



Local Government Performance Assessment

Kaberamaido District

(Vote Code: 514)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	50%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	64%
Educational Performance Measures	77%
Health Performance Measures	65%
Water Performance Measures	71%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From MoFPED's inventory/schedule of LG submissions of performance contracts, check dates of submission and issuance of receipts and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If LG submitted before or by due date, then state 'compliant' o If LG had not submitted or submitted later than the due date, state 'non-compliant' • From the Uganda budget website: www.budget.go.ug, check and compare recorded date therein with date of LG submission to confirm. 	<p>Kaberamaido district was compliant with the PFMAA and LG budget submission guidelines. Performance Contracts were submitted on line on the 30th of July 2018 and duly received at the MoFPED on the same date as reflected on inventory/schedule of LG submissions of Performance contracts generated at the MoFPED on the 28th of August 2018.</p> <p>The Performance contract was approved by MoFPED on the 31st of July 2018.</p> <p>Hard copies of the Performance contracts were also available at the District Planning unit duly endorsed by the CAO and the District LC V chairperson.</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"> • From MoFPED's inventory of LG budget submissions, check whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The LG budget is accompanied by a Procurement Plan or not. If a LG submission includes a Procurement Plan, the LG is compliant; otherwise it is not compliant. 	<p>Kaberaido district was not compliant with the PFMAA and LG budget submission guidelines. Budget estimates (that included a procurement Plan as an appendix) were submitted on line on the 12th of August 2018 and duly received at the MoFPED on the same date as reflected on inventory/schedule of LG submissions of Performance contracts generated at the MoFPED on the 28th of August 2018. The estimates were approved on the 13th of August by MoFPED.</p>	<p>No</p>
--	--	--	-----------

Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports

<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted report to MoFPED in time, then it is compliant • If LG submitted late or did not submit, then it is not compliant 	<p>Kaberaido district was not compliant with the requirement to submit the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before the 31st of July. The Annual Performance Report was submitted on line to MoFPED on 31st of August 2018. By the time the MoFPED generated the inventory/schedule of LG submissions of Performance contracts on the 28th of August 2018 Kaberaido district was not included on the list.</p> <p>Reasons mentioned for the non compliance included challenges faced by staff in the use of the newly introduced PBS system that resulted in delays in the Performance Contract and other subsequent reports.</p>	<p>No</p>
--	--	---	-----------

<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY by end of the FY; PFMA Act, 2015).</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/ inventory of LG submission of quarterly reports submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the quarterly performance reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted all four reports to MoFPED of the previous FY by July 31, then it is compliant (timely submission of each quarterly report, is not an accountability requirement, but by end of the FY, all quarterly reports should be available). • If LG submitted late or did not submit at all, then it is not compliant. 	<p>Kaberaido district was not compliant with the requirement to submit the quarterly budget performance report by the 31st July as per PFMA Act 2015 (including quarterly reports). The Quarterly budget performance report was submitted on line on the 31st of August 2018 (which was after the expiry of the deadline of submission date of August 1st). The submission date was not reflected on the inventory/schedule of LG submissions of Quarterly reports generated at the MoFPED on the 28th of August 2018.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Audit</p>			

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and the Auditor General's findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action in 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"> • If LG submitted a 'Response' (and provide details), then it is compliant • If LG did not submit a 'response', then it is non-compliant • If there is a response for all –LG is compliant • If there are partial or not all issues responded to – LG is not compliant. 	<p>The LG submitted the status on implementation of internal audit recommendations on 23 March 2018 as per the stamps appended to the submission document</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>From the Auditor General's report the LG obtained an unqualified audit report.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a district/ municipality has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 1. 	<p>In general terms the office of the Physical Planner of Kaberamaido district is not operational as there was no budget allocation to the unit and there is no substantive Physical Planner.</p> <p>The district has no functional Physical Planning Committee; neither does it have a Physical Development Plan.</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"> • Evidence that district/ MLG has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD score 1. 	<p>Physical Planning committee does not exist and therefore there were no meetings held and hence no minutes produced.</p>	0

<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All infrastructure investments are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan: score 1 or else 0 	<p>Consistency of investment projects with the Physical Development Plan could not be ascertained as the district does not have a Physical Development Plan.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action area plan prepared for the previous FY: score 1 or else 0 	<p>No evidence (in form of copies of physical Plans) was presented to the Assessor to confirm that Area Action Plans were developed during the previous FY, although the Ag. Physical Planner (Environment Officer) stated that Area Action plans had been developed for :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alwa sub-county - Ochero sub-county - Kobulubulu sub-county - Kalaki sub-county - Anyana sub-county. <p>Copies of the above were allegedly at the sub counties.</p> <p>The only copy that was seen was for Kaberamaido sub county but the assessor could not confirm that it was developed during the previous FY.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2. 	<p>Evidence was adduced by the Senior Planner in form of a Budget conference report, to confirm that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences.</p> <p>The budget conference was convened on the 19th of December 2017. A review of the report indicated the sectors (including those relevant to the assessment exercise- health, water & education) made presentations of their priorities for further discussion and approval by the conference. Page 5 of the report summarises the sector presentations of key priorities, while pages 10 to 14 of the report summarise the key priorities for all sectors that were vetted during the budget conference.</p>	<p>2</p>
--	--	---	----------

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If differences appear, a justification has to be provided and evidence provided that it was approved by the Council. Score 1. 	<p>Evidence was provided to the Assessor to confirm that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY were derived from the approved five-year development plan. The evidence provided included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A copy of an approved 5 Yr Development Plan that was approved by council. A review of the DDP revealed capital investments listed on pages; 117, 123, 124, 125, 134& 137. The investments included construction and /or rehabilitation of classrooms, construction of latrine stances, construction and Rehabilitation of Kaberamaido Office block, low cost ceiling of Kalaki-Opio road, Equipping of Kalaki HCIII and construction of \piped water scheme at Alwa Trading Centre. - A copy of an approved work plan (AWP) for the current year. A review of the AWP revealed that the same projects are included in the AWP on pages: 62, 76, 77, 85 & 143. 	<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"> • Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 2. 	<p>Kaberamaido district did not develop project profiles for the FY 2017/18.</p> <p>The Senior Planner indicated that the respective sectors failed to develop project profiles for their sector specific projects while the Senior Planner was engaged in many planning activities for the district since the Planning Unit consists of only one staff (the Senior Planner).</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual statistical abstract, with gender-disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum score 1. 	<p>Kaberamaido district developed Annual statistical abstracts, with gender disaggregated data that was presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evidence was presented in form of a Statistical Abstracts booklet 2017/18 that was duly by the CAO on the 15/08/17. - The statistical abstracts were presented to the TPC to support budget allocation during the TPC meeting that sat on the 13/07/17 as as per minute extract 13/Jul/DTPC/2017. 	<p>1</p>

<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2 	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evidence provided included a list of projects that were included in the AWP and also included in the budget of the previous year. <p>The projects were stated on the following pages of the AWP; 62, 76, 77, 85 & 143.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The same projects were reflected in the annual budget estimates and stated on the following pages of the budget document with their indicative budgets; pages; 27, 39, 40, 42, 54 & 55. 	<p>2</p>
<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>The investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by the end of the FY. This constituted a percentage completion of 95 %.</p> <p>A comparison was made of the planned investment projects in the Annual work Plan and Budget with the projects reported in the Annual Budget Performance Report and the final accounts available in the CFO's office. The projects looked at included that of sitting, design and construction of five (5) deep boreholes that was completed pending payment of retention fees,</p> <p>Rehabilitation of 9 boreholes of which 7 boreholes were rehabilitated pending payment of retention fees of 5%.</p> <p>Completion of a theater at Kalaki Health Center III that was completed pending settlement of the retention fees.</p> <p>Construction of 2 classroom block at Otuboi Township primary school completed but pending settlement of retention fees.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	<p>All investment projects in the previous FY were completed within the approved budget- Maximum 15% plus or minus of the original budget.</p> <p>A review of information contained in the Annual budget performance report (as part of the Q4 report submitted to MoFPED and the Annual Final Accounts confirmed that the projects were completed within the approved budgets.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	<p>There was evidence presented to the Assessor to confirm that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY.</p> <p>The Evidence was in form of budget estimates for 2017/18 (generated from the OBT) indicated that no department spent less than 80% of their O&M budgets. Examples reviewed included the following O&M budget lines across the sectors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning Unit. Budgeted for renovation of office. Budgeted 400,000=, spent 400,000 (100%). Works and Housing: Budgeted maintenance of buildings at 5,000,000=, Spent 5,000,000= (100%) - Health: Repairs and maintenance of Office Equipment. Budgeted 1, 600, 000=, spent 1,682,000= (105%) - Education. Budgeted for maintenance of buildings at 300,000=, spent 300,000= (100%) - Production: Fisheries unit budgeted 400,000= for office equipment, spent 4,670, 000= (1168%). Over spend due to release of additional funds through a supplementary budget - Administration: Maintenance of buildings: budgeted 400,000=, spent 400,000= (100%). 	<p>2</p>
<p>Human Resource Management</p>			

