 4,460,,400 for construction of 3 classroom block at St Francis Kasaana PS was invoiced on 13/06/2018 and paid on 18/06/2018(5days) 5. Alikazi Enterprises ltd-PV.EDUC-36978 (UGX 23,324,895) for construction of 5- stance latrine at Kaina PS was invoiced on 18/06/2018 and paid on 20/06/2018 (2 days). 6. Total Ntungamo Service Station-PV.EDUC-036787 (UGX 3,176,243) for fuel supply was invoiced on 18/06/2018 and paid on 20/06/2018 (2days).</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15th of July for consolidation: score 4 	<p>No evidence availed</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If sector has no audit query <p>score 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 o If all queries are not responded to score 0 	<p>Education department had 26 of audit queries in the 1st quarter audit report, 40 accountability queries in the 2nd quarter report, 40 audit queries in the 3rd quarter and 10 audit queries in the 4th quarter. There was no evidence of response on those queries found in the internal audit department by the education department. .</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			

<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills, etc.: Score 2 	<p>The DEO's office did not provide of dissemination of guidelines. They said they conducted a training in 2017, but could not produce any evidence to show.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2 	<p>There was no evidence to show that the department has explained the guidelines.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	<p>The Guidelines on gender composition for the SMCs says the committee should have at least 2 females on the team. All the schools adhered to this guideline: for example for the sampled schools; Kitembe P.S had 5 females, Rwera P.S had 4 females, Rwengoma P.S had 4 females, Ruhama P.S had 4 females and Kahungye P.S: had 2 female representatives on committees of 12 members.</p>	<p>1</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"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 1: 	<p>There was no evidence of issuing guidelines on environmental management.</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"> • Evidence that all school infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 1 	<p>No evidence was provided.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide- lines on environmental management are dissemi- nated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1 	<p>No evidence was provided.</p>	<p>0</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health care workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health care with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 80% filled: score 8 • 60 – 80% - score 4 • Less than 60% filled: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the performance contract (generated on 27/07/2018 08:06) and approved structure revealed that there are 553 established position of primary health workers filled. • Review of wage IPFs (generated on 27/07/2018 08:06) revealed that there are 553 positions of health worker with a wage bill provision of 5,840,387,000/= for the year 2018/19 • Hence more than 80% of the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY has been filled 	8
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the approved performance contract provided by the district revealed that there was a staff establishment and recruitment plan for the year 2018/19. 	0

<p>The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital In-charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 3 Health Centre 4s in Ntungamo district with In-charges as follows: <p>Dr. Twesiime Innocent is In-charge of Kitwe HC4 and was not appraised. Dr. Agaba Brian who is In-charge of Rwashamaire HC4 was appraised as per appraisal report dated 7/5/2018 and signed by Kiiza Fidelis - found in his personal file. In-charge of Rubaare HC4 (Dr. Mugisha Trithon) also had no evidence of appraisal in his personal file.</p> <p>Therefore, only one of the 3 HC4 In-charges of Ntungamo district were not appraised during FY 2017/18, which is 33.3%.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The Local Government Health department has deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY, and if not provided justification for deviations: score 4 	<p>The number of midwives and enrolled nurses deployed at Rwashamaire HC IV (4 enrolled nurses, 5 enrolled midwives & 3 clinical officers), Rukanango HC II (2 enrolled nurses, 2 nursing assistants, 1 porter & 1 Askari) and Kitondo HC III (3 enrolled nurse & 4 enrolled midwife) as counted on the health worker`s list on deployment are consistent with the staff Lists submitted with the budget of 2018/19</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Monitoring and Supervision</p>			

