



## Local Government Performance Assessment

Rukungiri District

(Vote Code: 550)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	33%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	69%
Educational Performance Measures	70%
Health Performance Measures	60%
Water Performance Measures	49%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From MoFPED's inventory/schedule of LG submissions of performance contracts, check dates of submission and issuance of receipts and:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If LG submitted before or by due date, then state 'compliant'</li> <li>o If LG had not submitted or submitted later than the due date, state 'non-compliant'</li> </ul> </li> <li>• From the Uganda budget website: <a href="http://www.budget.go.ug">www.budget.go.ug</a>, check and compare recorded date therein with date of LG submission to confirm.</li> </ul>	<p>Annual Performance Contract Submitted &amp; received at MoFPED on 3/8/2018 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"> <li>• From MoFPED's inventory of LG budget submissions, check whether:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The LG budget is accompanied by a Procurement Plan or not. If a LG submission includes a Procurement Plan, the LG is compliant; otherwise it is not compliant.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>LG submitted the budget that includes the procurement plan for FY 2018/19 on 3rd August 2018 as per data at MOFPED</p>	No
Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			

<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted report to MoFPED in time, then it is compliant</li> <li>• If LG submitted late or did not submit, then it is not compliant</li> </ul>	<p>Annual Performance report- Q4 was submitted to MoFPED and received on 23rd 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"> <li>• If LG submitted all four reports to MoFPED of the previous FY by July 31, then it is compliant (timely submission of each quarterly report, is not an accountability requirement, but by end of the FY, all quarterly reports should be available).</li> <li>• If LG submitted late or did not submit at all, then it is not compliant.</li> </ul>	<p>Quarterly Budget performance report submitted as follows: Q1 dated 7/12/2017 Q2 dated 9/02/2018 Q3 dated 5/05/2018 Q4 dated 23/8/2018 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"> <li>• If LG submitted a 'Response' (and provide details), then it is compliant</li> <li>• If LG did not submit a 'response', then it is non-compliant</li> <li>• If there is a response for all –LG is compliant</li> <li>• If there are partial or not all issues responded to – LG is not compliant.</li> </ul>	<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 an unreferenced letter dated 13th April, 2018 which was received by the MoFPED registry on 20th April 2018. All the 4 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.FIN.252 dated 16th April 2018 and was received by the MOFPED on 20th April 2018. All the 14 internal audit findings were responded to in the letter.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>The 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"> <li>• A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>There is a physical planning committee as evidenced by: The letter by CAO appointing 10 members ref CR/212/1 of 7th December 2017</p> <p>The Ag physical planner Mr Matin Agaba is the secretary and Mr Kato Milton the Chief Administrative Officer as Chairperson of the Committee</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"> <li>• Evidence that district/ MLG has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence that district 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"> <li>• All infrastructure investments are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan: score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• Action area plan prepared for the previous FY: score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence that action area plan was prepared for the previous FY</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>From the approved annual work plan Education sector has priorities such as: Provision of furniture to primary schools, Construction of classrooms and Rehabilitation by world bank page 62 &amp;63.</p> <p>Under health sector Rukungiri District planned to fence Kebisoni HCIV page 55.All these are based on the outcomes of the budget conference held on 6th November, 2017</p>	<p>2</p>
--	--	---	----------

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If differences appear, a justification has to be provided and evidence provided that it was approved by the Council. Score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Capital investments in the approved AWP for FY 2018/19 were derived from the 5 year DDP as shown here under:</p> <p>Construction of the District Administration block at the District Headquarters, Construction of VIP Latrines, Procurement of furniture priority areas, were found in the District Development Plan (2015/2016-2019/20-2020) (Pg.141). Which demonstrates clear linkage</p>	<p>1</p>
--	---	---	----------



<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence that Project profiles were developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline</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"> <li>• Annual statistical abstract, with gender-disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Annual Statistical Abstract of FY 2018/19 dated August 2018 with gender dis-aggregated data was compiled and was presented to the TPC of 3rd September 2018 to support allocation and decision making</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>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; eg Construction of Administration block AWP page 31, Supply of 3 seater twin desks to the following primary schools; Ngoma P/S in Nyakishenyi S/C, Kikarara P/S in Bwambara S/C, Karukata P/S, Rwanyundo P/S in Nyarushanje S/C, Kebisoni Integrated P/S in Kebisoni S/C .</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance vip pit latrines at Rushasha P/S in Nyakagyeme S/C, Rwemiringa P/S in Bugangari S/C, Rutooma &amp; Kihanga P/S in Buhunga S/C, Kisiizi &amp; Bwanga P/S in Nyarushanje S/C, Omuburama, Bukongozo P/S in Nyakishenyi S/C, Kajwamushana P/S in Ruhinda S/C and kishonga P/S in Buyanja S/C AWP page 54, Construction of Mini piped water supply system of Bugarama GFS phase III to supply villages of Mitooma, Rwenkuba, Mairo, Kyamacere, Nyakacwamba.</p> <p>Constuction of 3 springs in Bwamabara, Buyanja and Nyarushanje sub counties were some of the infrastructure projects implemented that show linkage with the approved budget( pg 30-) by the Council.</p>	2
<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100%: score 4</li> <li>o 80-99%: score 2</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>From the review of payments certificates for the following investments in the department of Health and Works &amp; Technical services Construction of Rukungiri District administration block phase IX at shs 137,356,130, Construction of 7 Classrooms and office at kasheshe primary school at shs 199,999,036, Construction of 2 stance VIP latrine with urinal &amp; sreen walls at Ndere HCII in Ruhinda, Ihunga HCII in Nyarushanje sub county, Supply of three seater Twin desks to selected P/S in the District at shs 23,950,401, Construction of 5 stance VIP lined Latrines with urinals &amp; screen walling at Rwemiringa and Kikarara primary schools at shs 48,372,880, Construction of 5 stance VIP lined Latrines with urinals &amp; screen walling at Kishonga and Rushasha primary schools at shs 45,376,860, Construction of 5 stance VIP lined Latrines with urinals &amp; screen walling at Rutooma, Kihanga &amp; Kajwamushana P/S at shs 45,210,480, Construction of 5 stance VIP lined Latrines with urinals &amp; screen walling at Bikongozo &amp; Bwanga primary schools at Shs 47,414,720, Construction of 5 stance VIP lined Latrines with urinals &amp; screen walling at Omurutooma &amp; Kisiizi primary schools at shs 49,453,760. All these investments were completed as per work plan by end of FY. DLG has already issued Final certificates of completion indicating 100% execution.</p>	4