<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3 	<p>According the approved staff establishment structures (approved by Ministry of Public Service ARC/135/306/1 dated 26th March 2018), the District has 10 departments. Of the 10 departments only 5 are substantially filled. Details of sampled HoDS are indicated below.</p> <p>Magnet Charles: Education; appointed on accelerated promotion as a DEO on 16th June 2015. DSC 28 (i)/2015</p> <p>Odongo James: Health; appointed on promotion as a senior clinical officer on 11th Sept 2008 under DSC minute No: 21/2008-2.12. The officer was assigned duties as the DHO on 22nd March 2018 by the CAO. Ref No: CR/156/7</p> <p>Magambo Mathias: Natural Resources; appointed on promotion as a Senior Environment Officer on 26th Oct 2017, under DSC minute No: 30/2017 (a) – 1. The officer was assigned extra duties as the District Natural Resources Officer 20th April 2017 by the CAO. Ref No: CR/167/2</p> <p>The District reported that it has been advertising but has failed to attract qualified candidates for the positions not substantively filled.</p>	<p>0</p>
---	---	---	----------

LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.

• Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2

Of the 10 HoDs existing in the District (both acting and substantive) only two HoDs had been appraised and these were the acting head of works and acting DHO. Details of the status of HoD appraisal are indicated below:

Magnet Charles: Education; the performance report seen was incomplete, not rated and stamped. File No. CR/D/10231

Odela Nelson: Community Based services; the performance report seen was incomplete, not rated and stamped. File No. CR/D/10248

Ojur Francis: Finance; the performance report seen was incomplete, not rated and stamped. File No. CR/D/10231

Chakua Wilfred: Production; the appraisal report seen was not counter signed by CAO. File no. CR/D/10485

Odongo James: Health; officer was appraised, an appraisal report signed by CAO on 2/7/2018 seen. File No. CR/D/10252

Ewayu Francis: Works; the officer was appraised, a performance report signed by CAO on 1st July 2018 seen.

Magambo Mathias: Natural Resources; the last appraisal form seen was for FY 2015/16. File No. CR/D/10422

It was reported that although HR department coordinates the appraisals, the key people involved are not in the HR department e.g. the process of signing performance reports and agreement is coordinated by the DCAO.

The district officials thus recommended that there is need that appraisals should be assessed per department since it's done at departmental level.

<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 % of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	<p>From the review of the vacancy declaration forms that encompassed submission from CAO it was found out 34 positions were submitted for recruitment. Reference No of submissions were:</p> <p>a) Ref. CR/115/1 dated 24th May 2018</p> <p>b) Ref CR/156/7 dated 20th May 2018 and</p> <p>c) Un-referenced declaration of vacancy form dated 12th Feb 2018.</p> <p>All the 34 positions (100%) were considered by the DSC in the following meetings</p> <p>a) Meeting 22nd to 24th May 2018 under DSC minute No: 14/2018 and DSC meeting 7th March 2018 under DSC minute No: 4/2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	<p>From review of submissions for confirmation file no: KDSC/159/1, it was found out that 51 submissions for confirmation were sent from CAO's to the DSC. Of these only 22 were considered (43%) under the following minutes:</p> <p>a) DSC meeting of 7th March 2018, minute 4/2018</p> <p>b) DSC meeting of 20th Dec 2017, minute 36/2017</p> <p>c) DSC meeting of 19th Oct 2017, minute 30/2017</p> <p>On the other hand, 29 submissions for confirmation were not handled because these were sent in May when the commission was busy handling recruitment of new staff because they wanted the staff to access the payroll before the end of the financial</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	<p>From the review of submission of cases of disciplinary actions file Ref No: KDSC/157/1, it was found out that 2 cases of disciplinary actions were submitted to the DSC as detailed below:</p> <p>Ogwang Calvin Considered during the DSC meeting of 20th 12, 2017.</p> <p>Minute No: 36/2017 (17)</p> <p>Enywaku Alfred Not yet handled. Although the submission is dated 8th May 2018. The received stamp copy seen at DSC was dated 06/08/2018. Thus not received within the financial year being assessed. Hence does not impact on the score.</p>	<p>1</p>																		
<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3 	<p>From review of the minute extracts of the DSC it was found out that 28 new staff were appointed in 2017/18 (appointed on 25th May 2018).</p> <p>All the 28 (100%) newly appointed staff had accessed the payroll by June 30th 2018. Details of 5 of the new staff that accessed the payroll include:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name</th> <th>IPPS No.</th> <th>Date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Aripo Catherine</td> <td>1026327</td> <td>June 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Elwoku James</td> <td>1026386</td> <td>June 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Elengu Simon</td> <td>1026330</td> <td>June 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Odongo Peter</td> <td>1026337</td> <td>June 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Olupot Isaac</td> <td>1026376</td> <td>June 2018</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>It was reported that staff are able to access the payroll on time because the process is managed internally so it is easier for the payroll management team to coordinate the process and access the new staff on time. For example during the data capture if a staff presents documents he/she can be accessed within a day.</p>	Name	IPPS No.	Date	Aripo Catherine	1026327	June 2018	Elwoku James	1026386	June 2018	Elengu Simon	1026330	June 2018	Odongo Peter	1026337	June 2018	Olupot Isaac	1026376	June 2018	<p>3</p>
Name	IPPS No.	Date																			
Aripo Catherine	1026327	June 2018																			
Elwoku James	1026386	June 2018																			
Elengu Simon	1026330	June 2018																			
Odongo Peter	1026337	June 2018																			
Olupot Isaac	1026376	June 2018																			

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

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.

- Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous

FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2

From review of pension computation for 2017/18 (constituted annually) there were 25 people that retired in 2017/18 of these only 07(28%) had accessed the pension payroll. Below are details of 05 sampled pensioners that had not accessed the payroll.

Name and due date of retirement

Odong Joseph 01/01/2018

Edyangu Charles 09/04/2018

Edyau Joseph 15/04/2018

Etayu Alfred 14/02/2018

Ayabu Jacob Ochen 07/03/2018

It was reported that the delay in enrolling pensioners on the payroll is caused by involvement of a number of players who must all play their part on time before they can access the payroll.

The process starts with the pensioners themselves, the District, MoES (for teachers) and finally MoPS.

These players are not yet efficient in executing in their roles e.g. there are still delays from pensioners themselves, they delay to constitute retirement files for submission to Ministry of Public service.

Additionally, there are delays in approval of files at the MoPS partly because there are many hierarchical levels at the Ministry.