<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/ MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 	<p>The following guidelines were found at the DHOs office:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Health Guidelines for Local Government Planning Process Health Sector Supplement – 2017. Ministry of Health, Sector Grant and Budget Guidelines to Local Governments FY 2018/19. Ministry of Health, Policy Strategies for Improving Health Service Delivery 2016-2021 <p>However there was no evidence (a communication letter or meeting minutes) to indicate that the DHO communicated ALL of the guidelines to health facilities</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/ MHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	<p>Although the DHO had a copy of each of the 3 prioritized guidelines mentioned above, review of the only minutes of a meeting with health facility in-charges (held on the 13/02/2018) had no record or minute indicating that the DHO explained these guidelines, policies and circulars issued by the national level.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: score 3</p>	<p>No Integrated support supervision reports for Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4 were presented for FY 2017/18. In addition to this a review of the supervision log book at Rwashamaire HC IV revealed that the DHT had supervised that HC IV only once (on the 25th July 2017) during the FY 2017/18. Hence the DHT did not supervise 100% of the 3 HC IVs at least once in a quarter</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% supervised: score 3 • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60% - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0 	<p>The DHT provided no evidence (copies of support supervision reports by the HSDs) to indicate that all 3 HC IV supervised lower level health facilities within the FY 2017/18.</p> <p>Review of the supervision log book at Rukanango HC II revealed that it had NOT been supervised in the FY 2017/18.</p> <p>Review of the supervision log book at Kitondo HC III revealed that it had only been supervised by Kajara HSD on the 5TH October 2017 during the FY 2017/18</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	<p>The health department and HSDs did not provided the 4 mandatory quarterly integrated support supervision reports for the FY 2017/18.</p> <p>Review of the only set of DHT meeting minutes presented during the assessment (dated 22nd August 2017 and 4th June 2018) did not have a minute or record of discussions of the 4 mandatory quarterly integrated support supervision reports and use to make recommendations</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 	<p>The only DHT meetings minutes presented (dated 22nd August 2017 and 4th June 2018) did not have record of discussion of neither the DHT nor HSD integrated support supervision reports. Hence no recommendations to be followed upon.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10 	<p>Review of the PBS (generated on 27/04/2018 06:27) and Performance contract (generated on 27/07/2018 08:06) did not have a list of lists of health facilities receiving PHC funding hence nothing to compare with the HMIS list of HFs from MOH.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>Council Committee responsible for health met on 16/3/2018,22/2/2018 discussed service delivery issues for example promotion of health workers, Monitoring of health facilities, water tank at health centres</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>From the minutes dated 22/2/2018 the health sector presented issues that require council approval</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 6 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 6 If 80-99 %: score 4 If 70-79 %: score 2 If less than 70%: score 0 	<p>HUMCs were not fully functional as not all sampled HFs held the four mandatory HUMC meetings and meetings minutes presented.</p> <p>Kitwe HC IV - DHT presented only 1 sets of HUMC meeting minutes dated 27/03/2018</p> <p>Rwashamaire HC IV - DHT presented only 2 sets of HUMC meeting minutes dated 5/09/2017 and 15/03/2018</p> <p>Rubaare HC IV - DHT presented only 1 set of HUMC meeting minute dated 20/04/2018</p> <p>Rukanango HC II presented only 1 set of HUMC meeting minute dated 21/08/2017</p> <p>Kitondo HC III – NO minutes presented apparently locked away by HF in-charge who was of station at time of assessment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 4 	<p>There was posting on the public notice board at the DHOs office of a list of all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>However all HFs visited on the 2/10/2018 (Rwashamaire HC IV, Rukanango HC II & Kitondo HC III) did not have positing of the PHC non-wage recurrent grant received.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has submitted input to procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2 	<p>A copy of the AWP that was submitted to PDU was availed and there was no corresponding letter of submission from the DHO to the DPU to indicate that the AWP was submitted on time by April 30 .</p>	<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"> Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2. 	<p>There was a copy of form PP1 with PD entry name and code – Ntung 546. (Subject of procurement – Fuel for daily office running & operations). Confirmation of need was established on the 4th May 2018 and was signed for confirmation of funding by the CAO on the 5th May 2018. This was well beyond 1st Quarter of the FY 2017/18</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/ MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4. 	<p>The DHO certified and recommended payments to suppliers on time because the sampled 5 contracts certified and recommended suppliers within 30 days as per the contracts as evidenced below: 1. Sure Oil Ltd-PV.HO100207 (UGX 3,412,500) for supply of fuel for support supervision was invoiced on 22/06/2018 and paid on the same day. 2. Sure Oil Ltd-PV.HO100199 (UGX 7m) for supply of fuel and lubricants was invoiced on 21/06/2018 and paid on the same day. 3. Geff Technical Services- PV.HO11089 (UGX 1,010,000) for supply of tonner and assorted stationery was invoiced on 20/05/2018 and paid on 30/05/2018 (10 days). 4. Total Ntugamo Service Station –PV.HO09954 (UGX 1,502,750) was invoiced on 20/05/2018 and paid on 31/05/2018(11 days). 5. Sure Oil Ltd-PV.HO09953(UGX 3,120,000) for fuel supply was invoiced on 27/03/2018 and paid on 6/04/2018 (9 days).</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the depart- ment submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	<p>No evidence availed</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If sector has no audit query: Score 4 • If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: Score 2 points • If all queries are not responded to Score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG health department had 8 queries on outstanding obligations in quarter 1, 128 accountability queries in quarter 3 and 8 issues on Itojo Hospital in quarter 4. There was no evidence of responses by the DHO on the above audit findings in the financial year 2017/18 from internal audit. 	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30 % women: score 2 	<p>All Health Unit Management Committees (HUMCs) at the sampled health facilities met the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum of 30% females on the HUMC).</p> <p>Kitwe HC IV (3 female & 6 male)</p> <p>Rwashamaire HC IV (2 female & 5 male)</p> <p>Rukanango HC II (3 female & 2 male)</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2. 	<p>There was no evidence LGs had issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities (No communication letter from the LG was provided). None of the visited HFs had guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities. Toilets at Kitondo HC III, and Rukanango HC II were not separated (labeled for Male and Female)</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 2 	<p>There was no provision for PHC development for the district during the FY 2017/18, so the health department did not implement any health facility infrastructure projects that year - hence no evidence to indicated that health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects and that risk mitigation plans are developed.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 2 	<p>No site visit reports by the district EO or CDO were availed as no health facility infrastructure projects during FY 2017/18 were implemented by the health department</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal: score 4. 	<p>All HF's visited (Rwashamaire HC IV, Rukanango HC II & Kitondo HC III) had a chart on medical waste management guidelines pinned in either the labor ward, laboratory or treatment room</p>	<p>4</p>
---	--	--	----------