<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>From the District Annual budget performance report a number of projects have been reported completed within the budget and these include: Construction of Rukungiri District administration block phase IX at UGX 137,356,130, Construction of 7 Classrooms and office at kasheshe primary school at UGX 199,999,036, Construction of 2 stance VIP latrine with urinal &amp; screen walls at Ndere HCII in Ruhinda, Ihunga HCII in Nyarushanje sub county, Supply of three seater Twin desks to selected P/S in the District at UGX 23,950,401, Construction of 5 stance VIP lined Latrines with urinals &amp; screen walling at Rwemiringa and Kikarara primary schools at UGX 48,372,880, Construction of 5 stance VIP lined Latrines with urinals &amp; screen walling at Kishonga and Rushasha primary schools at UGX 45,376,860, Construction of 5 stance VIP lined Latrines with urinals &amp; screen walling at Rutooma, Kihanga &amp; Kajwamushana P/S at UGX 45,210,480, Construction of 5 stance VIP lined Latrines with urinals &amp; screen walling at Bikongozo &amp; Bwanga primary schools at UGX 47,414,720, Construction of 5 stance VIP lined Latrines with urinals &amp; screen walling at Omurutooma &amp; Kisiizi primary schools at UGX 49,453,760.</p> <p>All the above mentioned projects were completed within approved budget</p>	2
<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Budget for O&amp;M in FY 2017/2018 was UGX. 16,000,000 /=. 100% of the budget was all spent according to the vouchers availed</p>	2
Human Resource Management			

LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.

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

• Not all HoDs positions are substantively filled at the LG of Rukungiri during FY 2017/18. As per the staff structure, there are 13 HoDs and heads of units. In Rukungiri district, only 10 HoDs are substantively filled. This represents 77% of positions filled. Broken down as follows:

? Chief Finance Officer – position is not substantively appointed but assigned duties as per letter dated 30/7/2017 signed by Ntimba Edward under min DSC135/2015(1).

? Head Statutory Bodies (Clerk to Council) – position is substantively appointed as per letter dated 16.11.16 and signed by Kato Milton with ref DSC 89/2016(1).

? District Education Officer (Nzarirwehi Jackson) – position substantively filled by appointment letter dated 26/11/2016, signed by Kabugo D under minute DSC/129/2016(1).

? Principle HR Officer position (Ndyamureeba Dan) – Substantively appointed as per letter dated 16/11/2016 and signed by Kato Milton and with min extract DSC88/2016(1).

? District Internal Auditor position (Arinaitwe Florence) – filled by appointment letter dated 20/1/2010 and signed by Muhenda Rujumba under minute DSC92/2009.

? District Health Officer (Dr. Musinguzi Anasiima) – position is substantively filled as per appointment letter dated 26/6/2018, signed by Kato and Ref DSC81/2017.

? District Production & Marketing (Karyaija Zepher) – position is substantively appointed by letter dated 12.3.2015 signed by Kato Milton under min DSC50/2015(1).

? Senior Procurement Officer (Atuheire Mercy) – position filled as per appointment letter 25/2/2011 and signed by Muhenda Rujumba under min DSC4/2017(17).

? Dist Community Development Officer (Tiwaitu Cloepas) – position is substantively filled as per appointment letter dated 1.9.1996 and signed by Ntaho Frank with min DSC24/1996.

? District Engineer (Bagira Julius) – not substantively appointed but assigned duties of acting as per letter dated 22/2/2018 and signed by Sande Kyomya Christopher, ref CR156/2.

? Natural Resources Officer (Rukwago Severino) – position substantively appointed as per letter dated 22/6/2006 under min 135/2015(1).

<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appraisals during FY 2017/18: 12 HoDs and Units were appraised during FY 2017/18 using standard guidelines from MoPS by various officers. This represents 92% of HoDs appraised. Some of the appraisal dates for those HoDs were: 30/7/2017 (Ag Chief Finance Officer) by Sande Kyomya, 22/8/2018 Comm Based Services. 10/8/2017 by Sande Kyomya, 19/7/17 (Dist Production Officer) by Kyomya C, 13/11/17 (Dist Education Officer) by Sande Kyomya etc.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to DSC minutes and submission list viewed (dated 4.12.2017) in Rukungiri district, a total of 28 positions were submitted for recruitment at DSC during FY 2017/18. Reference number of the submission was: CR/156/1, and some of the positions submitted include: Majanga Tom for Physical Planner, Head Teachers, Office attendant, Asst Agricultural Officer, etc. Submission lists were consulted and contained all the 28 candidates considered. New Vision advert of 12/12/2017 confirmed that all the 28 positions submitted were considered. Minute extracts also used to consideration of these staff were as follows: DSC 19/2018, 24/2018, DSC27/2018, DSC22/2018, DSC23/2018, etc. These submissions viewed indicate that all the 28 positions were considered for recruitment. That is 100%</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50 staff were submitted for confirmation during FY2017/18. Submission lists for confirmation viewed (dated 28.06.2017 signed by Mike P Yoga, 13.12.2017, 21.6.2018, 11.12.2017, 10.4.2018 signed by Kabugo Deo and 22.2.2018 signed by Sande Kyomya. The DSC meeting of 18th to 21st June 2018 developed confirmation consideration for all the 50 staff submitted with individual minute extracts as DSC65/2018, DSC 67/2018. DSC conformation meeting of 12th to 20th November confirmed staff such as Agaba Norman (DSC24/2018), Karenzi Stephen (DSC22/2018), Baguma James (DSC25/2018). These submission lists from CAO's office and corresponding dates indicate that all the 53 staff submitted for confirmation. A list of confirmed staff during FY 2017/18 indicated that all 53 staff submitted were confirmed as per minute extracts indicated above. This represents 100% of staff confirmed during FY 2017/18.</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only 2 staff were submitted to DSC for disciplinary action. According to the submission list (dated 28/8/2017, signed by Kabugo Deo listed the two staff for disciplinary action. A DSC convened disciplinary meeting of 19th to 21st Sept 2017 also confirmed that the 2 staff were considered and their case resolved with a reprimand (ie. Letter of dated 22/10/2017). No staff submitted therefore was not considered for disciplinary action in Rukungiri district. This is 100%.</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>
<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Of the 30 staff verified as recruited during FY 2017/18, all of them entered salary payroll within one month and others within 2 months of recruitment in Rukungiri district. This information is derived through payroll invoice register and IPPS numbers of the staff recruited verified. For example, some of these 30 staff recruited accessed salary payroll as follows:  Dr. Akankwasa Mucunguzi was recruited 30th / June 2017 and accessed payroll in August 2017,  Bulegyeya Ben (Asst. Agric Officer) / Kalenzi Stephen (Asst. Agric Officer) / Tumwesigye Robert (Plant Attendant) / Majanga Tom (Physical planner) / Chalisiima Hilda (Medical Officer) / Tugume Darius (Road Inspector) all were recruited with letters dated 27/3/2018 and accessed payroll in May 2018. Together with their IPPS numbers obtained out of the payroll (ie 1010645, 1022540, 1010752, 1022560, 1022837, 1022804, 1022798, 1022819 and 1022837) all indicate that the 30 staff recruited accessed salary within 2 months or less of recruitment. There was no evidence shown in form of staff pay slip presented to show that staff recruited during FY2017/18 accessed salary payroll beyond the first two months of recruitment. That is 100%.</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>