There is thus need for full decentralization of pension like it is happening with the salaries

Revenue Mobilization

<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •• If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets) from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10 %: score 4. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 2. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>Total of OSR for FY 2016/2017 was shs.175,183,413</p> <p>Total of OSR for FY 2017/2018 was shs.203,503,151</p> <p>Increase was shs.28,319,738</p> <p>Percentage increase was 16%</p> <p>The OSR for FY 2016/17 was extracted from the final accounts for the FY 2016/17</p> <p>The OSR for the financial year was extracted from the draft financial statements for the LG for the FY2017/18 provided as submitted on 31/08/2018.</p> <p>since the LG's performance in terms of increase was above 10% full score is attained.</p>	4
<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0. 	<p>Total Local Revenue Planned/Budgeted for FY 2017/2018 was shs168,567,723</p> <p>Total Local Revenue collected during FY 2017/2018 was shs.156,663,151</p> <p>Performance 93%</p> <p>The Draft financial statements for the LG for the FY2017/18 were availed but subject to audit. The details of revenue are extracted from the prepared draft financial statements and this local revenue collected is reduced by the sale of assets amounting to shs.46,840,000 as provided for in the performance assessment manual.</p>	2
<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	<p>Local Revenue collections subjected to sharing with LLGs was shs.52,032,735 for FY 2017/18</p> <p>Amount of local revenue remitted to LLGs was shs.22,650,196</p> <p>Status of compliance: 43.5%</p> <p>The LG only remitted a percentage of 40% of the LST instead of shs. 33,821,278 which is the 65% mandatory requirement</p> <p>Extracted from the revenue register, the payment vouchers.</p>	0

<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the total Council expenditures on allowances and emoluments- (including from all sources) is not higher than 20% of the OSR collected in the previous FY: score 2 	<p>Total of OSR for FY 2017/2018 Shs.200,833,155</p> <p>Total expenditure on council allowances during FY 2017/2018 Shs.126,565,000</p> <p>Percentage 62%.</p> <p>Emoluments were shs. 45,360,000 and PAYE is shs.19,440,000, council meeting shs.37,920,000, committees shs. 23,845,000</p> <p>The 62% performance is way above the threshold of 20% hence the LG does not score.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2 	<p>The District does not have a senior procurement officer. It was reported that the procurement unit is headed by a procurement officer (Appointed on promotion as a procurement officer on 11th /01/2016; DSC minute No: 54 (ii)/2015.</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"> • Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	<p>TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee.</p> <p>For example Technical evaluation Committee meeting was held 12/July/2017 (Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00006: Fence construction at district headquarters for works department)</p> <p>Produced report (12 /July/2018) submitted to contracts committee. The report</p> <p>Recommended that Mi Romi general supplies and Contractors Ltd for the award of the contract at a bid price of UGX 156,173,600,</p> <p>Technical evaluation Committee meeting was held 12/July/2017 (Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00008: Sitting, design and construction of 8 deep boreholes Lot 2</p> <p>Produced report (12 /July/ 2018) submitted to contracts committee. The report</p> <p>Recommended Multec consults (U) Ltd for the award of the contract at a bid price of UGX 147,943,680.</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"> • Evidence that the Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	<p>Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC. For example</p> <p>-Report of the contracts committee seating on 14/July/2018, minute no CC/MIN/01/05/14/07/2017/2017-2018 (Item 5/7), as per TEC recommendation, Contracts committee looked at the evaluation report and considered its recommendation of awarding contract to Mi Romi general supplies and Contractors Ltd for the award of the contract at a bid price of UGX 156,173,600.</p> <p>-Report of the contracts committee seating on 14/July/2018, minute no CC/MIN/01/05/14/07/2017/2017-2018 (Item 5/5), as per TEC recommendation, Contracts committee looked at the evaluation report and considered its recommendation of awarding contract to Multec consults (U) Ltd for the award of the contract at a bid price of UGX 147,943,680.</p>	<p>1</p>

The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.

• 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

-The procurement and Disposal Plan for 2018/2019 year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget. For example

-Construction of a community resource centre at Apapai Subcounty ((Ref; Keb514/wrks/2018-2019/00011:) at UGX 159,500,000 Million

- Siting, design and construction of 8 deep boreholes Lot 1(Ref: Keb514/wrks/2018-2019/00013)at UGX 196,077,082 Million.

- Construction of Alwa piped water system at Alwa TC phase IV. (Ref: Keb514/wrks/2018-2019/00015)at UGX 118,752,252 Million

- Construction of two classroom block at Kiryamet P/S in Kalaki Sub county (Ref: Keb514/wrks/2018-2019/00010)at UGX 64,685,122 Million.

-Rehabilitation of a 4-classroom block with an office at Kaberpila P/S in Anyara Sub County (Ref: Keb514/wrks/2018-2019/00005)at UGX 75,996,130 Million.

In FY 2017/2018 procurements were done as per plan in accordance with the procurement plan).

- Fence construction at district headquarters for works department) (Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00006).

-Siting, design and construction of 8 deep boreholes Lot 2 (Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00008).

- Construction of a community resource centre at Aperikira Sub County ((Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00005).

-Completion of a theatre block, at Kalaki HCIII in Kalaki Sub County ((Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00004).

-Construction of a 2- classroom block at Otuboi Township Primary School, Otuboi Sub County.

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/ infrastructure by August 30: score 2 	<p>For FY 2018/2019, By August 30 2018, all bid documents for all investment/infrastructure were prepared above 80%. These include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Construction of a community resource centre at Apapai Sub county ((Ref; Keb514/wrks/2018-2019/00011:)) at UGX 159,500,000 Million - Siting, design and construction of 8 deep boreholes Lot 1(Ref: Keb514/wrks/2018-2019/00013)at UGX 196,077,082 Million. - Construction of Alwa piped water system at Alwa TC phase IV. (Ref: Keb514/wrks/2018-2019/00015)at UGX 118,752,252 Million - Construction of two classroom block at Kiryamet P/S in Kalaki Sub county (Ref: Keb514/wrks/2018-2019/00010) at UGX 64,685,122 Million. -Rehabilitation of a 4-classroom block with an office at Kaberpila P/S in Anyara Subcounty (Ref: Keb514/wrks/2018-2019/00005)at UGX 75,996,130 Million. 	2
<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2 	<p>For FY 2017/2018, contract register fully updated (2017-2018).</p> <p>Contracts Register FY 2017/2018 is fully updated such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fence construction at district headquarters for works department) (Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00006). -Sitting, design and construction of 8 deep boreholes Lot 2 (Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00008). - Construction of a community resource centre at Aperikira Subcounty ((Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00005). -Completion of a theatre block, at Kalaki HCIII in Kalaki Sub county ((Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00004). -Construction of a 2- classroom block at Otuboi Township Primary School, Otuboi Sub County. 	2

The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.

• For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects):
score 2.

For FY 2017/2018, procurement thresholds were well adhered to. Example of sampled projects

- Fence construction at district headquarters for works department) (Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00006) at UGX 156,173,600 (Open domestic bidding in Daily Monitor, Monday June 19th 2017).

-Siting, design and construction of 8 deep boreholes Lot 2 (Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00008) at UGX 147,943,680. (Open domestic bidding in Daily Monitor, Monday June 19th 2017).

- Construction of a community resource centre at Aperikira Sub county UGX 150,000,000 (Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00005) (Open domestic bidding in Daily Monitor, Monday June 19th 2017).

-Completion of a theatre block, at Kalaki HCIII in Kalaki Sub county ((Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00004) at UGX 169,533,610 (Open domestic bidding in Daily Monitor, Monday June 19th 2017).

-Construction of a 2- classroom block at Otuboi Township Primary School, Otuboi Subcounty UGX 60,000,000 (Open domestic bidding in Daily Monitor, Monday June 19th 2017).

-Construction of a 5-stance pit latrine with urinal at Abirabira P/S in Aperkira Sub County (Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00054) UGX 20,000,000 (Selective biding).

-Construction of 5-stance drainable pit latrine at Anyara P/S (Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00072) UGX 20,000,000 (Selective biding).

