



## Local Government Performance Assessment

Rukungiri Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 778)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	67%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	75%
Educational Performance Measures	77%
Health Performance Measures	68%
Water Performance Measures	0%

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 19/7/2018 which is within the timeline date of 1st August 2018.</p>	Yes
Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY by 30th June (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From MoFPED's inventory of LG budget submissions, check whether:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The LG budget is accompanied by a Procurement Plan or not. If a LG submission includes a Procurement Plan, the LG is compliant; otherwise it is not compliant.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Consolidated Procurement Plan was accompanied to the Budget</p>	Yes
Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			

<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted report to MoFPED in time, then it is compliant</li> <li>• If LG submitted late or did not submit, then it is not compliant</li> </ul>	<p>Annual Performance report-Q4 was submitted to MoFPED and received on 24th August, 2018 which is outside the timeline</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 02/3/2018 Q2 dated 23/03/2018 Q3 dated 18/05/2018 Q4 dated 24/08/2018 which is outside the timeline</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Audit</p>			

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and the Auditor General's findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action in lines with applicable laws.</p>	<p>From MoFPED's Inventory/record of LG submissions of statements entitled "Actions to Address Internal Auditor General's findings",</p> <p>Check:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted a 'Response' (and provide details), then it is compliant</li> <li>• If LG did not submit a 'response', then it is non-compliant</li> <li>• If there is a response for all –LG is compliant</li> <li>• If there are partial or not all issues responded to – LG is not compliant.</li> </ul>	<p>The MC provided and submitted information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the financial year 2016/2017 in a letter REF RMC 250 dated 28th March 2018 signed by the Head of Internal Audit (Mr Richard Baguma), which received by the MOFED (Directorate of Internal Audit) on 10th April 2018 .</p> <p>The response to findings in the findings in the Auditor General's findings were in a letter REF CR/RMC dated 27th February 2018, signed by the Town Clerk ( Lillian Kobusingye) which was received by the MOFPED on 1st March 2018. This was before the deadline of 30th April 2018 required by the PFMA.</p> <p>All the 6 findings in the Auditor General's report and 19 findings in the internal Auditor General's report were responded to.</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>The external audit report for the FY 2017/18 was unqualified.</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a district/ municipality has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Physical Planning Committee appointed on 20/7/2017. A letter designating members of the Urban Physical Planning Committee was available on file.</p> <p>Minutes of the physical planning meetings were undertaken on the following days: 20/6/2018, 8/2/2018,12/9/2017</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 is evidence that MLG submitted one set of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD on 28/5/2018.</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>The Municipal council lacks a Physical Development Plan. Plan Registration book availed was complete with details of submission &amp; approval. • 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 the action area plan was done. The assessor asked for a copy but none was availed.</p>	<p>0</p>

The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year

development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and

budget conferences and

have project profiles

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.

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

From the AWP page 48 under education sector has priorities such as: Construction of 2 classroom blocks at Kahororo primary schools, construction of 5 stance pit latrine at Kashozi primary school and Construction of 2 in one teacher house at Katwekamwe primary school which are based on the outcomes of the budget conference held on 22nd December, 2017

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If differences appear, a justification has to be provided and evidence provided that it was approved by the Council. Score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Capital investments in the approved AWP for FY 2018/19 were derived from the 5year Municipal Development Plan as shown here under;</p> <p>Construction of 2 classroom blocks at kahororo primary schools,construction of 5 stance pit latrine at kashozi primary school and Construction of 2 in one teacher house at katwekamwe primary school as a priority s was found in the Development Plan (2015/2016-2019/2020) (Pg.97) 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>TPC meeting held on 20/04/2018 under Min.06/RMC/TPC/2017/2018 Presented and discussed Project Profiles for FY 2018/2019 e.g. construction of classroom at Kahororo primary school at shs 64,000,000 page 6</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual statistical abstract, with gender-disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>A copy of the Annual Statistical Abstract with Gender aggregated data had been compiled by the Municipal Council and was made available for assessment. Minutes of the TPC dated 19/2/2018 under minute 22/RMC/TPC/17/18 do indicate that the Annual Statistical Abstract was discussed.</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>Using Education as a case in point on Page 41 of the AWP and Budget Performance report, infrastructure projects such as; Construction of 5 stance Vip Latrines at Kiyaga primary school at shs 17,959,415, Construction of 5 stance Vip Pit latrine at Rukungiri Primary School at shs 17,042,620, Construction of 5 stance Vip Latrine at Town Council Primary School at shs 18,195,550 were some of the infrastructure projects implemented that show linkage with the approved budget by the Council.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>Using Education as a case in point on Page 41 of the AWP and Budget Performance report, infrastructure projects as; Construction of 5 stance Vip Latrines at Kiyaga primary school at shs 17,959,415, Construction of 5 stance Vip Pit latrine at Rukungiri Primary School at shs 17,042,620, Construction of 5 stance Vip Latrine at Town Council Primary School at shs 18,195,550 were some of the infrastructure projects implemented that show linkage with the approved budget by the Council.</p> <p>From the review of payments Certificates for the following investments in the department of Education i.e. Construction of 5 stance Vip Latrines at Kiyaga primary school at shs 17,959,415, Construction of 5 stance Vip Pit latrine at Rukungiri Primary School at shs 17,042,620, Construction of 5 stance Vip Latrine at Town Council Primary School at shs 18,195,550 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>	<p>4</p>