<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Rukungri District LG submitted 32 staff who retired during FY 2017/18. The list indicated that the 32 staff retired on different months within the FY17/18 and none of them accessed pension payroll within 2 months of retirement. For example, Turyamureeba Geoffrey (Education Asst) retired on 3.4.18 and has not yet accessed pension payroll about 6 months later, Murausia Richard Balamu (Forest guard IPPS No. 830351) retired on 16.7.2017 and has not yet accessed pension payroll by the time making this assessment in Sept., Mugabe Joan (Educ Asst., IPPS no. 327190) retired on 4.9.17 and accessed pension payroll on 1st March 2018, Bijokyi Godfrey (H/Teacher) retired on 19/4/18 and has not yet also accessed pension payroll as of Sept 2018. For all these retired staff represented by the examples given above, there is no evidence to indicate that any retired staff accessed pension payroll any earlier that 2 months of retirement. Some of them had not accessed pension payroll yet by the time of assessment of FY 2017/18. Therefore, no staff accessed pension payroll within 2 months of retirement in Rukungiri district. i.e. 0 out of 32 is 0%.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Revenue Mobilization</p>			
<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•• If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets) from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10 %: score 4.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The OSR for the district LG increased by 6% from UGX 354,539,275 in the FY 2016/17 to UGX 376,819,571 in the FY 2017/18. This increment is between 5% and 10% and hence scores 2. (Source: District financial statements for FY 2017/18).</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>The actual/budget revenue collection ratio for the FY 2017/18 was 104% (UGX354,669,571/340,145,165). This resulted in a budget variance of -4% which is higher than -10%.(Source: budget and financial statements for FY2017/18)</p> <p>NB: The actual revenue collection for Rukungiri District for FY 2017/18 was UGX 379,819,571. However, UGX 25,150,000 was a one off- revenue from the sale of cattle in the District Farm resulting into a net revenue of UGX 354,669,571.</p>	2
<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The financial statements for the FY 2017/18 indicated that Local Service Tax (LST- which is dominantly and evidently collected from the Dist HQRs) amounting to UGX 136,836,165 was collected at the District Level, out of which the UGX 42,570,159 was remitted to Lower LGs, which was 31% of the total LST. (Source: DLG accounts for 2016/17 and the declaration by the Head of Finance dated 18th September 2018). This fell short of the expected revenue that should have been remitted of 65% to Sub-counties and of 100% to Town Councils.</p>	0
<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the total Council expenditures on allowances and emoluments- (including from all sources) is not higher than 20% of the OSR collected in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The LG spent UGX 70,222,000 in the FY 2017/18 on Council allowances and emoluments as declared by the Head of Finance (letter dated 18th September 2018) compared to UGX 354,539,275, collected in the FY 2016/17. This constituted 19.8 % of OSR for the FY 2016/17 (less than 20%) as per Section 4 of the Local Governments Act.</p>	2
Procurement and contract management			