<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates <p>for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</p>	<p>Projects implemented in the FY 2017/18 were appropriately certified with interim and completion certificates as per technical supervision. For example Completion certificates.</p> <p>Completion of a theatre block, at Kalaki HCIII in Kalaki Sub county ((Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00004) completion certificate dated 20/03/2018</p> <p>- Construction of a community resource centre at Aperikira Sub county ((Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00005) completion certificate dated 23/08/2017</p> <p>- Construction of Alwa piped water system at Alwa TC phase III. (Ref: Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00009) completion certificate dated 25/10/2017</p> <p>- Fence construction at district headquarters for works department) (Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00006) completion certificate dated 05/06/2018</p> <p>-Construction of a 2- classroom block at Otuboi Township Primary School, Otuboi Sub County completion certificate dated 12/06/2017.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2 	<p>The FY 2018/2019 project site boards for all projects are not yet erected/available but even the ones for previous year are not clearly labelled. They miss information on contract value and expected duration.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management</p>			
<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4 	<p>The LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and these are done on a daily basis from the system. Reviewed the reconciliations on the system and confirmed that the reconciliations are done online.</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"> • If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2. 	<p>A voucher for payment of Elgonia Two Builders for rehabilitation of 9 classrooms, office and store at Opungure PS had the DEO recommend payment on 11/06/2018 and the requisition was dated 04/06/2018 and was paid on 14/06/2018.</p> <p>A requisition dated 12/06/2018 from Grassland Business Contractors for the completion of work for rehabilitation of a 4 classroom block at Doya PS was recommended for payment by DEO on 09/06/2018 and was paid on 22/06/2018</p> <p>A payment made to Can Pwonyi Construction on 16/04/2018 had a requisition dated 03/04/2018 and DEO recommending for payment on 13/04/2018</p> <p>Voucher#15243522 from Can Pwonyi Construction for completion of a theatre at Kalaki H/C III requisition was submitted on 23/08/2017 was certified for payment on 20/09/2017 and was approved for payment on 25/09/2017</p> <p>Voucher #15654495 had a requisition date of 23/08/2017 and was paid on 15/11/2017. Recommended for payment by DHO on 20/09/2017</p> <p>Voucher #15629339 that was paid on 21/03/2018 had a requisition for payment submitted on 20/03/2018 and recommended for payment by DHO on 20/03/2018</p> <p>Voucher 16516590 that was paid on 25/01/2018 had a requisition raised on 15/12/2017 was recommended for payment by DHO on 24/01/2018</p> <p>A review of the vouchers indicated that payments were done on time.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor: 1 point. • LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2. 	<p>Appointment of Mr. Ekutu Max as the Internal Auditor was seen done by the CAO Mr. Oryono Grandfield Omonda on 25/05/2018 as per reference CR/156/2. Acceptance of appointment seen dated 28/05/2018. Assignment of duty as internal auditor was also seen dated 19/06/2017 done by CAO as per reference CR/115/1. The position of Senior Internal Auditor doesn't exist in the new structure. The LG thus scores zero due to the lack of a substantive senior internal auditor.</p>	<p>0</p>

The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.

• LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2.

Quarter	Date of report	Reference
Quarter 1	28/11/2017	No reference
Quarter 2	31/01/2018	No reference
Quarter 3	30/04/2018	No reference
Quarter 4	30/07/2018	No reference

4th quarter report was prepared by Ekutu Max, District Internal Auditor on 30/07/2018 received by Central Registry on 06/08/2018, Clerk to Council on 06/08/2018 and the District Chairperson on 06/08/2018. It was copied to Chairperson DPAC, RDC, CAO Office of the Auditor General, Soroti Regional Office, The Internal Auditor General MoFPED and the PS, Ministry of Local Government. A number of items (18) were raised. Yet to see action taken on recommendations of the auditor. There is evidence that the 4th Quarter report was sent today 13/09/2018 to the Office of the Internal Auditor General from maxekutu@gmail.com to Martha.nagadya@finance.go.ug and copied to tabisa.akello@finance.go.ug and perpetua.biraaro@finance.go.ug. Max says he had forgotten to forward the report within the stipulated time.

3rd quarter report was seen and was circulated to the individuals mentioned above. Received by District Chairperson on 30/04/2018, Received by Chairperson DPAC on the same date and the Directorate of Internal Audit on 01/06/2018. 10 items were identified and as per the 4th quarter report, action was not taken. The copy soft copy of the report was emailed on 04/05/2018 to Internal Auditor General on the emails above.

2nd Quarter report was issued on 31/01/2018, received by central registry on 31/01/2018 and District Chairperson on the same date. Delivered hard copy to Directorate of internal audit on 01/06/2018 but email forwarding the soft copy is seen dated 13/02/2018 to the officers indicated above.

1st quarter report was issued on 28/11/2017 and received by central registry on 28/11/2017, the District Chairperson on the same date and the Directorate of Internal Audit on 06/12/2017 soft copy was sent on 07/12/2017

<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>A number of issues were raised in all audit quarterly reports. Much as there is evidence that the reports were forwarded to DC/PAC, and District Chairperson on the dates indicated, for the FY 2017/18 the reports were not discussed as there were never tabled for discussion. There is therefore no minute to that effect.</p> <p>All items remained outstanding</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>	<p>• Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="603 801 794 869">Quarter review</th> <th data-bbox="794 801 1114 869">Date of submission</th> <th data-bbox="1114 801 1401 869">Reference for report</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="603 902 794 947">Quarter 1</td> <td data-bbox="794 902 1114 947">28/11/2017</td> <td data-bbox="1114 902 1401 947">No reference</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="603 969 794 1014">Quarter 2</td> <td data-bbox="794 969 1114 1014">31/01/2018</td> <td data-bbox="1114 969 1401 1014">No reference</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="603 1037 794 1081">Quarter 3</td> <td data-bbox="794 1037 1114 1081">30/04/2018</td> <td data-bbox="1114 1037 1401 1081">No reference</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="603 1104 794 1149">Quarter 4</td> <td data-bbox="794 1104 1114 1149">30/07/2018</td> <td data-bbox="1114 1104 1401 1149">No reference</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The reports were forwarded to PAC on the respective dates but there were never put on the order paper and therefore were never discussed. Funds are drawn quarterly for meetings but discussions of the audit reports is not done thereby creating a backlog.</p>	Quarter review	Date of submission	Reference for report	Quarter 1	28/11/2017	No reference	Quarter 2	31/01/2018	No reference	Quarter 3	30/04/2018	No reference	Quarter 4	30/07/2018	No reference	<p>0</p>
Quarter review	Date of submission	Reference for report																
Quarter 1	28/11/2017	No reference																
Quarter 2	31/01/2018	No reference																
Quarter 3	30/04/2018	No reference																
Quarter 4	30/07/2018	No reference																
<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG maintains an updated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4</p>	<p>An up to date assets register is maintained in the format provided for in the accounting manual and is generated from the system.</p>	<p>4</p>															

<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unqualified audit opinion: score 4 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0 	<p>The LG obtained an unqualified report for the FY 2017/18 hence scores 4</p>	<p>4</p>
--	--	--	----------

Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2 	<p>Evidence was provided by the Clerk to Council to confirm that Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY.</p> <p>Evidence adduced included a set of council meetings' minutes as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meeting of the 28/09/ 2017. Service delivery issues discussed included; recruitment of staff in the education department, enforcement of the education ordinance among other issues (ref. Minute extract no. 5/KDO/COU/09/2017/18 - Meeting of the 21/12/ 2017/18: Service delivery issues discussed included ; Operation and maintenance of water sources by water user committees, gazetting district natural resources ordinance, monitoring of road construction work by stakeholders, council and technical staff of the district (ref. Min. Ext. No. 11/ KDO/Cou/12/2017/18. - Meeting of the 20/03/2018: issues discussed included need for sub county authorities to implement the Education Ordinance to improve quality of education, recruitment of Inspectors of schools (Ref. Min. Ext no. 17/KDO/Cou/03/2017/18. - PAC reports were discussed at the council meeting of the 20/03/2018 as per minute extract no. 15/KDO/Cou/03/2017/18. 	<p>2</p>
---	---	--	----------