<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>From the Municipal annual budget performance report a number of projects have been reported completed within the budget and these include: Construction of 5 stance Vip Latrines at Kiyaga primary school at UGX 17,959,415, Construction of 5 stance Vip Pit latrine at Rukungiri Primary School at UGX 17,042,620, Construction of 5 stance Vip Latrine at Town Council Primary School at UGX 18,195,550. All the projects were completed within approved budget</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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. 11,000,000 /= 100% of the budget was spent according to the vouchers availed</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Human Resource Management</p>			

LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.

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

• Not all HoDs positions were substantively filled at the Municipality of Rukungiri during FY 2017/18. As per the staff structure, there are 11 HoDs and heads of units. In Rukungiri Municipality, 8 HoDs and units are substantively filled. This represents 72% of positions filled. Broken down as follows:

? Principal Treasurer – Substantively filled by Mwebesa Jackson as Chief Finance Officer by appointment letter dated 10.04.2017 under DSC min. 34/2017 signed by Baryantuma.

? Principal Education Officer (by Kyahurwa David) – position is filled substantively by appointment letter dated 12/05/2017 and minute DSC/51/2017 and signed by Baryantuma John Munono.

? Senior HR Officer position (Asiime Ruth) –Substantively appointed by letter dated 10.4.2017 with min extract DSC/33/2017 and signed by Baryantuma Johnson.

? Internal Auditor position – filled on assignment (by Maguma Richard) with letter dated 1/8/2018 under reference CR/RMC/156/1.

? Principal Medical Officer (Dr. Musimenta Emmanuel) – position substantively filled as per appointment letter dated 6nd July 2012, minute DSC/114/2012 and letter signed by Batambuze Abdu.

? Senior Agricultural Officer (Tugume Dennis) – position is not substantively appointed but only acting staff assigned.

? Procurement Officer (Tushabe Emilly) – position filled as per appointment letter 19/3/2013 under min DSC/28/2013 and signed by Ssebude Joseph.

? Principal Community Development Officer (Birungi Front) – position substantively filled as per appointment letter dated 4th July 2017 under DSC min. 35/2017 and signed by Munono Baryantuma.

? Senior Planner – position substantively filled (by Katende Raban) as per letter dated 19/3/2013 – signed by Ssebude Joseph.

? Principal Commercial Officer position – filled on assignment (by Owoesi Jilly Perry) with letter dated 7/4/2015 under reference CR/RMC/161/3 and signed by Otim Andre Kibwota.