<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The district had substantively appointed senior procurement officer (Gordon Murekyezi) appointment letter dated 25th February 2011 under Min. DSC4/2011 signed by CAO and procurement officer (Richard Ahimbisibwe) in appointment letter dated 18th December 2015 under Min. DSC201/2015 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"> <li>• Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• Construction of district administration block phase IX TEC produced the evaluation report on 8th September 2017 at 137,356,130Ushs price and submitted to the contracts committee on 12/09/2017 which approved and awarded on the same day under minute number 19/02/DCC/2017/2018.</li> <li>• Construction of Bugarama GFS phase IV TEC produced the evaluation report on 8th September 2017 at 129,410,550Ushs price and submitted to the contracts committee on 12/09/2017 which approved and awarded on the same day under minute number 19/05/DCC/2017/2018.</li> <li>• Construction of 7 classroom block and office at Kasheshe P/S TEC produced the evaluation report on 7th September 2017 at 195,946,680Ushs price and submitted to the contracts committee on 12/09/2017 which approved and awarded on the same day under minute number 19/01/DCC/2017/2018.</li> <li>• Construction of five stance latrines at Kishonga and Rushasha Primary Schools the two were evaluated as one project TEC produced the evaluation report on 4th October 2017 at 45,376,860Ushs price and submitted to the contracts committee on 05/10/2017 which approved and awarded on the same day under minute number 25/04/DCC/2017/2018.</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The contracts committee considered the recommendations of the TEC and approved the award of the contracts without any deviations for the five sampled projects.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the procurement and disposal plan for FY 2018/2019 availed which was received on 17th August 2018 by PPDA and approved by the CAO covers all Infrastructure projects in the approved AWP for the current FY 2018/2019.</p> <p>Considering the sampled projects there was adherence to the procurement plan in the previous FY 2017/18.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/ infrastructure by August 30: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>According to the procurement plan for the FY 2018/2019 which was received by PPDA on 17th August 2018 and approved by the CAO there were 31 infrastructure projects (exclusive of road maintenance) and out of 31 only 3 (10%) bid documents had been prepared 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"> <li>• For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The 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"> <li>• For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• Construction of district administration block phase IX was budgeted 150 million Ushs and the procurement method used was open national bidding.</li> <li>• Construction of Bugarama GFS phase IV was budgeted 164,171,000Ushs and the procurement method used was open national bidding.</li> <li>• Construction of 7 classroom block and office at Kasheshe P/S was budgeted 200 million Ushs and the procurement method used was open national bidding.</li> <li>• Construction of five stance latrines at Kishonga and Rushasha Primary Schools were budgeted 45,376,860Ushs and the procurement method used was selective national bidding.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>For the five sampled projects there was evidence of certification though not all were issued with both interim and completion certificates as indicated;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of district administration block phase IX only one certificate was issued dated 2nd March 2018.</li> <li>• Construction of Bugarama GFS phase IV three certificates were issued dated 30/11/2017, 20/03/18 and 13/06/18 respectively.</li> <li>• Construction of 7 classroom block and office at Kasheshe P/S three certificates were issued dated 01/12/17, 29/01/18 and 02/05/18 respectively.</li> <li>• Construction of five stance latrines at Kishonga and Rushasha Primary Schools only one certificate was issued dated 28th February 2018.</li> </ul> <p>The above showed that the certification was not appropriate.</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"> <li>Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>For all the five sampled projects four had no site boards while for the construction of district administration block phase IX there was an old site board which could not be read and interpreted.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management</p>			
<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>The monthly bank reconciliation statements (BRS) for the FY 2017/18 were updated. However the BRS for the FY 2018/19 (July and August) had not been produced due to the introduction of the Tier 1 of the IFMIS whose installation was still ongoing.</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"> <li>If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>In the education, health and water sectors, all the 7 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"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor: 1 point.</li> <li>• LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The District Internal Auditor (Mrs Arinaitwe Florence) was substantively appointed a Principal Internal Auditor (scale U2) by the District Service Commission under minute NO.DSC92/2009 as per appointment letter dated January 20, 2010 signed by the Chief Administrative Officer (Muhindo Rujumba). This position is higher than a Senior Internal Auditor position 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"> <li>• LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The DIA produced 4 quarterly Internal Audit reports. First quarterly report was signed on 6th November 2017. The Second quarter report was dated 7th February 2018. The 3rd quarter report was dated 27th April 2018 and the 4th quarter report was dated 1st 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 evidence that the LGPAC was given the status of implementation of internal audit finding as per the report submitted on the following dates: 1st quarter report on 7th /11/2017</p> <p>2nd quarter report on 23rd /02/2018</p> <p>3rd quarter report on 24th /04/2018</p> <p>4th quarter report on 14th /08/2018</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that internal audit reports for the FY 2017/18 were submitted to both AO and LGPAC on the following same dates: 1st quarter report on 7th /11/2017</p> <p>2nd quarter report on 23rd /02/2018</p> <p>3rd quarter report on 24th /04/2018</p> <p>4th quarter report on 14th /08/2018.</p> <p>There was also evidence of review and follow up of all internal audit issues for the FY 2017/18. This was evidenced by the LGPAC reports including: the one dated 7th December, 2017 signed by the LGPAC Chair (Mr Kimbugwe Jotham) received by the Chairpersons office on 8th January 2018 and another one dated 5th June 2015 received by the LCV Chairpersons office on 10th August 2018.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG maintains an up- dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence of an updated and detailed register FY 2017/18 but which also had assets acquired the FY 2018. It was however according to the format under the Accounting Manual. Efforts should be made to separate the assets according to the financial years</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"> <li>• Unqualified audit opinion: score 4</li> <li>• Qualified: score 2</li> <li>• Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The District availed a set of council minutes for the FY 2017/2018 as follows: 26/10/2017; 21/12/2017; 28/2/2018 and all the sets of minutes provide proof that Council met and discussed service delivery related issues including; Up grading of Mabanga HCII IN Kebisoni to HCIII,Meetings with all headteachers to strategise for first grades,Lobby more funds for upgrading Rukungiri HCIV to District hospital,Provision of 3 seater twin desks to selected primary schools and construction of Rwenyangi Primary school in Bugangari sub county</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/ complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Mr Ndyamureba Dan Principal Human Resource Officer is the designated person to handle complaints as per the letter dated 4/1/2017 CR/154/1 signed by CAO</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/ complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which should be displayed at LG offices and made publically available: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG 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"> <li>• The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The payroll for August 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"> <li>• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Procurement plan for 2018/19 was found published at the District Notice Board. Notice of awarded contracts for 2017/2018 and 2018 were 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"> <li>• Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG published the performance assessment results for FY 2016/2017 on public Notice board by the District Planner(Kwizera Godie) on 4/6/2018</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The HLG communicated national guidelines and circulars as per delivery book dated 9/1/2018</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>LG conducted discussions with the public through a radio talk show on Radio Boma 91.8 Fm held on 6th February 2018 as evidenced by the report to the Chief Administrative Officer from the Bigira Julius Byakurema (Ag DE)</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG gender focal person and CDO have provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion into their activities score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The CDO provided guidance to sector departments as evidenced in the report on mentoring of departmental heads on gender mainstreaming held on 17th April 2018 in the district council hall signed by all heads of departments and also in the report on guidance given to education department in respect of reproductive health, life skills, gender responsive school sanitation and violence against children in schools dated 4th April 2018 and signed by CAO on 16th April 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the gender focal point and CDO have planned for minimum 2 activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and address vulnerability and social inclusions and that more than 90 % of previous year's budget for gender activities/ vulnerability/ social inclusion has been implemented: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG GFP and CDO had planned for youth resettlement, sensitization on youth livelihood, court inquiries and supervision of projects among others as activities for the current FY 2018/2019 as evidenced in the AWP for the FY 2018/2019 generated on 03/05/2018 and signed by the district chairman.</p> <p>The previous year's budget was 1,019,468,000Ushs and the total expenditure approved by the CAO as provided by the CDO amounts 962,956,549Ushs which was 94.5% of the previous year's budget. This showed that more than 90% of the previous year's budget was implemented.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>For all the five sampled projects (construction of district administration block phase IX, construction of Bugarama GFS phase IV, construction of 7 classroom block and office at Kasheshe P/S and construction of five stance latrines at Kishonga and Rushasha Primary Schools), there was evidence of environmental screening carried out and there was proof of budget (2million Ushs) for the mitigation measures in the previous FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was proof of integration of environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents for all the sampled projects.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1</li> </ul>	<p>For all the sampled projects there was no proof of land ownership. There were no agreements, land titles or any memorandum of understanding regarding the land on which the investments were constructed.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>All the 5 sampled projects had completed and signed certificates by the environmental officer but did not have a provision for the signature of the 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"> <li>• Evidence that the contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance (new one): Score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that environmental and social clearance was done for construction of 5 stance VIP latrines for Kishonga and Rushasha Primary Schools however there was no evidence for the other projects sampled.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that environmental officer and CDO monthly report, includes a) completed checklists, b) deviations observed with pictures, c) corrective actions taken. Score: 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence that the environmental officer and CDO report monthly therefore no completed check lists and observed deviations for the sampled projects. There were no reports or any other information to that effect.</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>The teachers lists and the budget presented showed that there is minimum standard of budgeting for a head teacher and a minimum of seven teachers for all the primary schools with seven classes evidence seen in the structure of performance contract FY 2017/2018 generated on 21/09/2018 11:13</p>	4
<p>The LG education de- partment has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</p>	<p>Evidence from the PBS generated on 21st Sept 2018 lists showed 156 schools revealed that a head teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school had been deployed for the current FY. For schools with less than 7 classes, there was evidence of a head teacher per school and at least a teacher per class. e.g. Ibanda P.S and Kigarama P.S</p>	4

<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100%: score 6</li> <li>o If 80 - 99%: score 3</li> <li>o If below 80%: score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Basing on the LG structure for primary teachers and the wage bill provisions of 13,894,490,000 the district has 1695 teachers, no recruitments of teachers done in the FY 2018/2019 and therefore all positions of primary are filled.</p> <p>Hence 100% of the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision for the current year has been filled</p>	<p>6</p>
<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6</li> </ul>	<p>A review of the LG performance contract revealed that there were three inspectors of schools budgeted position which were substantively filled. Appointed in Dec 2016 was Turyahumura Jackson ref.CR.160/1,Bamutuhaire Denis was appointed 12/03/2015,Gumisiriza, Keishiki Aida was appointed 12/03/2015 ref160/1 as per staff structure</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"> <li>• Primary Teachers: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was no recruitment plan presented for the FY 2017/2018.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) They only replace teachers after the teacher has died.</li> <li>ii) School Inspectors were not recruited and positions were filled</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>