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the district Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below average coverage: score 10 o If 80-99%: Score 7 o If 60-79: Score 4 o If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>Data on District safe water coverage obtained from MIS reports at the Ministry of Water and Environment differed from what was provided by the District Water Office. Ministry of Water and Environment MIS data showed that the average safe water coverage for Ntungamo District for FY 2017/18 was 81% whereas the information obtained from the District Water Office indicated that the District average safe water coverage was 61%. This figure was arrived at after the District Water Office, with support from Extension Staff based at the respective sub-counties conducted an inventory of all existing safe water supply sources at the end of FY 2017/18 and this figure was considered more realistic.</p> <p>The Sub-counties with safe water coverage below the District average were Ruhaama (57%), Rukoni East (54%), Ihunga (59%), Rweikiniro (50%), Kibatsi (54%), Kayonza (49%), Nyakyera (60%), Rubaare (59%), Rugarama (46%) and Ngoma (42%)</p> <p>From the Annual Work plans and PBS for FY 2018/19, out of the total Sector Development Grant of UGX 561,812,236 /=-, the total budget allocation to Sub-counties below the District average was UGX 347,000,000/= representing 62 % of the total Sector Development Grant and was distributed as follows:-</p> <p>Ruhaama S/C UGX 15,600,000/=</p> <p>Rukoni East S/C UGX 25,600,000/=</p> <p>Ihunga S/C UGX 15,600,000/=</p> <p>Rweikiniro S/C UGX 82,350,000/=</p> <p>Kibatsi S/C UGX 15,300,000/=</p> <p>Kayonza S/C UGX 36,000,000/=</p> <p>Nyakyera S/C UGX 25,200,000/=</p> <p>Rubaare S/C UGX 40,000,000/=</p> <p>Rugarama S/C UGX 76,050,000/=</p> <p>Ngoma S/C UGX 15,300,000/=</p>	4