<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: All 11 HoDs and Units were appraised during FY 2017/18 using standard guidelines from MoPS by various officers. This represents 100% of HoDs appraised. Appraisal dates for some of those HoDs were: 30/8/2018 signed by Lilian Kobusingye (T/Clerk), 9.08.2017 signed by Kobusingye, 12.9.2018 signed by Kobusingye, 19.7.2018 signed by Kobusingye, 10.9.2018 signed by Kobusingye. Having all HoDs appraised represents 100% compliance of this indicator.</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 staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to records viewed, submission lists viewed and personnel personal files looked through, there were no positions submitted to DSC by Town Clerk's office via HR section for recruitment. These submissions viewed indicate that absence of any submission of position for recruitment represents 100% due to absence of assessable indicator.</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>• Submission lists for confirmation viewed at HR office at Rukungiri Municipality indicate that 9 cases were submitted from Town Clerk's office to DSC. A sample of three staff submitted for confirmation contains details as follows: Submission list dated 24/1/2018 and signed by Kobusingye Lilian – Kanyanjyeyo Raban (Asst Agric Officer), DSC55/2017; Kemigisha Ritah (Office Attendant) with Min extract DSC56/2017; Kwetegyeka Jimmy (Town Agent) with min extract DSC/53/2017; Twinomuhwezi Isaiah (Askari) with min extract DSC/57/2017. A list of confirmed staff during FY 2017/18 indicated that all 9 staff submitted were confirmed as per minute extracts indicated against each staff's name. The DSC meeting dated 21/3/2018 confirmed all the 9 staff submitted. Confirmation letters dated 9th April 2018 for all confirmed staff further add more evidence to this indicator. Thus 9 out of 9 represents 100% of staff considered for confirmation in Rukungiri Municipal Council 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>• According to review of submission lists for disciplinary action, only one staff was submitted for disciplinary action in Rukungiri Municipality. Records submitted indicate that this one staff was discussed during a DSC meeting convened on 28/9/2017. Disciplinary decision was arrived at and a letter dated 27/12/2017 issued with reference CR/RMC/157 and signed by Kobusingye Lilian no evidence of any staff submitted to District Service Commission for disciplinary action during FY 2017/18. Compliance in considering the only staff submitted for disciplinary action represents a consideration of 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>• In Rukungiri Municipal Council during FY 2017/18, there were no new staff recruited and therefore no new staff could access payroll within at least two months of recruitment. This therefore represents 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>Rukungiri Municipal Council submitted only 3 case who retired during FY 2017/18. The staff pension payroll list presented and verified indicated that these three retired staff:</p> <p>(Sempa Vincent, cleaner) retired on as per letter of retirement dated 12/1/2018 – accessed payroll register on 30/5/2018 i.e. 5 months later,</p> <p>Kamusiime John (Porter) retired as per payroll register and letter dated 20/12/2017 – accessed pension payroll on 9/4/2018 i.e. 4 months later;</p> <p>Tumusiime Enock (Education Officer) retired as per payroll register and letter dated 24/4/2018 - accessed pension payroll on 5/6/2018 i.e. 2 months later. Pension Invoice payroll verified against IPPS numbers of these staff showed that one out of 3 of these retired staff accessed his gratuity pension pay within 2 months of retiring and the other two accessed beyond 2 months. Therefore, one staff who accessed pension payroll within 2 months of retirement in Rukungiri Municipality represents 33.3% compliance.</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 Municipal Council OSR increased by 13% from UGX 296,597,784 in the FY 2016/7 to UGX 334,953,699 in the FY 2017/18. This is less than 10% increment. (Source: financial statements for 2017/18)</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 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 71% (UGX 334,953,699/472,344,588). This resulted in a budget variance of 29% which is higher than 10%.(Source: budget and financial statements for FY2016/17)</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The MC remitted UGX 22,485,271 out of UGX 44,389,997 collected out of Local Service Tax on payroll, constituting 51%. This was slightly higher than 50% they were required to remit. They therefore complied with the statutory requirements of the Local Governments Act CAP 243.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the 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 38,630,600 in the FY 2017/18 on Council allowances and emoluments compared to UGX 296,597,784 collected in the FY 2016/17. This constituted 13 % of OSR for the FY 2016/17 (less than 20%) as per Section 4 of the Local Governments Act.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			