<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Inspectors: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was no recruitment plan presented for the FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>ii) School Inspectors were not recruited and positions were filled</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Monitoring and Inspection</p>			
<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% school inspectors: score 3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are 3 School Inspectors in Rukungiri district, as shown by the list of inspectors and personal files verified. It is evident through the appraisal reports, personnel files and list verified that all the 3 school inspectors were appraised during FY 2017/18. Appraisal report for school Inspector Turyahumura Jackson was signed by Nzavirwehi J on 14th Sept 2018; School Inspector Gumisiriza Kaishihi was appraised by Nzavirwehi report dated 14/12/2017; School Inspector Turyahumura Jackson was appraised by Nzavirwehi Jackson with report dated 14/9/2018. All appraisal reports (dated 31.12.17, 14.9.18 etc) pegged against these school inspectors confirm all three appraised. Therefore 3 out of 3 school inspectors appraised represents a percentage of 100%.</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>

<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary school head teachers o 90 - 100%: score 3</li> <li>o 70% and 89%: score 2</li> <li>o Below 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are 162 Primary Schools in Rukungiri district. A sample of 10% of 162 Primary schools was made to make 16 Primary Schools. Thus personal files of 16 Head Teachers of these schools were presented and analysed. Reviewing these personal H/Teachers' files, 14 appraisal reports were found. These included for example, for H/Teacher for Rushasha P. School (Ms. Katemba Mary) appraised by Kamanzi Fatuma – report dated 12.2.18, H/Teacher for Ndago P School (H/Teacher Rukundo Samuel) appraised by Nyarushanje report dated 4.5.18, Head Teacher of Kibizi P. School, Abaho Patriot, was appraised by Kilanzi Deo on 20.3.2018 etc. This list of Head Teachers and appraisal reports and agreements viewed in their personal files shows that from the sample of 16, as many as 14 head teachers out of were appraised - that is a percentage of 88%.</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that some circulars ,were communicated for instance Environmental guidelines dated 02/02/2018, another circular on gender sensitization meeting held on 21/08/2017,however no circulars were disseminated in the sampled schools,</p> <p>e.g. Kagati P.S, Nyakiina P.S, St. Joseph,Katojo,Rwenyanji P.S,Kiborogota P.S</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The DEO's office had minutes of a meeting where circulars were discussed and explained with head teachers, in a meetings held on 21/08/2017, 14/09/2017, 2/05/2018, 09/05/2017</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Education De- partment has effectively inspected all registered primary schools2</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100% - score 12</li> <li>o 90 to 99% - score 10</li> <li>o 80 to 89% - score 8</li> <li>o 70 to 79% - score 6</li> <li>o 60 to 69% - score 3</li> <li>o 50 to 59 % score 1</li> <li>o Below 50% score 0.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence of inspection conducted in several schools found in the visitors books however they were not done termly e.g at Kagati P.S inspection was conducted on 20/10/2017 and on 22/03/2018 by Tushemererwe. At Nyakina P.S 16/10/2017 At St Joseph Katojo inspection was done once on 10/08/2017 and both at Kiborogota P.S and Rwenyangi P.S no inspection was conducted. Evidence inspection report 1st quarter 20/10/17, 2nd quarter was dated on 15/01/2018, 3rd quarter was done in April 2018, and 4th quarter was done in July 2018</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence of meetings to discuss inspection reports e.g. 05/02/18, min 4 /18 talked about sanitation and hygiene, 23/08/2017, 3/17 discussed school schemes and performance however no evidence for recommendations for corrective action during FY 2017/2018</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence was found of submission of school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES). Acknowledgement of inspection reports dated 20/10/2017, 05/1/2018,25/07/2018 were seen</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed- up: score 4.</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence of whether there was follow up on recommendations from the inspections conducted in FY 2017/2018</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence of data that corresponded with the lists of schools in the EMIS reports and PBS generated on 21/09/2018 11:12</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>The EMIS data copy obtained from the Ministry showed enrollment of 7164, similar to what was presented in the PBS</p>	<p>5</p>

Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<p>The LG committee re- sponsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Council Committee responsible for Education met on the following days 7/12/2017; 28/2/2018; 13/12/2017; where issues like opening of new roads,Construction vip pit latrines in primary schools,Monitoring of all government programmes were discussed</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"> <li>• Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>14/9/2017 under minute 10/SS/20172018 there is proof that the education sector committee presented issues that required approval of Council. eg Workplans,Monitoring of projects</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO/MEO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% schools: score 5</li> <li>• 80 to 99% schools: score 3</li> <li>• Below 80 % schools: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that majority of the schools had functional SMCs. The five sampled schools, had copies of minutes from meetings they held as per the dates below. These minutes were also found in the DEO's office:</p> <p>Kagati P&gt;S held meetings on 5/2/2018,3/5/18.7/6/18/19/9/17/7/13/17</p> <p>Nyakiina P&gt;S held meetings on 24/8/17,21/9/17,7/12/17,3/5/18,5/6/18</p> <p>Rwenyangi ps 12/6/17,9/2/18,3/2/18</p> <p>Kiborogota P.S held meetings on 24/8/18,12/3/18, 8/2/18, 7/8/17</p> <p>St Josephs held meetings on 23/8/2018/9/17</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non- wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</li> </ul> <p>e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</p>	<p>There was a list on the wall near the DEO's office with a list of schools and the amounts that each of the schools received as non-wage recurrent grants.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The LG Education department has submitted input into the LG procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements,</p> <p>to the Procurement Unit that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>The education sector prepared and submitted their procurement plan to the Procurement Unit dated 8/8/17, Ref.Ruku/550 Supls FY2017/18 00004 was budgeted in time</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"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG education department certified and recommended payments to suppliers on time because the 4 sampled contracts (agreements) were paid for within 30 days stipulated in the contracts as indicated below. (a) PV-ED00908 for Rwakaja(U) Ltd (construction of Kakamba P/S) amounting to UGX 22,752,880, request received on 31/1/2018 and paid on 13/2/2018 (b) PV-No FN00230 for Danic Engineering Ltd(UGX 1,958,033) request received on 25/01/2018 and paid on 24th /06/2018., ( c) PV- No ED00748 Kinombe Construction Ltd (UGX 48,986,670) invoice received on 18th /10/2018 and paid on 27th /10/2018, (d) ITRACK Services Ltd , invoice received on 25th January 2018(UGX 46,221,072) and paid on 29th /01/2018.</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"> <li>• Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15th of July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence of departmental submission of the annual Performance report and other quarter reports to planning unit.</p> <p>However, the LG was using online reporting and the planner was able to consolidate the quarter 4 by 23/8/2018. The annual performance report was submitted later than the stipulated date</p>	<p>0</p>