The district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)

Maximum 15 points for this performance measure

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

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

Score 15

- o If 80-99%:
Score 10

- o If 60-79: Score 5

- o If below 60 %:
Score 0

.The review annual progress report for FY 2017/18 prepared by the District Water Office revealed that the following projects were implemented:

- Construction of 7 No. communal Rain Water Harvesting Tanks.
- Protection of 16 No. water springs.
- Rehabilitation of 17 No. boreholes.
- Drilling of 2 No. production boreholes.
- Construction of two 5-stance lined VIP latrines.
- Design of 4 No. piped water supply schemes.

Out of the above projects, the following were implemented in the Sub-counties with safe water coverage below the District average:

- Construction of 5 No. communal Rain Harvesting Tanks in the Sub-counties of Ngoma, Rugarama, Rukoni East and Rweikiniro,
- Protection of 9 No. water springs in the targeted Sub-counties of Kayonza, Rukoni East, Ngoma and Ihunga.
- Drilling of two production boreholes in Ngoma Sub-county.
- Design of two piped water supply schemes in the Sub-counties of Ngoma and Rukooni East.

In capital terms, about 62% of the water projects were implemented in the Sub-counties with safe water coverage below the District average.

<p>The district Water department carries out monthly monitoring of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the district Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15 • 80% - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10 • 70 - 79%: score 7 • 60% - 69% monitored: score 5 • 50% - 59%: score 3 • Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored: score 0 	<p>The review of the annual progress report revealed that the District Water Office had constructed 7 No. communal Rain Water Harvesting Tanks, protected 16 No. water springs, rehabilitated 17 No. boreholes, drilled 2 No. production boreholes, constructed two 5-stance lined VIP latrines and designed 4 No. piped water supply schemes. The availed periodic inspection reports clearly indicated that all the new projects were regularly supervised and monitored. Data from the District Water Office indicated that there were functional 218 No. protected springs, 190 No. shallow wells, 81 No. deep boreholes, 63 Rain Harvesting Tanks and 178 Public Tap-stands. Monitoring reports on the files indicated that about 152 water supply points were monitored and supervised every Quarter during the FY 2017/18 by the District Water Office supported by the Extension Staff (Health Inspector and Community Development Officer). It is therefore estimated that about 608 out of 730 functional water supply points were monitored and supervised which represented about 83%</p>	<p>10</p>
<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the district has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: Score 5 • List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>The District Water Office submitted FORM 1 (Data Collection Form for Point Water Sources) and FORM 4 (Source Functionality, Management and Gender) to the Ministry of Water and Environment for capture in the MIS. The list of the water facilities reported in the PBS were consistent with the MIS records at the Ministry of Water and Environment which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of 7 No. communal Rain Water Harvesting Tanks. • Protection of 16 No. water springs. • Rehabilitation of 17 No. boreholes. • Drilling of 2 No. production boreholes. • Construction of two 5-stance lined VIP latrines. • Design of 4 No. piped water supply schemes. 	<p>5</p>