<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The district had a substantively appointed procurement officer (Tushabe Emily) appointment letter dated 19th March 2013 under Min. DSC/28/2013 signed by Town Clerk (Joseph Sebude) and no assistant procurement officer.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>In the previous FY the municipal TEC handled four infrastructure projects and there was evidence that they produced and submitted reports to the contracts committee as shown below;</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance VIP latrines for Rukungiri and Town council Primary Schools were evaluated on the same day 18th September 2017 under minute number 4/a/MCC/2017/2018 and 4/b/MCC/2017/2018 respectively, TEC produced reports on the same day which were submitted to the contracts committee on 20/09/17.</p> <p>Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine for Kiyaga Primary School was evaluated on 10th January 2018 under minute number 10/MCC/2017/2018, TEC produced a report on the same day which was submitted to the contracts committee on 23rd January 2018.</p> <p>Construction of a pit latrine at Rukungiri municipal council offices no evaluation was done, the contracts committee approved use of force on account on 28th August 2017 under minute number 24/C/MCC/2017/2018.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The contracts committee considered the recommendations of the TEC and approved the award of the contracts without any deviations for all projects;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 5 stance VIP latrines for Rukungiri and Town council Primary Schools the contracts committee approved and awarded as per the TEC report on 20/09/2018 under minute number 29/ii/MCC/2017/18 and 29/iii/MCC/2017/18 respectively.</li> <li>• Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine for Kiyaga Primary School the contracts committee approved and awarded as per the TEC report on 23/01/2018 under minute number 51/b/MCC2017/18.</li> <li>• Construction of a pit latrine at Rukungiri municipal council offices the contracts committee approved use of force on account.</li> </ul>	<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 a procurement and disposal plan for FY 2018/2019 which was signed by the Town Clerk on 23/07/18 and received by PPDA on 26/07/2018 covering all Infrastructure projects in the approved AWP for the current FY 2018/2019.</p> <p>The LG procured as per the procurement plan in the previous FY 2017/18, all the four implemented projects existed in the procurement plan of the FY 2017/2018.</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 26th July 2018 and approved by the Town Clerk there were 5 infrastructure projects (exclusive of road maintenance) and the LG had not yet prepared the bid documents for any of the projects 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 four infrastructure 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 5 stance VIP latrines for Kiyaga, Rukungiri and Town council Primary Schools the budget was 20 million Ushs each and selective bidding was used.</li> <li>• Construction of a pit latrine at Rukungiri municipal council offices the budget was 12 million Ushs and selective bidding was to be used but the contracts committee approved use of force on account on 28th August 2017 under minute number 24/C/MCC/2017/2018.</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 all the infrastructure projects implemented there was evidence of certification though not all projects were issued with both interim and completion certificates as indicated;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine for Rukungiri Primary School two certificates were issued dated 08/02/18 and 30/07/18.</li> <li>• Construction of a pit latrine at Rukungiri municipal council offices no certificate was issued.</li> <li>• Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine for Rukungiri Town council Primary School two certificates were issued dated 27/11/17 and 28/11/17.</li> <li>• Construction of 5 stance VIP latrines for Kiyaga Primary School two certificates were issued dated 27/04/18 and 30/06/18.</li> </ul> <p>The above showed that the certification was not appropriate since one project was not certified.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 four infrastructure projects implemented in the previous FY 2017/2018 none had a site board.</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 available. The LG was put on Tier one of the IFMIS the process and the staff were conversant with the new system. The BRS for the months of July and August were duly signed by the Accountant and the Principal Treasurer. The BRS for July and August were produced using both Manual and electronic systems.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY <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>While payments were made on time (within 30 days) in the health sector, 2 of the 3 sampled payments in the education were paid beyond 30 days as agreed in the contracts. This was because of the introduction of a new IFMIS system which would obstruct and delay the payment system in its early stages of implementation.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 Municipal Internal Auditor (Mr Baguma Richard) was not substantively appointed but was assigned the job as per letter REF: CR/RMC/1561 dated 1st August 2018. He is substantively appointed a Senior Finance Officer (scale U3) by the District Service Commission under minute NO. 69/2018 as per appointment letter dated June 1st August 2018 both of them signed by the Town Clerk (Ms Kobusingye Lillian).</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The DIA produced 4 quarterly Internal Audit reports. First quarterly report was dated 30th October 2017. The Second quarter report was dated 31st January 2018. The 3rd quarter report was dated 30th April 2018 and the 4th quarter report was dated 25th July 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 evidence that the LG provided information to Council and LGPAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The first quarter report was received was received by TC, LGPAC and Mayor on 30th October 2017.</li> <li>2. 2nd quarter report was received by TC and Mayor on 31st January 2018.</li> <li>3. 3rd quarter report was received by the Mayor and LGPAC on 30th April 2018</li> <li>4. 4th quarter report was received by TC, Mayor and LGPAC on 25th July 2018.</li> </ol> <p>The LGPAC produced a report of discussion of the internal audit report dated 22nd May 2018 signed by the LGPAC Chairperson addressed to the Municipal Mayor .</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 the LG provided information to Council and LGPAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The first quarter report was received was received by TC, LGPAC and Mayor on 30th October 2017.</li> <li>2. 2nd quarter report was received by TC and Mayor on 31st January 2018.</li> <li>3. 3rd quarter report was received by the Mayor and LGPAC on 30th April 2018</li> <li>4. 4th quarter report was received by TC, Mayor and LGPAC on 25th July 2018.</li> </ol> <p>The Municipal Council discussed the LGPAC report in a Council meeting of 6th June 2018 under Min RMC/Min.30/c/2017/18</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>The LG maintains updated assets register on works and vehicles both in physical and electronic form. The assets register was comprehensive and included assets of all other government institutions in the district including; land for, the various institutions. They are well updated and were in an approved format as per the LGFAM.</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 Municipal Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues.</p> <p>The Municipal Council meeting held on 28/3/2018,2018,21/12/2017,31/10/2017,30/8/2018 discussed service delivery issues eg Establishment of a primary school in Kitimba ward western Division, mock results, Sensitisation of parents and children on education, Repair of Latrines and fencing and ,Monitoring reports</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>The Municipal Council has a designated person to coordinate response to feedback as evidenced by the appointment letter of Mr Tusiime Ambrose Principal Community Development Officer dated 16 July 2017.</p>	<p>1</p>