<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</li> <li>o If sector has no audit query score 4</li> <li>o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2</li> <li>o If all queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Education department had 4 audit queries in the fourth audit report which were responded to by the DEO (Mr Nzarirwehi Jackson) in a letter REF EDUC.213/1 dated 8th August 2018.</p>	
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			

<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills, etc.: Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The DEO presented a training report dated 02/05/18,02/02/18,27/03/2018,02/08/17, whose major content was about Hygiene in schools. Participants of this training event were head teachers from schools in Rukungiri District some endorsed by Gumisiriza Aida as the inspector of schools</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Guidelines were issued and during the training, mentioned in (i) above.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The Guidelines on gender composition for the SMCs say that the committee should have at least 2 females on the SMC team. Of the schools visited,Kagati PS,Rwenyangi PS,Kiborogota and St.Josephs Katojo had females , thus complying with the guidelines.</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"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 1:</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence existed that guidelines on environmental management were disseminated and complied with.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide- lines on environmental management are dissemi- nated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all school infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 1</li> </ul>	<p>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"> <li>• The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• More than 80% filled: score 8</li> <li>• 60 – 80% - score 4</li> <li>• Less than 60% filled: score 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of the performance contract (generated on 21/09/2018 11:13) and approved structure revealed that there are 403 established position of primary health workers filled.</li> <li>• Review of wage IPFs (generated on 19/07/2018) revealed that there are 403 positions of health worker with a wage bill provision for the year 2018/19</li> <li>• Hence 100% of the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY has been filled</li> </ul>	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/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of primary health care workers: score 6</p>	<p>There was a staff establishment and recruitment plan for the year 2018/19. Review of the recruitment plan revealed that 278 vacant positions of primary health care workers had been included. There was a submission letter from the DHO to the Principle Human Resource officer dated and received by the HRM on the 10/05/2018</p>	6

<p>The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital In-charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100%: score 8</li> <li>o 70 – 99%: score 4</li> <li>o Below 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are 3 Health Centre 4s in Rukungiri district with In-charges as follows:</li> </ul> <p>Dr. Byamugisha Asaph is In-charge of Buhunga HC4 and was appraised on 15.8.18 by Yoga P Mike. Dr. Mukisa Serunjogi Jimmy who is In-charge of Kebisoni HC4 was not appraised as there was no report found in his personal file. In-charge of Bugangali HC4 (Dr. Kusiima Odeth) was not yet eligible for appraisal due to being a new staff.</p> <p>Therefore, 2 out of 3 HC4 In-charges of Rukungiri district were appraised during FY 2017/18, that is 66.6, rounded to 67%.</p>	8
<p>The Local Government Health department has deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY, and if not provided justification for deviations: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>The number of midwives and enrolled nurses deployed at Buyanja HC III (6 enrolled nurses &amp; 3 enrolled midwives), Kebisoni HC IV (7 enrolled nurse &amp; 5 enrolled midwives), Kahengye HC II (1 enrolled nurse &amp; 1 enrolled midwife) Rubanga HC II (1 enrolled nurse) as counted on the health worker`s list on deployment are consistent with the staff Lists submitted with the budget of 2018/19 (generated on 21/09/2018 11:13)</p>	4
Monitoring and Supervision			
<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DHO/ MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence (a communication letter) to indicate that the DHO communicated ALL of the following guidelines issued by the national level in the FY 2017/18:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ministry of Health Guidelines for Local Government Planning Process Health Sector Supplement – 2017</li> <li>2. Ministry of Health, Sector Grant and Budget Guidelines to Local Governments FY 2018/19</li> <li>3. Ministry of Health, Policy Strategies for Improving Health Service Delivery 2016-2021</li> </ol>	0

<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO/ MHO has held meetings with health facility in- charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>All though the DHO had a copy each of the 3 prioritized guidelines mentioned above, the minutes of the meeting with health facility in-charges held on the 12/01/2018 had no record of the DHO explaining these guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level among other thing.</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>DHT Integrated support supervision reports FY 2017/18) were presented (Q1 report dated 3/10/2017, Q2 report dated 12/01/2018, Q3 report dated 03/04/2018 &amp; Q4 report dated 30/06/2018. All reports indicated that 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) had been supervised each quarter, however review of health facility records (supervision log book) at Nyakibale PNFP hospital revealed that it had been supervised at least once in a quarter. It was supervised only in Q2 on the 06/11/2017, 15/01/2018 &amp; 19/06/2018</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% supervised: score 3</li> <li>80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2</li> <li>60% - 79% of the health facilities: score 1</li> <li>Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The DHT provided evidence (copies of support supervision reports by Kebisoni, Rujumbura and Baganagri HSDs that indicated that less than 60% of lower level health facilities were supervised during the FY 2017/18</p> <p>Reports of Rubaba HSD were not availed by the DHT.</p> <p>Kebisoni HSD had only Q3 dated 30/03/2018 &amp; Q4 dated 09/05/2018,</p> <p>Rujumbura HSD had only Q1 dated 15/09/2017 &amp; Q2 dated 25/01/2018</p> <p>Baganagri HSD had only Q1 dated 8/10/2017 &amp; Q2 with no date</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>The HSDs did not provided the 4 mandatory quarterly integrated support supervision reports for 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"> <li>Evidence that the recommendations are followed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>DHT meetings 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"> <li>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The lists of health facilities receiving PHC funding (in PBS) is consistent with the list received from MoH (health facilities reporting 2018/19). All 46 health facilities in PBS are also on the HMIS list from MOH.</p>	<p>10</p>

Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented is- sues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Council Committee responsible for health met on 26/10/2017. Issues like DHO visiting Health IIs and compilation of monitoring reports, HUMC for Kebisoni HCIV were discussed</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented is- sues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that health sector committee meeting of 14/9/2017 presented the following issues for approval</p> <p>Fencing of Health Centre IIs, monitoring reports</p>	<p>2</p>