<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 1. 	<p>By the time of the assessment , no person had been designated by CAO to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints from the citizenry.</p> <p>There was no evidence of a formal system of recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which was displayed at LG offices and made publicly.</p> <p>While there was a file of complaints and grievances at the office of PAS, there was no clear documentary evidence to show the system of providing feedback to the concerned persons or the citizenry at large.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which should be displayed at LG offices and made publically available: score 1 	<p>There was no evidence of a formal system of recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which was displayed at LG offices and made publically.</p> <p>While there was a file of complaints and grievances at the office of PAS, there was no clear documentary evidence to show the system of providing feedback to the concerned persons or the citizenry at large.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2 	<p>There was evidence to confirm that the LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule were publicised on the public notice boards.</p> <p>At the time of the assessment the Assessor saw copies of the August 2018 pay roll displayed at the Administration block notice board.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1. 	<p>There was evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published. At the time of the review, the procurement plan and the awarded contracts (best bidder notices) were displayed at the procurement office notice board as well as at the administration block notice board. The bidder notices indicated information including the following; date of notice, subject of procurement, method of procurement, name of provider and total contract price.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1. 	<p>There was no evidence presented to the assessor to confirm that the district published the results of the performance assessment exercise for the previous FY.</p> <p>The national assessment results were released by government in late May 2018 and only summarised results for the whole country were released. while Government sent copies of the summarised synthesis report to the CAOs, Kaberamaido district at that time, was undergoing transition, as the CAO had been transferred and a new CAO was yet to report, making it difficult for the district to make any arrangements of disseminating the synthesis report.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1 	<p>Evidence provided to the Assessor to confirm that the HLG communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Email from the Sr. District Planner (dated 11/04/2017) to lower level local governments with an attachment of the DDEG guidelines. The letter highlighted the critical areas in the revised guidelines for the attention of the addressees. Email from the Senior District Planner (dated 1/07/201), to lower level local governments with an attachment of Planning Guidelines for 2017/18. Report of a mentoring session on PRDP/DDEG guidelines dated 9/01/2017. Email from the Senior District Planner dated 13/03/2017 with an attachment of the budget circular call II. 	<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"> Evidence that LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1. 	<p>There was no evidenced provided to the Assessor at the time of the review, to confirm that the district, during the previous FY, held discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, Barazas, radio programmes etc.) 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"> Evidence that the LG gender focal person and CDO have provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion into their activities score 2. 	<p>Guidance has been provided by gender focal point person to departments regarding how to mainstream gender. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Report (Ref Date:3, July, 2017) GENDER MAIN STREAMING in Works Department. -Report (Ref Date 28/09/2017 GENDER MAIN STREAMING in Health Department . -Report (Ref Date 8/08/2017 GENDER MAIN STREAMING in Production -Minutes of GBV meeting held on 29th/ 05/2018 at the council hall (Agenda:Gender Based Violence) -Gender conference Kobulubulu Sub County on 8/Dec/2017) - Community Dialogue meeting on gender Issues in Atingi Trading Centre on 3/May/2017). 	<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"> 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 implement-ted: score 2. 	<p>In FY 2018/19 Gender focal point person and CDO have planned activities (work plan) Vote:514 Kaberamaido District). These include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Gender Main streaming - children and youth services, -community based services and -support to disabled and elderly, -Support Women councils. -probation and welfare support -operation of community based services Department. -UWEP Projects, YLP, NUSAF support <p>In FY 2017/18 over 90% of the planned activities on gender activities/vulnerability/social inclusion well implemented e.g 100% achievement was registered as was planned</p> <p>Departments were helped in on gender main streaming, facilitating youth council meetings, supporting people with disabilities (PWDs), dissemination of gender and radio talk shows were held on UWEP.</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"> Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 1 	<p>Environmental screening and EIA are carried out for activities and projects are planned and budgeted for in respective BOQs for specific projects in each department depending on the department e.g Water (Voucher number No: 16717331 indicates money drawn from the budget as planned for conducting environmental screening of bore holes O3. –Works (Voucher number No: 16717331 indicates money drawn from the budget as planned for conducting environmental screening for low cost sealing of Kaberamaido-Kalaki Road.</p> <p>However a number of other projects were not screened in the FY 2018/2019.for example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Completion of a theatre block, at Kalaki HCIII in Kalaki Sub county ((Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00004) - Construction of a community resource centre at Aperikira Sub county ((Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00005). - Construction of Alwa piped water system at Alwa TC phase III. (Ref: Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00009) - Fence construction at district headquarters for works department) (Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00006) -Construction of a 2- classroom block at Otuboi Township Primary School, Otuboi Sub County 	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	<p>Environmental and social management and health and safety plans are integrated and appended on the bid documents are contracts agreements for example: for example bid documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction of a community resource centre at Apapai Subcounty ((Ref; Keb514/wrks/2018-2019/00011:) - Sitting, design and construction of 8 deep boreholes Lot 1(Ref: Keb514/wrks/2018-2019/00013). - Construction of Alwa piped water system at Alwa TC phase IV. (Ref: Keb514/wrks/2018-2019/00015). - Construction of two classroom block at Kiryamet P/S in Kalaki Sub county (Ref: Keb514/wrks/2018-2019/00010). -Rehabilitation of a 4-classroom block with an office at Kaberpila P/S in Anyara Subcounty (Ref: Keb514/wrks/2018-2019/00005) 	<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"> Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1 	<p>All projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction of a community resource centre at Aperikira Subcounty ((Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00005) was done on PLOT 56, BLOCK 5 AT ABIRABIRA, APERIKIRA. -Construction of farmers exhibition hall at Alwa Sub County (Ref; Keb514/wrks/2017-2018/00003) on Plot 63 Kaberamaido, Block 5 AT AWIDYANG. -Drilling of bore holes was done on Private land and agreements were made and were available and MOUs. The agreements are witnessed by community members. For example Ojam Village agreement for bore hole dated 11/06/2018 was done, Oseny Village (Bore drilling Agreement dated 17/10/2018), Otela (Bore drilling Agreement dated 17/08/2017), Owerai B (construction of bore hole Agreement dated 07/08/2017). 	<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"> Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO: score 1 	<p>Not all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification. For the few that have, they only have Social Mitigation Certification. Even still the certification is not for the planned activities in the budget and work plan. For example:</p> <p>Social Mitigation Certification was done specifically by CDO on a number of projects in FY 2017/18, to include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -OMOROKIN Ox-traction for Soya Beans growing: Certification signed by DCDO dated 28/7/2017. -AKUYA A Fish Farming: Certification signed by DCDO dated 28/7/2017. -ABALANG ox-traction Certification signed by DCDO dated 28/7/2017 	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance (new one): Score 1 	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that the contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance.</p> <p>Clearance is done after inspection of contracts committee and based on the report of this committee, but in this case, there ere no reports to indicate environmental and social clearance</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that environmental officer and CDO monthly report, includes a) completed checklists, b) deviations observed with pictures, c) corrective actions taken. Score: 1 	<p>By the time of Assessment, there was no evidence that monthly reports were prepared. No evidence in terms of monthly reports prepared by both officers (Environmental and CDO) were found at the time of assessment at Kaberamaido District</p>	<p>0</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 	<p>The LG Education department Kaberamaido District budgeted for at least the H/T and the minimum of 7 teachers as per Performance Contract FY 2018/2019 (Vote 514) dated 31/7/18 indicates the budgeting for head teachers and teachers.</p> <p>Also there is a list of 94 primary schools, a list of 839 teachers including Head teachers, enrollment list by schools show at least the seven teachers, refer to list of teachers as at 31/7/18</p>	4
<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 	<p>As per teachers list, deployment is done accordingly. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Oyama P/S has a head teacher and 9 teachers. -Kaberamaido P/S has 16 including the head teacher; unfortunately 1 teacher has passed on recently. -Lwala Girls P/S has 10 teachers including the head teacher. -Abalang P/S has 14 teachers including the head teacher. 	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"> • Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100%: score 6 o If 80 - 99%: score 3 o If below 80%: score 0 	<p>According to Kaberamaido District approved structure of 2017/18, ref minute of approval ARC135/306/01 dated 26/3/18 by the MOES the structure for primary teachers is filled with a wage bill provision. For example, 1,334 teachers proposed by office of the DEO, as per the wage bill provision is 860 and 839 placements filled which is only 97%.</p>	3