<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which should be displayed at LG offices and made publically available: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>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 municipal staff for the month of 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 2018/2019 was found published at the Municipal Council Notice Board. Notice of awarded contract for 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 was found on display</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 performance assessment results for the previous financial year 2016/2017 were displayed on the public notice board on 31/8/2018</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>A letter from the District planner dated 31 /8/2018 ref CR/RMC/156/4 Explained Indicative planning Figures,Local Government assessment results to LLG staff</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>There was no evidence that LG during the previous FY conducted discussions with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 minutes of the technical planning committee meeting held on 28/08/2017 under minute number TPC91/MIN/2017/2018 and signed by the chairperson on 25th September 2017, report on mentoring on gender mainstreaming signed and approved by the Town Clerk on 14th November 2017 and report on dissemination of gender information received and signed by the Town Clerk on 13th September 2017.</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 mobilization and sensitization of stakeholders, monitoring and supervision of projects among others as activities for the current FY 2018/2019 as evidenced in the AWP for the FY 2018/2019 which was generated on 20/07/2018 and signed by the Town Clerk.</p> <p>The previous year's budget was 192,239,000Ushs and the total expenditure approved as provided by the CDO amounts 173,305,754Ushs which was 90.2% 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 four infrastructure projects that were done (construction of 5 stance VIP latrines for Kiyaga, Rukungiri and Town coucil Primary Schools and construction of a pit latrine at Rukungiri municipal council offices) there was evidence of environmental screening carried out and there was proof of budget (3,412,000Ushs) for 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 projects implemented in the 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 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 four implemented projects in the FY 2017/2018 two were implemented on land where LG had proof of ownership (land titles for plots 48-66 where a pit latrine for RMC offices was constructed and plot 2142 where a 5 stance VIP latrine was constructed for town council P/S) both land titles were dated 27th June 2018. For the other two projects at Kiyaga and Rukungiri primary school there was no proof of land ownership.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 four projects had completed certification forms signed by the environmental officer and CDO.</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 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 all the four projects (construction of 5 stance VIP latrines for Kiyaga, Rukungiri and Town coucil Primary Schools and construction of a pit latrine at Rukungiri municipal council offices) before payment was effected as evidenced by attached environmental and social mitigation certification forms to payment vouchers.</p>	<p>1</p>

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

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>The LG education de- partment has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>According to the PBS generated on 05/05 2018, the MC budgeted for Ugx 1,241,592,000 in the FY 2018/19 for all the 177 teachers on payroll. The LG budgeted for a minimum of a head teacher per school and at least a teacher per class.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>A review of the teachers list obtained from the Municipal Education Officer as compared with staff list from the sampled schools ( Nyakibare Lower PS &amp; Rukungiri P.S ,Nyakibare Upper BPS) revealed that a head teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school had been deployed for the current FY.2018/19</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>Review of wage IPFs revealed that there are 177 primary teachers with a wage bill provision of Ugx 1,241,592,000 for the year 2018/19</p> <p>Review of approved structure for primary school teachers revealed that there are 177 established positions of primary teachers filled.</p> <p>Hence 100% of the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision for the current year has been filled</p>	6

<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 was one budgeted position of a school inspector which was substantively filled. However, there was additionally assigned inspector of schools who was substantively an appointed head teacher.</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 recruitment plan vote 778 FY 17/18 submitted by the head of Education department received by acting deputy Town Clerk (Tagobya Prosper) dated 8/12/2016 ref .CR/RMC/115/1 showing recruitment of</p> <p>i) Twenty six (26) education assistants (teachers)</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Inspectors: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was recruitment plan vote 778 FY 17/18 submitted by the head of Education department received by acting deputy Town Clerk (Tagobya Prosper) dated 8/12/2016 ref .CR/RMC/115/1 showing recruitment of One(1) inspector of schools and salary to be paid per month.</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 exists only 2 School Inspector in Rukungiri Municipality. Personal file, appraisal reports and list of school inspectors viewed indicate that School Inspector Katabazi Alfred Mutuza was appraised by Kyahurwa David Mwesigwa and report is dated 22/6/2018.</li> </ul> <p>The second Inspector of Schools, Musimenta Juliet was appraised by Katabazi Alfred Mutuza and her appraisal report is dated 1/8/2018.</p> <p>Since all/both Inspectors of school were appraised, this therefore represents a percentage of 100%.</p>	3
<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>• Rukungiri Municipality has 15 Primary Schools. Head Teachers of all these 15 P/Schools were found to be appraised as per verified documentation. A sample of 7 schools were picked as follows:</li> </ul> <p>Kitozigurukwa PS – Head Teacher is Twehangane Henry was appraised on 19/3/2018 by Karenzi Paul</p> <p>Head Teacher Byarugaba Henry of Nyakibale PS was appraised on 23/7/2018 by Kobusingye Lilian.</p> <p>Mugisha Bruno of Nyakibale Pr School was appraised by Akankwasa Moses as per report dated 1/2/2018.</p> <p>Kiconco Siraji of Rukungiri P S was appraised by Karenzi Paul as per report dated 30/2/2018</p> <p>Tugume Godfrey of Rukundo PS was appraised by Adirwe Kashaha as per appraisal report dated 3/4/2018</p> <p>Kweyamba Alice of Kyatoko PS was appraised by Akankwasa Moses as per appraisal report dated 3/4/2018.</p> <p>Tumushangye Benard of Kinyasano Boarding PS was appraised by Kyaluma David as per report dated 17/7/2018. This list of Head Teachers and appraisal performance agreements/reports shows that 7 out of 7 is a percentage of 100%.</p>	3