<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 6 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 6</li> <li>• If 80-99 %: score 4</li> <li>• If 70-79: %: score 2</li> <li>• If less than 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>HUMCs were not fully functional as all sampled HFs did not hold the four mandatory HUMC meetings during 2017/18.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buyanja HC III presented only 3 HUMC meeting minutes dated 17/10/2017, 10/01/2018 and 11/04/20188.</li> <li>• Kebisoni HC IV presented only 2 HUMC meeting minutes dated 22/03/2018 &amp; 09/02/2018.</li> <li>• Kahengye HC II - no minutes were availed</li> <li>• Rubanga HC II - presented only 2 HUMC meeting minutes dated 14/12/2017 &amp; 22/06/2018.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>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. The amount received by each Health facility was also indicated</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the sector has submitted input to procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The DHO provided a procurement plan prepared by the DHO and received by the Head of PDU on the 22th April 2018</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"> <li>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>There was a copy of form PP1 (Subject of procurement – Fuel for PHC non-wage quarter one activities) was submitted by MHO to the PDU. It confirmed by DMO on the 15th August 2017 and was signed for confirmation of funding by the CAO on the same day.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO/ MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4.</li> </ul>	<p>The DHO certified and recommended payments to suppliers on time because the sampled 3 contracts certified and recommended suppliers within 30 days as per the contracts as evidenced below: (a) PV-000457 for OWIT TECHNICAL SERVICES LTD (UGX 22,565,057) invoice received on 13th March 2018 and paid on 20th March 2018 (7 days), (b) PV-HE00937 Total Uganda (Fuel UGX 4,440,000), request received on 31st /10/2017 and paid on 13th /11/2017(14days) ; (c ) PV- No HE00993 for Total(U) Ltd (Fuel-UGX 700,000), the request was received on 2nd /August 2017 and paid on 15th /08/2017(only 17 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"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence of departmental submission of the annual Performance report and other quarter reports to planning unit.</p> <p>However, using online reporting the planner was able to consolidate the quarter 4 by 23/8/2018. The annual performance report was submitted later than the stipulated date</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If sector has no audit query: Score 4</li> <li>If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: Score 2 points</li> <li>If all queries are not responded to Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG health department responded to all 4 queries raised on the Health department in a letter REF MED.251/1 dated 9th February 2018 signed by DHO ( Dr. Akansiima Muchunguzi) for the 2nd quarter report audit report.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			

<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30</li> </ul> <p>% women: score 2</p>	<p>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>Kafunjo HC II (3 female &amp; 4 male)</p> <p>Ibanda HC II (3 female &amp; 3 male)</p> <p>Kebisoni HC III (3 female &amp; 4 male)</p> <p>Buhunga HC IV (4 female &amp; 4 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"> <li>Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>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 and toilets at Rubanga HC II and Kahenye 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"> <li>Evidence that all health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The health department implemented two health facility infrastructure projects at Ndere HC II and Ihunga HC II (construction of 2 stance VIP pit latrines). The environment officer provided screening forms for Ndere HC II and Ihanga HC II both dated 04/08/2017. There was no evidence that risk mitigation plans developed.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to check whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>No site visit reports by the district EO or CDO for the health facility infrastructure projects at Ndere HC II and Ihunga HC II (construction of 2 stance VIP pit latrines).</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal: score 4.</li> </ul>	<p>All HFs visited (Buyanja HC III, Kebisoni HC IV, Kahengye HC II &amp; Rubanga HC II) 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"> <li>• Evidence that the district Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below average coverage: score 10</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 7</li> <li>o If 60-79: Score 4</li> <li>o If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Data from MIS reports at the Ministry of Water and Environment and District Water Office revealed that the average safe water coverage for Rukungiri District for FY 2017/18 was 90% The Sub-counties with safe water coverage below the District average were Bwambara (65%) and Nyarushanje (85%)</p> <p>From the Annual Work Plans and PBS for FY 2018/19, out of the total Sector Development Grant of UGX 290,230,000 /=, the total budget allocation to Sub-counties below the District average was UGX 10,000,000/= representing 3% of the total Sector Development Grant and was distributed as follows:-</p> <p>Bwambara S/C: UGX 10,000,000/=</p> <p>Nyarushanje S/C: UGX 0</p>	0

<p>The district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</li> <li>o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 15</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 10</li> <li>o If 60-79: Score 5</li> <li>o If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The review annual progress report for FY 2017/18 prepared by the District Water Office revealed that the following projects were implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The extension of Bugarama Gravity Flow Scheme Phase II.</li> <li>• Protection of 2 No. water springs.</li> <li>• Rehabilitation of 8 No. boreholes.</li> <li>• Construction of one 4-stance water borne toilet</li> </ul> <p>Out of the above projects, the following were implemented in the Sub-counties with safe water coverage below the District average:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of one water spring at Kanyabusambwe village in Bwambara Sub-county.</li> <li>• Rehabilitation of one deep borehole at Rwentuha in Nyarushanje Sub-county.</li> </ul> <p>In capital terms, about 10% of the water projects were implemented in the Sub-counties with safe water coverage below the District average.</p>	
Monitoring and Supervision			

<p>The district Water department carries out monthly monitoring of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the district Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15</li> <li>• 80% - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10</li> <li>• 70 - 79%: score 7</li> <li>• 60% - 69% monitored: score 5</li> <li>• 50% - 59%: score 3</li> <li>• Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The review of the annual progress report revealed that the District Water Office constructed the extension of Bugarama Gravity Flow Scheme in Nyakagyeme Sub-county, protected two springs at Kanyabusambwe village in Bwambara Sub-county and at Kibunda village in Buyanja Sub-county, rehabilitated eight boreholes at Buguma, Rwentuha, Nyamicucu, Rwakanyegyero, Kacece, Rwenshaka and Kyatoko villages in Buyanja, Nyarushanje, Bugangari, Kebisoni, Buhunga, Ruhinda Northern Division Sub-counties and constructed a 4- Stance water borne toilet at Kakamba in Buhunga Sub-county. The availed periodic inspection reports clearly indicated that all the new projects were regularly supervised and monitored. Data from MIS reports at the Ministry of Water and Environment and at the District Water Offices indicated that there were functional 1,176 No. protected springs, 62 No. shallow wells, 36 No. deep boreholes, 289 Rain Harvesting Tanks and 394 Public Tap-stands. Monitoring reports on the files indicated that about 312 water supply points were monitored and supervised every Quarter during the FY 2017/18 by the District Water Office supported by Extension Staff located at the respective Sub-counties. It is therefore estimated that about 1,248 out of 1,957 functional water supply points were monitored and supervised which represented about 64%.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the district has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: Score 5</li> <li>• List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>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 MIS records at the Ministry of Water and Environment and included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The extension of one Gravity Flow Scheme.</li> <li>• Protection of 2 No. water springs.</li> <li>• Rehabilitation of 8 No. boreholes.</li> <li>• Construction of one 4-stance water borne toilet.</li> </ul>	<p>5</p>



<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>List of water facilities indicated in the Ministry of Water and Environment MIS reports were consistent with those in PBS as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extension of one Gravity Flow Scheme.</li> <li>Protection of 2 No. water springs.</li> <li>Rehabilitation of 8 No. boreholes.</li> <li>Construction of one 4-stance water borne toilet.</li> </ul>	5
Procurement and contract management			
<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 11th April 2018.</p>	4
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the contract manager prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence in form of signed letters that Contract Managers were appointed by the District Administration to manage WSS contracts for the extension of Bugarama Gravity Flow Scheme, protection of two springs at Kanyabusambwe village in Bwambara Sub-county and at Kibunda village in Buyanja Sub-county, rehabilitation of eight boreholes at Buguma, Rwentuha, Nyamicucu, Rwakanyegyero, Kacece, Rwenshaka and Kyatoko villages in Buyanja, Nyarushanje, Bugangari, Kebisoni, Buhunga, Ruhinda Northern Division Sub-counties and construction a 4-Stance water borne toilet at Kakamba in Buhunga Sub-county. However, Contract Management Plans were not available. Review of the sampled WSS projects revealed that although site visits were done but were not on monthly basis.</p>	0