<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	<p>Kaberaido District approved structure of 2017/18 had a provision of 3 slots of school inspectors, only 2 are substantively filled, as per the HRM payroll and wage bill.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary Teachers: score 2 	<p>According to a submitted recruitment plan to HRM for the FY 2018/2019 Education Department, the vacant positions of primary teachers are 1334 , the Primary Teachers positions to be filled are 495 as dated on 31/7/18.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Inspectors: score 2 	<p>According to a submitted recruitment plan to HRM for the FY 2018/2019 Education Department the Position of school inspectors to be filled are 3.</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"> • 100% school inspectors: score 3 	<p>The District has 2 education inspectors of the two inspectors only one was appraised in 2017/18; Ongada Florence appraised by the DEO on 10/08/2018. The other Inspector Aluro Beatrice was last appraised 21/12/2013.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary school head teachers o 90 - 100%: score 3 o 70% and 89%: score 2 o Below 70%: score 0 	<p>From the review of appraisal files of 10 randomly sampled head teachers it was found out that all of them had been appraised in 2017. Details of 5 of the 10 sampled files are indicated below:</p> <p>Aligoi Elizabeth N: Alem PS.</p> <p>Ejumu Jims George: Bira PS</p> <p>Oluka Christopher: Abata PS</p> <p>Odogola Alfred: Ocelakur PS</p> <p>Alibu Francis: Ogongora PS</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1 	<p>All guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the FY 2017/2018 were communicated to schools, reference circular No.5/2018 also meetings with H/Ts and SMCs on 25th- 28thSeptember. 2018, 2nd, 4th, 12th, 17th September, 2018 and other circulars no.1/2018, and 1/28/2017 letters to department heads on the 28/2/18 on Land Titles and budget implement.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 2 	<p>A number of meetings were held with head teachers of primary schools on different dates to elaborate and sensitize on the matters regarding education improvement as guided by the MOES</p> <p>for example on 11/9/18 about schemes, instructional materials, assessment of performance and others. On 5/6/18 for information on co-curricular activities, review of performance in athletics, MDD, and others., on 2/8/18 about reports on inspection and work plan.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all registered primary schools²</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59 % score 1 o Below 50% score 0. 	<p>Inventory of Schools Inspection Tool dated 29/6/18, at least once per term inspections were done and reports were produced 94 government aided primary schools plus 16 private and 16 secondary schools. There are monthly inspection reports eg; June '18, May'18, and April'18.</p> <p>A quarterly Inspection report as per DEO's submissions and DIS filling at the MOES on 18/8/18 and received by DES ON 22/8/18.</p> <p>Quarterly Inspection report as submitted to CAO by the DEO and DIS AND DUELY forwarded to MOES on 18/8/18 and received by DES on 22/8/18, also Quarterly report of inspection for 3rd quarter dated 18/8/18 and received by DES on 22/8/18. All schools were inspected.</p> <p>The sampled schools,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Abalang P/S has 14 teachers including the head teacher included, inspected 4 times. -Lwala P/S has 10 teachers including the head teacher, 5 times inspected. -Kaberamaido P/S has 16 teachers including the head teacher, inspected at least 5 times. -Oyama P/S has 10 teachers including a head teacher, inspected 4 times. 	<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"> • Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	<p>The education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations as per rewards and sanctions files.</p> <p>Meeting dated 24/7/18 at the DEO with H/Ts, 59 teachers rewarded letters of recognition, 15 H/Ts like Epelu Simon, Adou Lawrence, Elwaru Cornelius were some of those given warning letters. On 6/9/18 letter to the MOES with a list of the rewarded by CAO.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 	<p>Kaberaido Education department submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports. These inspection reports were submitted on 18/8/18 and acknowledged by DES on 22/8/18 for 1st and 2nd quarter and the 3rd and 4th quarter submitted 18/8/18 also acknowledged by DES on 22/8/18.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4. 	<p>The rewards and sanctions record show the 59 teachers rewarded with letters of recognition as per the meeting of the DEO with the H/Ts dated 24/7/18,</p> <p>15 H/Ts received warning letters while there was a letter written to the MOES with a least of the rewarded on 6/9/18. Inspection recommendations are followed-up.</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>Data submitted was accurate and consistent</p> <p>For example performance contract FY 2018/2019 dated 31/7/2018 provides the list of primary schools of 94, consistent with PBS data.</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"> • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS: score 5 	<p>Enrolment data submitted for all schools was consistent and accurate/consistent with PBS as reviewed at the time of 94 schools and 66,724 pupils as per 2018.</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"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>Evidence was provided to the Assessor to confirm that the council committee for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY.</p> <p>Evidence adduced included 3 sets of minutes of the committee meetings that sat on: 26Th -27th /09/17, 15th -16th /02/2018, 22nd-23rd/05/18</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meeting of the 26th and 27th September discussed among other issues; recruitment of staff in the education sector, need to increase wage allocation to the education sector by the Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Public service, need to enforce the Education Ordinance by the sub-county leaders (Min. Ext. no. 03/SCs/09/2017/18) - Meeting of 15th -16th /02/2018. Discussed the high rate of absenteeism of teachers and pupils in schools, provision of mid day meals, drop- out rate issues, need for construction of more class rooms and latrines, need to resolve land conflicts where schools are situated (Min. Ext. no. 03/SCS/2/2017/18. 	<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"> Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>Issues tabled to council for approval included issues that the council committee responsible for education discussed in the committee meetings. The issues were eventually tabled to council for resolution. For example the council meetings that sat on the dates below resolved some education issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meeting of the 28/09/17. Resolved issues including the recruitment of teachers for the education department and enforcement of the Education Ordinance (Min. Ext. no. 5/KDO/Cou/09/2017/18. - Meeting of the 20/03 /17. Resolved issues pertaining to recruitment of school inspectors (Min. Ext. no.17/KDO/Cou/03/2017/18. 	<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"> • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80 % schools: score 0 	<p>All the 94 primary schools in Kaberamaido District have functional SMCs. These SMCs meet regularly and keep minutes and submitted minutes to the DEO. For example as sampled ,</p> <p>-Oyama P/S SMC had meetings and recorded minutes on various days such as on 6/7/18, 16/2/18, 29/11/17 discussing financial reports, academic strategies among others and forwarded them to the DEO.</p> <p>-Kaberamaido P/S SMC had meetings and recorded minutes on various days on 15/7/18, 1/3/18, 12/10/17 and duly forwarded the minutes to the DEO.</p> <p>-Lwala P/S SMC had meetings and recorded minutes on 28/8/17, 26/3/18, 7/6/18, and 20/8/18 and duly forwarded to the DEO.</p> <p>-Abalang P/S SMC had meetings and recorded minutes on 13/6/18, 2/5/18, 16/3/18, 20/2/18 and were able to submit minutes to the DEO.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non- wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants <p>e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</p>	<p>All schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants were posted on public notice boards at the DEO's office.</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"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	<p>Education Department Submissions were done and they covered all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget and the submissions were done on 25/4/18 before the dead line submission time of April 30.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3. 	<p>A voucher for payment of Elgonia Two Builders for rehabilitation of 9 classrooms, office and store at Opungure PS had the DEO recommend payment on 11/06/2018 and the requisition was dated 04/06/2018 and was paid on 14/06/2018.</p> <p>A requisition dated 12/06/2018 from Grassland Business Contractors for the completion of work for rehabilitation of a 4 classroom block at Doya PS was recommended for payment by DEO on 09/06/2018 and was paid on 22/06/2018</p> <p>A payment made to Can Pwonyi Construction on 16/04/2018 had a requisition dated 03/04/2018 and DEO recommending for payment on 13/04/2018</p> <p>The reviewed documents indicate that the DEO timely makes recommendations and certifications for the suppliers' payments.</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15th of July for consolidation: score 4 	<p>There was no evidence presented to the Assessor by the Senior Planner to confirm that the education sector submitted annual reports for previous FY (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit, although all the 4 Quarterly reports were available (with Q4 report recently submitted to MoFPED for approval on the 5th of September 2018.</p> <p>Senior Planner could not retrospectively trace and or retrieve the submission dates by all sectors including education. Too, there was no acknowledgement of receipt of the reports by the Planner at the time of submission.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If sector has no audit query score 4 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 o If all queries are not responded to score 0 	<p>The sector had 3 issues raised regarding, unbanked revenue, uncollected revenue and unaccounted for funds in Q4 and all these issues remained unresolved.</p> <p>For the 3rd quarter 4 items were identified under: Unbanked revenue/PTA contributions, unaccounted for funds, non-deduction and remittance of statutory deductions and uncollected revenue. No evidence that these were rectified.</p> <p>One item was observed regarding unaccounted for funds and there is no evidence on how this was resolved.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			