<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 no evidence (a communication letter) to indicate that the Municipal Education Officer communicated ALL guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools.</p> <p>In the sampled schools (Kinyasano BPS,Rukungiri PS,Nyakibare Lower PS,Nyakibare Upper BPS, Rukungiri Town Council PS ), only guidelines on school adherence were found during the visits. 0</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 Municipal Education Officer's office had minutes of meetings where circulars were discussed and explained with head teachers, held on 13/08/17,05/12/2017,17/11/2017, 04/06/2018,but not all policies circulars were not mentioned</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all registered primary schools<sup>2</sup></p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100% - score 12</li> <li>o 90 to 99% - score 10</li> <li>o 80 to 89% - score 8</li> <li>o 70 to 79% - score 6</li> <li>o 60 to 69% - score 3</li> <li>o 50 to 59 % score 1</li> <li>o Below 50% score 0.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence of inspections, for several licensed schools, on 05/11/2017 inspection was conducted by Alfred Mutuza at Kinyasano Boarding P.S on 18/10/2017, 25/09/2017 inspection was conducted by Madam Musiimenta Juliet, at Rukungiri P/S ,and at Nyakibale upper BPS inspection was conducted by Musiimenta Juliet on 12/05/18 at Rukungiri Town Council inspection was conducted on 23/03/2018,</p>	<p>12</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>A review of minutes of departmental meetings held on 13/08/2018, 23/08/2017, 5/12/2017 &amp; 27/03/2018 did not have record of discussions of school inspection reports and recommendations for corrective actions</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 notes were found e.g of the 3rd quarter 27/07/2018 was signed by Mugume Stephen, on 13/2/18 it was received by Kirenda Winnie (Secretary)</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>There was no evidence provided that inspection recommendations are followed</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>The list of schools as submitted by the LG Education department ( PBS generated by 14/05/2018,01:04 )is consistent with EMIS obtained from the MoES.</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>There was evidence that LG submitted consistent data on enrolment. The EMIS data obtained from the MoES indicates enrollment of 5,646 while PBS showed total enrollment of 5,743.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the 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 which met on the following days: 16/5/2018; 01/03/2018; 14/12/2017 and 8/8/2017 discussed issues like Inspection and monitoring of Primary schools, absenteeism of teachers and pupils and PLE performance</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>21/12/2017 from these minutes there was proof that the education sector committee presented issues that required approval of Council</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 MEO's office:</p> <p>Kinyasano Boarding P.S: 23/8/2017, &amp;06/ 12/2017</p> <p>Nyakibare lower P.S : 30/04/2018, 04/06/2018, 23/06/2017,19/09/2017</p> <p>Rukungiri P.S: 06/12/2018, 06/12/2017,09/04/2017</p> <p>Nyakibare Upper boarding P.S: 24/08/2017, 14/07/2017</p> <p>Rukungiri Town Council P.S: 28/07/2017, 26,/05/2018, 03/03/2018</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non- wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>There was a list on the wall on the main notice board on the main entrance of the council building , with a list of schools and the amounts that each of the schools received as non-wage recurrent grants dated,24/02/2018</p> <p>In addition all schools visited had UPE grant published.</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, 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 on 18th/April/2018 and was received by 30th April 2018</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3.</li> </ul>	<p>The MC implemented three projects during the FY for construction of VIP Latrines at the following schools. 1. Rukungiri Town Council Primary School by Kyatoko Technical and Supplies Ltd, 2. Rukungiri Primary school by Extech Technical Services Ltd and 3. Kiyaga Primary School by Aban Services Ltd . Except for Aban Services Ltd, which was paid within 22 days, the rest of the above contractors were paid beyond 30 days. Management contended that the introduction of IFMIS was the major cause of the delayed payments.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15th of July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>The department submitted to the Planner the annual performance report for the previous FY 2017/2018 on 11th July 2018 as evidenced by acknowledgement receipt from the Municipal Planner</p>	<p>4</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</li> <li>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>The education department had 11 internal audit findings in quarter 5 of which the Municipal Education Officer (Mr. Kyaburwa David) responded to in a letter REF CR/RMC/300 dated May 2nd, 2018. The remaining 6 audit findings were responded to by the Head teacher of St Gerald, Nyakibaare SS (Mr. Byaruhanga Nazarius) in his letter dated 10th May 2018. All audit finding were responded accordingly to.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills, etc.: Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There were no guidelines available on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills in the sampled schools</p>	<p>0</p>