<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>List of water facilities indicated in the Ministry of Water and Environment MIS reports were consistent with those in PBS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of 7 No. communal Rain Water Harvesting Tanks. Protection of 16 No. water springs. Rehabilitation of 17 No. boreholes. Drilling of 2 No. production boreholes. Construction of two 5-stance lined VIP latrines. Design of 4 No. piped water supply schemes. 	<p>5</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The district Water department has submitted input for district's procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted input for the district procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	<p>The sector submitted in put for the District Procurement Plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on 18th April 2018 which was within the stipulated time frame</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the contract manager prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2 	<p>There was evidence in form of signed letters that the District Water Officer was appointed Contract Manager by the Chief Administrative Officer to manage and supervise WSS contracts. E.g. for the construction of two 5-stances lined VIP latrines at Rwamabondo and Rwahi Rural Growth Centres, the District Water Officer was appointed Contract Manager in a letter dated 17th January 2017. Regarding the protection of 7 No. water springs and construction of 7 No. communal Rain Harvesting Tanks, the District Water Officer was appointed Contract Manager in a letter dated 27th April 2017. Regarding the drilling of two production boreholes, protection of 6 No. water springs and construction of two 5-stance lined VIP latrines, the District Water Officer was appointed Contract Manager in the letter dated 19th December 2017. Contract Management Plans were prepared and the review of the sampled WSS projects revealed that monitoring and supervision visits were conducted on monthly basis</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	<p>Modular designs for the point water sources and public sanitation facilities were approved by the District Engineer and were availed to the Assessor for review. The Assessor inspected two constructed water springs at Rwahi Cell in Kayonza Sub-county and Bukonje II in Rukoni East, one production borehole at Rwoho in Rukoni East Sub-county, two communal Rain Water Harvesting Tanks at Ruhaara in Ngoma Sub-county and Kyafora in Rugarama Sub-county and a 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Kibingo Monthly Market in Nyakyera Sub-county. All of the water supply and sanitation facilities were found functioning satisfactorily as per engineering designs.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	<p>Certificates of Practical Completion and Handover Reports were prepared, certified and filed appropriately. E.g. Under Procurement Reference NTUN 546/WRKS/2017 -18/00106 for the construction of lined VIP latrine in Rukoni East Sub-county, contracted to M/s SAGM Technical Services Ltd, Certificate of Practical Completion was signed by all parties on 20th March 2018. Under Procurement Reference NTUN 546/WRKS/2017 - 18/00105 for the construction of Rain Harvesting Tank at Rweikiniro Sub-county, contracted to M/s ZEPH Construction Co Ltd, Certificate of Practical Completion was signed by all parties on 10th May 2018 and under Procurement Reference NTUN 546/WRKS/2017 - 18/00104 for the protection of water springs, contracted to M/s ADVANTAGE Safaries Ltd, Certificate of Practical Completion was signed by all parties on 23rd February 2018</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2 	<p>Sampled Interim Payment Certificates showed that the District Water Officer had duly certified the Payment Certificates. E.g. Under Procurement Reference No NTUN 546/WRKS/2017 -18/00105 for the construction of Rain Harvesting Tank in Rweikiniro Sub-county, Interim Payment Certificate No.1 was duly certified by the District Water Officer on 8th May 2018. Under Procurement Reference NTUN 546/WRKS/2017 -18/00104 for the protection of water springs, Interim Payment Certificate 1 was duly certified by the District Water Officer on 31st May 2018. Under Procurement Reference NTUN 546/WRKS/2017 -18/00106 for the construction of lined VIP latrine Interim Payment Certificate 1 was duly certified by the District Water Officer on 20th March 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district Water department has certified and initiated payment for works and supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<p>- The LG Water department certified and recommended payments to suppliers on time as provided for the contracts</p> <p>- A sample of 4 payment vouchers and contracts showed that all payments were certified and paid within a maximum of 30 days provided for in the contract as evidenced below: 1. Asiibe Co Ltd-PV.PPW-443716(UGX 19,659,740) for construction of Pit Latrine at RGC was invoiced on 13/03/2018 and paid on 19/03/2018 (6 days). 2. Marvpa Enterprises Ltd-PV.PPWK-443731 (UGX 18,086,427) for protection of 4 springs was invoiced on 06/03/2018 and paid on 26/03/2018(20days). 3. Sure Oil Ltd-PV.PPW443983 (UGX 8.8M) for fuel supply was invoiced on 29/03/2018 and paid on 05/04/2018(7days). 4. East African Boreholes Ltd-PV.PPW443999 (UGX 95,167,696) for drilling and installation of production wells at Kashenyi Village was invoiced on 16/03/2018 and paid on 05/04/2018 (30days).</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<p>The district Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	<p>The District Water Office submitted to the District Planner the annual performance report for the FY 2017/18 on 13th July 2018. The Quarter 1 performance report was submitted on 17th October 2017, the Quarter 2 performance report was submitted on 12th January 2018, Quarter 3 performance report was submitted on 13th April 2018 and Quarter 4 including annual performance report was submitted on 13th July 2018. Therefore the annual performance report was submitted earlier than the stipulated date.</p>	<p>5</p>