<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Detailed designs for Buhunga and Bugarama Gravity Flow Scheme were approved by the Ministry of Water and Environment on 6th October 2011. Detailed designs for the point water sources and public sanitation facilities were approved by the District Engineer. Approved designs for water supply and sanitation facilities were availed to the Assessor and construction progress reports were reviewed. The Assessor also inspected the Bugarama Gravity Flow Scheme, two protected springs at Kanyabusambwe village in Bwambara Sub-county and at Kibunda village in Buyanja Sub-county, two rehabilitated boreholes at Rwentuha in Nyarushanje Sub-county and Kyatoko in Northern Division and 4-Stage water borne toilet at Kakamba in Buhunga Sub-county. All of the water supply and sanitation facilities were found functioning satisfactorily as per engineering designs and specifications.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Certificate of Substantial Completion of works and Hand-over reports were available on files. E.g. Under Procurement Reference RUKU 550/WRKS/2017 - 18/00006 for the rehabilitation of boreholes contracted to M/s ITRACK Services Ltd, Certificate of Completion was signed by all parties on 1st December 2017</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Sampled Interim Payment Certificates showed that the District Water Officer had duly certified the Interim Payment Certificates. E.g. Under Procurement Reference No. RUKU 550/WRKS/2017 – 2018/00006 for the rehabilitation of Boreholes in Kebisoni, Nyarushanje, Buhunga, Bugangari, Ruhinda and Buyanja Sub-counties Buhara, Payment Certificate No.1 was duly certified by the District Water Officer on 30th November 2017. Under Procurement Reference No. RUKU 550/WRKS/2017 – 2018/00004 for the construction of Bugarama Gravity Flow Scheme, Payment Certificate No.1 was duly certified by the District Water Officer on 30th November 2017.</p> <p>Projection Completion Reports were prepared, certified and filed appropriately. E.g. Under Procurement Reference RUKU 550/WRKS/2017 -18/00006 for the rehabilitation of boreholes contracted to M/s ITRACK Services Ltd, Certificate of Completion was signed by all parties on 1st December 2017</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"> <li>Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG Water department certified and recommended payments to suppliers on time as provided for the contracts</li> <li>A sample of 3 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) PV-No 0000467 for Fright Technologies Ltd (Toilets at Kakamba PS, UGX 30,030,024) invoice received on 3rd /11/2017 and paid on the same day;</li> <li>(b) PV- No WK 00649 for OWIT Technical Services Ltd( GFS- UGX 17,997,273), invoice received on 8th /11/2017 and paid on 23rd /11/2017;</li> <li>(c) PV-No 00600 for Daikam Technologies Ltd (Rugarama GFS- UGX 38,938,148), invoice received on 20th /3/2018 and paid on 13th/4/2018.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>3</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

<p>The district Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Plan- ning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>The District Water Department submitted to the District Planner the annual performance report for the FY 2017/18 on 30th July 2018. The Quarter 1 performance report was submitted on 13th October 2017, the Quarter 2 performance report was submitted on 15th January 2018, Quarter 3 performance report was submitted on 17th May 2018 and Quarter 4 including annual performance report was submitted on 30th July 2018. Therefore the annual performance report was submitted later than the stipulated date.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The District Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If sector has no audit query score 5</li> <li>If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3</li> <li>If queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The LG Water department responded to the only one audit query in the 4th quarter report of the FY 2017/18 in a letter (un-referenced) dated 9th August 2018 signed by Mr. Tweekwase Denis as a District Water Officer.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>The Rukungiri District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee held meetings on 10th October 2017, 14th December 2017, 25th April 2018 and 27th June 2018 to discuss water supply and sanitation issues and prepared submissions to the Standing Committee for Works, Production and Natural Resources which held meetings on 8th August 2017, 19th October 2017, 13th December 2017 and 27th June 2018 and considered among others 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"> <li>Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>The Rukungiri District Council meetings were held on 24th August 2017, 26th October 2017, 21st December 2017, 10th January 2018 and 20th February 2018 where the Standing Committee for Works, Production and Natural Resources presented reports which contained among others water supply and sanitation issued which required approval from the 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"> <li>The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>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 and discussed at advocacy meetings.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The sampled water supply projects were the Bugarama Gravity Flow Scheme, two protected springs at Kanyabusambwe village in Bwambara Sub-county and at Kibunda village in Buyanja Sub-county, two rehabilitated boreholes at Rwentuha in Nyarushanje Sub-county and Kyatoko in Northern Division and 4-Stance water borne toilet at Kakamba in Buhunga 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"> <li>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) were clearly 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"> <li>If communities apply for water/ public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Application letters 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 Runyamunyu II for the protection of water spring dated 17th May 2017, application Rweibumba Village for the protection of water spring dated 15th May 2017 and application from Nyarututu and Nyarubare villages for the protection of water springs dated 20th November 2017.</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"> <li>Water and Sanitation Committees that are functioning evidenced by either: i) collection of O&amp;M funds, ii( carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, iii) facility fenced/protected, or iv) they an M&amp;E plan for the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul> <p>Note: One of parameters above is sufficient for the score.</p>	<p>There was evidence that O &amp; M funds were being collected by Water and Sanitation Committees and the sampled water supply facilities were fenced, 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 charged UGX 500/= per household per month. Whereas for gravity flow schemes, communities were charged UGX 1,000/= per household. Each Water and Sanitation Committee kept a book where records of funds received and spent are maintained.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Two environment screening reports were available. One for the construction of a 4-Stance water borne toilet at Kakamba in Buhunga Sub-county was submitted on 3rd August 2018 and the other one for the protection of water springs in Buyanja and Bwambara Sub-counties dated 22nd August 2018 There was no evidence that environmental screening had been conducted for the large Bugarama Gravity Flow Scheme.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence that there was follow up support provided to address unacceptable environmental concerns raised in FY 2017/18.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>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"> <li>If at least 50% WSCs are women and at least one occupying a key position (chairperson, secretary or Treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>Review of information contained in FORM 4 (Source Functionality, Management &amp; Gender) and 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>3</p>



<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/</p> <p>RGCs provided by the Water Department.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>There were two existing public sanitation facilities at Kakamba in Buhunga Sub-county and Rwesigiro-Kikara Rural Growth Centre in Bwabara Sub-county which were not marked to give direction as to which stances were for men, women and PWDs.</p>	<p>0</p>
--	--	---	----------