<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills, etc.: Score 2 	<p>Meetings of DEO with H/Ts and SMCs dated 27/4/18 ref: Min 4/18 for dissemination of guidelines on gender issues, SMC appointments, hygiene, senior woman and man, and Inspector for Special Needs Education with H/Ts and SMCs on issues of PWD and reproductive health on 6/9/18.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2 	<p>Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools. For example;</p> <p>Inspector for Special Needs Education with H/Ts and SMCs on issues of PWD and reproductive health on 6/9/18.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	<p>The SMC composition in schools followed the issued guidelines, e.g.;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Kaberamaido P/S SMC has 13 members including 2 females. -Lwala Girls P/S SMC has 13 members with 5 females. -Oyama P/S SMC has 12 members with 3 female. -Abalang P/S SMC has 13 members with 5 female. <p>At all the schools' notice boards their names are publicized.</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"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 1: 	<p>Meeting with H/Ts and SMCs by the DEO's office as a way of disseminating guidelines on environmental issues, land, waste disposal management and climate change addressed by the EO on 6/9/18</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"> • Evidence that all school infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 1 	<p>At the time of assessment there was no evidence that school infrastructure projects were screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines.</p> <p>No site visits reports by the environment officer.</p> <p>Though CDO visited some projects and did the screening, no reports were prepared to this effect.</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"> • The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1 	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence that environmental officer and community development officer visited the sites to check whether the mitigation plans are complied with. (No site visit reports found).</p>	<p>0</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health care workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health care with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 80% filled: score 8 • 60 – 80% - score 4 • Less than 60% filled: score 0 	<p>The Kaberamaido DLG HD had substantively recruited PHC workers to the tune of 85.5% only (i.e. according to PS/MoPS Transmittal Letter to CAO dated 26th/3/2018 Ref: ARC/135/306/01 on the approved structure for Kaberamaido):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Kaberamaido DLG HD's Staffing Norm for the HWs was 266 but only 226 of the PHC workers had been filled at the time of the assessment. The HD did not offer evidence of attempts made to fill 40 vacancies through conducting of interviews. This means that the attempts made overall suggest that 226 HWs give us the 83.5% (numerator is 226 divided by the denominator of 266 multiply by 100). 2. While the DLG had IPFs with a PHC wage bill provision for amounting to UGX 2,489,619, 000 for the FY 2018/19, by the time the assessment was completed in Kaberamaido DLG, the assessment team did not access online PBS records to confirm that the IPFs had to do with existing wage provisions of PHC workers. The records in the PBS would be required to indicate whether the IPFs matched existing wage obligations as per the staffing list. 3. There were some mismatches in the information on staffing, especially inconsistencies between the HD and HF level records. For example, the Kaberamaido HC IV reported having 58 while the HD's records pointed to 61 filled positions for the HC IV. It was clear that the HD's records were not up to date and this includes the ones offered to the assessment team (see table). <p>ID Type of HF No. of HFs Norm Filled Vacant</p> <p>1 HC IV 1 49 57 12</p> <p>2 HC III 8 152 122 34</p> <p>3 HC II 6 54 39 57</p> <p>Total 13 255 214 103</p>	<p>8</p>

<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan for primary health care workers to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of primary health care workers: score 6</p>	<p>Kaberamaido DLG HD submitted a staff recruitment plan/request to HRM that was fairly comprehensive in its coverage of PHC workers in all HFs in the DLG:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The official (signed and stamped) DHO's submission letter (dated 29th/9/2018) to CAO and HR on recruitment had appendix 4 with a column of sub-total for health indicating 760,491,720 necessary to fill the remaining vacancies. 2. Again, while the DLG had IPFs with a PHC wage bill provision for amounting to UGX 2,489,619, 000 for the FY 2018/19, by the time the assessment was completed in Kaberamaido DLG, the assessment team had not accessed the online PBS system records to confirm that the IPFs had to do with existing and future recruitment needs, including wage obligations (on the latter the need to confirm whether the recruitment drive was based on an available wage bill). However, a hard copy of the health sector AWP for the FY 2018/19 (Vote 514 and Page 58) indicates that the health sector contributed to overall DLG work plan. 	<p>6</p>
<p>The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital In-charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0 	<p>The District was only able to present 9 appraisal files of the health in-charges. Review of 9 files presented revealed that 5 of the health in-charges had not been appraised for the period 2017/18. Details of the 5 in-charges not appraised are indicated below:</p> <p>Name, name of HC and date of last appraisal</p> <p>Elwau James Ocheri HC III 24/8/2017</p> <p>Emenyu Samuel Kalaki HC III 23/10/2015</p> <p>Balengera Ssekimanyi Kaberamaido HC IV Un signed performance report of 2014/15</p> <p>Nangoma Susan Aperkira HC III 22/8/2013</p> <p>Ekou Jonathan Abirabira HC II 30/6/2016.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The Local Government Health department has deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY, and if not provided justification for deviations: score 4 	<p>On the whole, the staffing records were only marginally comparable with deployment levels. Even so, there were some discrepancies when it came to what the HD stated as filled positions and what the HFs documented and reported as deployed HWs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> For some HFs the staff deployment was not in accordance with the positions as seen in HD's official records. As seen in the HD's staffing lists, Kaberamaido HC IV had 57 staff according to HD records yet the HF's records showed 61 fully-filled portfolios. At the time of the assessment, the PBS records were inaccessible to be able to confirm that the overall deployment of PHC workers in the health sector was fully in line with the staffing lists in use together with the budget for FY 2018/19. 	<p>0</p>
--	---	---	----------

Monitoring and Supervision

<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/ MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 	<p>There was mixed evidence from the sampled HFs that the DHO/HD was effective when it came to communicating all the circulars, guidelines and policies issued by the national level for the FY 2017/18 (see table). There was only evidence that the sampled HFs had access to some assorted circulars, guidelines and policies from the national level (i.e. did not receive all or 100% of those issued). Indeed, there were both apparent and reported challenges in the mode of communication and documentation between and within the HD and HFs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> As signals for commitment towards "effective communication" and investment into efforts towards supporting CME, more systematic records of those received and those distributed would be necessary. Even going by their own records alone, there was no documented evidence that the DHO had communicated all the circulars, guidelines and policies received from the center (i.e. in the spirit of ensuring "effective communication" and promoting CME). At the HD level, the DHO had distribution file (opening date – 28th/3/2013). The file contained signed submission lists of (i) The National HIV Testing Services Policy (October 2017) and (ii) The District HIV/AIDS Strategic Plan 2015/16-2019/20 (27th/7/2017). At a HF level, while it was often difficult for HFs to establish when exactly they had 	<p>0</p>
--	---	--	----------

		<p>received what circular, guideline or policy, on the whole the sampled HFs possessed an average of (only) 5 circulars, guidelines or policies issued in the FY 2017/18 (see table). Also, HF's records indicated that the list of those received excluded "Guidelines for LG Planning for the Health Sector, 2017; Sector Grant and Budget Guidelines FY2018/19; and Policy Strategies for Improving Health Service Delivery 2016-2021".</p> <p>4. No sampled HF offered evidence of a DHO submitted transmittal letter accompanying the issued circulars, guidelines and policies for the FY 2017/18.</p> <p>ID No. Issued to HFs (FY 2017/18) Average</p> <p>1 Abirabira HC II 1</p> <p>5</p> <p>2 Alwa HC III 10</p> <p>3 Kaberamaido CoU HC II (Alem) 2</p> <p>4 Kaberamaido HC IV 8</p>	
<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/ MHO has held meetings with health facility in- charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	<p>In line with the quest to support effective communication and promote CME, the HD supported activities to explain some circulars, guidelines and policies issued by the national level:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The HD's 11th/7/2018 Quarterly Performance Review Meeting discussed and explained that covered Test, Treat and Track Policy for Malaria. NB: The Minutes had not been signed and stamped at the time of the assessment 15th/9/2018. The stakeholder engagement covered HF I/Cs, DHT members, RDC, CAO, LCV and Secretary for Health. 	<p>3</p>

The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services

Maximum 6 points for this performance measure

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

The DHT supervised 100% of the sampled HC IVs (i.e. Kaberamaido HC IV). This means that there was evidence of supervising fully the higher level HFs. The MoH Supervision Log Book indicated that the DHT supervised the HC IV at least once in a quarter. In the MoH logbook, the visits are evident between series 408815 and 408825 (i.e. from 14th/7/2017 to 5th/6/2018) for the FY 2017/18:

Quarters Date

Q1 19th/10/2017

Q2 29th/12/2017

Q3 29th/3/2018

Q4 5th/7/2018

From the other records for FY 2017/18 (e.g. DHO, DHT and HSD/HC IVs), it was clear that discussion of support supervision results/reports was partial. The HD attributed this to partial funding to the DLG. For the FY 2017/18, the support supervision visits for Kaberamaido HC IV are captured both in the logbook and in the visitors' book (see table).