<p>The District Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit 	<p>The LG Water department had 19 queries on outstanding obligations in quarter 1 and 24 accountability issues in quarter 3 of the FY 2017/18. There was no evidence of response from the DWO in the internal audit department.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>findings for the previous financial year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If sector has no audit query score 5 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 <p>If queries are not responded to score 0</p>		

Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3 	<p>The Ntungamo District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee held meetings on 13th July 2017, 16th August 2017, 14th September 2017 and 29th June 2018 to discuss water supply and sanitation issues and prepared submissions to the Standing Committee for Works, Technical Services, Urban Development and Community Based Services which held meetings on 16th August 2017, 14th September 2017, 16th January 2018 and 14th April 2018 and considered among others matters concerning the report from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	<p>The Ntungamo District Council meetings were held on 19th September 2017, 12th December 2018, 25th January 2018 where the Standing Committee for Works, Technical Services, Urban Development and Community Based Services presented the report which contained among others water and sanitation issues that required approval from Council.</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"> The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2. 	<p>The was evidence that the AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures were clearly displayed on the District Notice Boards as per the PPDA Act. There was no evidence in form of minutes that advocacy meetings were held.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2 	<p>The water supply projects which were sampled on 1st and 2nd October 2018 were two constructed water springs at Rwahi Cell in Kayonza Sub-county and Bukonje II in Rukoni East, one production borehole at Rwoho in Rukoni East Sub-county, two communal Rain Water Harvesting Tanks at Ruhaara in Ngoma Sub-county and Kyafora in Rugarama Sub-county and a 5-stance lined VIP latrine Kibingo Monthly Market in Nyakyera Sub-county. All the above projects were clearly labeled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	<p>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) were displayed on the District Notice Boards.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If communities apply for water/ public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	<p>Application letters from communities for water supply facilities together with the minutes of the meetings held by communities were submitted to the District Water Office for action and were properly filed. E.g application from Kanyerere I village for the protection of water spring is dated 29th January 2018, application from Irangara LCI Village for the protection of water spring dated 8th December 2017 and application from Katunga Parish for the construction of communal Rain Water Harvesting Tank dated 28th April 2018.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water and Sanitation Committees that are functioning evidenced by either: i) collection of O&M funds, ii) carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, iii) facility fenced/protected, or iv) they an M&E plan for the previous FY: score 2 <p>Note: One of parameters above is sufficient for the score.</p>	<p>There was evidence that O & M funds were being collected by Water and Sanitation Committees and the sampled water supply facilities were properly maintained and functioning satisfactorily. Quarterly reports from Extension staff on functionality of Water User Committees and software activities implemented were available on files. Communities being served by protected springs and boreholes were paying UGX 500/= per household per month. E.g the Rwahi Cell, Bukonje and Ruhaara Water Sanitation Committees. Whereas for gravity flow schemes, communities were charged UGX 1,000/= per household. There is a Water and Sanitation Committee at Sub-county level to manage O & M funds for Gravity Flow scheme.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	<p>There was no evidence presented that environmental screening had been undertaken for all projects as reports were not available.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1 	<p>Since the projects were not initially subjected to environmental screening, environmental concerns could not be ascertained.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	<p>Sampled construction and supervision contracts did not have any clauses on environmental protection.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If at least 50% WSCs are women and at least one occupying a key position (chairperson, secretary or Treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements: score 3 	<p>Review of information contained in FORM 4 (Source Functionality, Management & Gender) and the Software report contained in the Annual Progress Reports revealed that at least 50% WSCs are women and at least one occupied a key position (chairperson, secretary or treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/</p> <p>RGCs provided by the Water Department.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3 	<p>The constructed two 5-stance lined VIP latrines, one at Kibingo Monthly Market in Nyakyeru Sub-county and the other at Monthly Market in Kayonza Sub-county were not marked to give direction as to which stances were for men, women and PWDs.</p>	<p>0</p>
--	--	--	----------