<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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>In minutes of meetings held on the 17/11/2017, 04/06/2018, 23/3/2018,16/08/2017 and 5/08/2017 there was record of explanation of some but NOT all guidelines to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The 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, Nyakibare lower and upper, Rukungiri P.S and Kinyasano P.S had females, thus complying with the guidelines.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 1:</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence (communication letter) was provided to indicate that guidelines on environmental management were disseminated.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all school infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The MEO did not provide evidence (a risk mitigation plan) that indicate 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.</p> <p>However a there was a single report environment report on screening for a 5 stance VIP pit latrine dated 11/Oct.2017 signed by the principle community development officer(Tusiime Ambrose).</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There were no mitigation plans in the first place hence no evidence (site visit reports) shown by the environmental and community development officers to indicate that sites visits were made to check whether the mitigation plans are compiled with..</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 wage IPFs (generated on 19/07/2018) revealed that there are 73 positions of health worker with a wage bill provision for the year 2018/19</li> <li>• Review of the PBS (generated on 14/05/2018 01:04) and approved structure revealed that there are 73 established position of primary health workers filled.</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/re- quest to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of primary health care workers: score 6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a staff establishment and recruitment plan for the year 2018/19 viewed from the approved performance contract generated on the 17/07/2018 at 05:35</li> <li>• Review of the recruitment plan revealed that 21 vacant positions of primary health care workers had been included</li> <li>• There was a submission letter from the MHO to the Principle Human Resource officer dated and received by the HRM on the 04/07/2017</li> </ul>	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 is only one Health Centre 4 in Rukungiri Municipal Council. Jonathan Ronald Kintu was found to have been appraised by Dr. Musimenta and Kobusingye Lilian as per appraisal report dated 29/6/2018. This represents 100% compliance.</li> </ul>	<p>8</p>
<p>The Local Government Health department has deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY, and if not provided justification for deviations: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>The number of midwives and enrolled nurses deployed at Rukungiri HC IV (e.g. 3 enrolled midwives &amp; 3 enrolled nurses), Rwakabengo HC III (e.g. 1 enrolled midwives &amp; 2 enrolled nurses) and Kitimba HC II ( e.g. 2 enrolled nurses) 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 14/05/2018 01:04)</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Monitoring and Supervision</p>			

<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO/ MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence (a communication letter) to indicate that the MHO communicated ALL of the following guidelines issued by the national level in the FY 2017/18:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ministry of Health Guidelines for Local Government Planning Process Health Sector Supplement – 2017</li> <li>Ministry of Health, Sector Grant and Budget Guidelines to Local Governments FY 2018/19</li> <li>Ministry of Health, Policy Strategies for Improving Health Service Delivery 2016-2021</li> </ol> <p>These guidelines found at Rukungiri HC IV but not at Rwakabengo HC III nor at Kitimba HC II</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO/ MHO has held meetings with health facility in- charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>There were two MHT meeting held on the 23/11/2017 and on the 27/6/2018 however there is no minute in their meeting minutes to indicate that the MHO held meetings with health facility in-charges during the FY 2017/18 and among others explaining the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: score 3</p>	<p>There was no evidence (integrated support supervision reports FY 2017/18) to indicate that the MHT supervised 100% of HC IVs during FY 2017/18. Review of the supervision log book at Rukungiri HC IV revealed that it had not been supervised by the MHT during the FY 2017/18.</p> <p>NOTE - There are no hospitals or PNFPs receiving PHC grant under the mandate of Rukungiri municipal council.</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 MHT provided no evidence (copies of support supervision reports) that Rukungiri HC IV supervised lower level health facilities within the FY 2017/18.</p> <p>Review of the supervision log book at Kitimba HC II revealed that it had NOT been supervised by the Rukungiri HC IV in the FY 2017/18. In addition review of the supervision log book at Rwakabengo HC III revealed that it had not been supervised by the Rukungiri HC IV in the FY 2017/18</p> <p>Reason given by the LG was that Rukungiri HC IV is not a recognized HSD hence it did not receive funding for HSD activities</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 MHT and the HSD (Rukungiri HC IV) did not provided the 4 mandatory quarterly integrated support supervision reports for the FY 2017/18.</p> <p>MHT meeting held on the 23/11/2017 under minute 3/MHD/2017 indicated a discussion of a supervision report and another MHT meeting held on 27/6/2018 under minute 8/MHD/2017 indicated a discussion of a supervision report however these fall short of the 4 mandatory quarterly integrated support supervision reports</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</li> <li>– up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</li> </ul>	<p>The office of the Municipal Health Office did not have quarterly support supervision and monitoring visit reports for FY 2017/18. 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>There are 6 health facilities (Katwekamwe Health Centre II, Rukungiri Health Centre IV, Marumba Health Centre 11, Rwakabengo Health Centre III, Karangaro Health Centre II and Kitimba Health Centre II) receiving PHC funding (in PBS) is consistent with the list received from MoH indicating health facilities reporting 2018/19. All these HFs are listed under Rukungiri district as the HIMS system does not have Rukungiri Municipal Council as a LG.</p>	<p>10</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Council Committee responsible for health met on 1/3/2018, where supervision of Health facilities, and monitoring reports were discussed.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>From the minutes dated 21/12/2017 social services committee presented issues that required council approval</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 6 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 none held the four mandatory HUMC meetings and meetings minutes presented.</p> <p>Rukungiri HC IV presented only 3 HUMC meeting minutes because appointment of new HUMC member happened after the 1st quarter.</p> <p>Kitimba HC II, Rwakabengo HC III and Katwekamwe HC II presented only 2 HUMC meeting minutes because they had held only 2 HUMC meetings during FY 2017/18. The reason given was due to the lack of sufficient funds to hold the four mandatory HUMC meetings.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>There was posting on the public notice board at the MHOs 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>

Procurement and contract management



<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 MHO provided a procurement plan prepared by the MHO and received by the Head of PDU on the 24th 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 PMO on the 12th August 2017 and was signed for confirmation of funding by the Town Clerk 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 MC did not have any construction contracts in the health department. There were only three supplies in the FY 2017/18. The DHO was able to certify and pay suppliers on time as evidenced ahead: National water and Sewerage Corporation (UGX 200,000) invoice dated 5th /10/2017 and paid on 13th October 2017, Byaruhanga Amos Contractors with two requisitions on 12th September and was paid (UGX 280,000 and UGX 250,000 respectively on the same day</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>The department submitted to the Planner the annual performance report for the previous FY 2017/2018 on 11th July 2018 as evidenced by the acknowledgement receipt from the Municipal Planner</p>	<p>4</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Health department had 1 audit query in the second quarter on absenteeism of staff to which the Principal Medical Officer (Dr Musimenta Emmanuel) responded in a letter dated 29th March 2018 and 2 audit queries in the 3rd quarter audit report to which the Principal health Inspector (Ms Mary Grace Tumuhairwe) responded in a letter RF RMC/105 dated 11th May 2018.</li> </ul>	<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 % women: score 2</li> </ul>	<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>Rukungiri HC IV (3 female &amp; 4 male)</p> <p>Kitimba HC II (2 female &amp; 4 male)</p> <p>Rwakabengo HC III (3 female &amp; 4 male)</p> <p>Katwekamwe HC II (2 female &amp; 5 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).</p> <p>Rukungiri HC IV had toilets well labeled labeled for Male and Female however no guidelines were found there nor at the other sampled facilities.</p> <p>Toilets at Kitimba 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>There was no provision for PHC development for the municipality during the FY 2017/18, so the PMO did not implement any health facility infrastructure projects that year - hence no evidence to indicated that health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects and that risk mitigation plans are developed.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>No site visit reports by the district EO or CDO were availed as the health department did not implement any health facility infrastructure projects during FY 2017/18.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal: score 4.</li> </ul>	<p>All sampled HFs had a poster on medical waste management guidelines pinned in either the laboratory or maternity or both.</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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</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.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 15</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 10</li> <li>o If 60-79: Score 5</li> <li>o If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	0
Monitoring and Supervision			

<p>The district Water department carries out monthly monitoring of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the district Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15</li> <li>• 80% - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10</li> <li>• 70 - 79%: score 7</li> <li>• 60% - 69% monitored: score 5</li> <li>• 50% - 59%: score 3</li> <li>• Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The district Water department has submitted input for district's procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted input for the district procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the contract manager prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has certified and initiated payment for works and supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<p>The district Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>



<p>The District Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</li> <li>If sector has no audit query score 5</li> <li>If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3</li> <li>If queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If communities apply for water/ public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water and Sanitation Committees that are functioning evidenced by either: i) collection of O&amp;M funds, ii) carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, iii) facility fenced/protected, or iv) they an M&amp;E plan for the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul> <p>Note: One of parameters above is sufficient for the score.</p>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/ 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>Not applicable as Water Supply and Sewerage Services in Rukungiri Municipal Council are provided and managed by National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) which is an autonomous entity under the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	<p>0</p>