ID HFs OFFICIALVISITS (FY 2017/18) TOTAL

DHO DHT HSD

1 Kabramaido CoU HC II (Alem) 0 5 0 5

2 Kabramaido HC IV 3 21 - 24

For the FY 2017/18, the support supervision visits for the sampled PNFPs (Kabramaido CoU HC II (Alem)) are evidenced in the MoH Supervision Log Book (see table). The PNFP confirmed that they too benefited from DHT visits but had no logbook in which to capture the findings and advice arising from DHT support supervision. NB: It was indicated that the PNFP would improvise to ensure better documentation of support supervision either from the DHO, DHT, HSD or combinations of the above.

<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% supervised: score 3 • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60% - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0 	<p>Support supervision for FY 2017/18 covered 60.1% for all quarters (see table) i.e. 34 visits out of the required 56 (this including those sampled lower level HFs e.g. Abirabira HC II, Alwa HC III and Kaberamaido CoU HC II/Alem PNFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. While the DHT ensured that the HSD supervised lower level HFs, there was limited evidence offered to confirm that Support Supervision Reports happened covering all quarters. 2. The most commonly cited operational gap was limited funding to the HD to support total support supervision of all HFs for all quarters. <p>Quarters Date HC IIIs and IIs supervised</p> <p>Q1 19th/10/2017 7 out of 14</p> <p>Q2 29th/12/2017 6 out of 14</p> <p>Q3 29th/3/2018 12 out of 14</p> <p>Q4 5th/7/2018 9 out of 14</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	<p>The DLG HD did not provide evidence of the existence of DHT minutes discussing the 4 quarterly reports for FY 2017/18 (see table) and indeed no evidence was made available that the HD used any such reports (discussed and used them to make recommendations in each quarter):</p> <p>Quarters Date DHT Minutes Discussing Q Reports</p> <p>Q1 19th/10/2017 None provided/reviewed/seen</p> <p>Q2 29th/12/2017 None provided/reviewed/seen</p> <p>Q3 29th/3/2018 None provided/reviewed/seen</p> <p>Q4 5th/7/2018 None provided/reviewed/seen</p> <p>While the HD did not provide access to the DHT minutes discussing the 4 quarterly reports, it offered evidence that the DHT was functional for the greater part of the FY 2017/18 meeting 12 out of 12 times (i.e. met monthly on the 6th/7/2017, 23rd/8/2017, 8th/9/2017, 27th /10/2017, 28th/11/2017, 20th/12/2017, 24th/1/2018, 22nd/2/2018, 20th/3/2018, 24th/4/2018, 31st/5/2018 and 27th/6/2018).</p>	<p>0</p>

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

Maximum 10 points for this performance measure

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

In the course of support supervision visits, all sampled HFs (100%) benefited from DHT support supervision but only 75% had evidence (supervision logbooks) to confirm that the DHT made recommendations and with further evidence of follow up on the advice on corrective actions to be implemented in the FY 2017/18:

1. For FY 2017/18, the DHT only met 7 out of 12 mandatory times (i.e. to discuss support supervision and monitoring reports), hence was unable to discuss all reports fully and pave the way for follow up. NB: The DHT held the meetings on the 4th/9/2017, 13th/5/2018, 20th/4/2018, 14th/3/2018, 3th/1/2018, 24th/5/2018 and 20th/6/2018.
2. The recommendations in quarterly reports came in form of advice rendered as pointers to corrective actions, mainly those that were needed to deal with emerging challenges. Based on the details in the health sector AWP and HMIS, it was clear that the recommendations made were partial, hence follow up incomplete. For example, Q1 Report (pg. 19) cites In-service training for staff (i.e.”...there is need to lobby for support to enable organizing in-service courses for staff in the many health interventions...”). Follow up came by way of support to promoting EPI Standards.
3. Again, while the DHT ensured that the HSD supervised lower level HFs, the discussion of Support Supervision Reports only focused on the Q2 and Q3 findings, hence covering fewer HFs as against the total number of HFs in the district. Again the reported operational gap had to do with the limited funding to the HD to support total and integrated support supervision for all HFs for all quarters. For example, the HSD covered 0 out of 2 PNFPs in quarter 2 of FY 2017/18.

ID HF Recommendation Follow up

1 Abirabira HC II Need for better use of stock book Seen HMIS 083 used to compute average monthly consumption

2 Alwa HC III Use dispensing logbook to indicate ART packs (9th/9/2017 – 208830) Column in logbook used capture info on packs distributed (5th/6/2018)

3 Kaberamaido CoU HC II (Alem) No logbook and advice made No issue to follow up

		4 Kaberamaido HC IV Promote condom distribution Dispensers seen in OPD and ART Clinics	
<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10 	<p>There was accurate and consistent data and reports on the 16 HFs receiving PHC funding as per MoH formats:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The HD publicized a list of 16 HFs receiving PHC funding for the FY 2017/18. 2. Based on the MoH Excel spreadsheet, the 16 HFs cited by the HD are covered among the broader listing of all HFs. Their HMIS reporting rate was fairly adequate or consistent (nearly meeting the required 100%). 3. Access to the PBS was limited as at the time of assessment, hence the assessor used printed out copies that confirmed that the 16 HFs were catered for (see Vote 514). 	10
Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability			
<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>Evidence was provided to the Assessor by the Clerk Council in form of minutes of the health sector council committee meeting minutes, to confirm that the committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports. A review of the minutes indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meeting of 26th -27th of September 2017 discussed health service delivery issues as per minute extract 03/Scs/09/2017/18. - Meeting of the 15th-16th /02/ 2108. Discussed among other issues, health related <p>Note that the council committee for health did not present many health issues to Council compared to the education committee, owing to the fact that the district does not have a substantive DHO. The district last had a substantive DHO in the FY 2008/09.</p>	2

<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>Health issues were presented to council for approval during the council meetings of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meeting of the 28/09/2017 as per minute extract No. 5/KDO/Cou/09/2017/18 - Meeting of the 20/03/2018, as per minute extract 17/KDO/Cou/03/2017/18. - Meeting of the 27/03/2018. Discussed the laying of the plans and budgets (including health) as per minute extract 21/KDO/Cou/03/2017/18. - Meeting of the 25/05/18. Approved work plans and budgets (including health) as per minute extract No.26/KDO/Cou/5/2017/18. 	<p>2</p>
<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 6 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 6 If 80-99 %: score 4 If 70-79: %: score 2 If less than 70%: score 0 	<p>According to all the sampled HFs (100%) had functional HUMCs (i.e. with minutes covering the 4 quarters of the FY 2017/18) – see table. NB: The assessor saw a report indicating that the HD worked with and through the Council for African Policy (CAP) Activity Report for HUMC Training of May 2018. However the training only covered 4 out of 16 HFs and reached 81 people (59 males and 22 females):</p> <p>HFs' HUMCs Meetings in FY 2017/18 Functionality</p> <p>Abirabira HC II 4 100%</p> <p>Alwa HC III 4 100%</p> <p>Kaberamaido CoU HC II (Alem) 4 100%</p> <p>Kaberamaido HC IV 4 100%</p> <p>% of HFs with 100% Functionality 100%</p>	<p>6</p>

<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 4 	<p>There was evidence from the DHO's Notice Board that Kaberamaido DLG published all the 16 HFs receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants. However, the publication did not captured all relevant information (.e. account number, annual budgets and total for FY 2017/18). Also, 100% of the sampled HFs had posted similar information (i.e. Kaberamaido HC IV, Kaberamaido CoU HC II/PNFP, Alwa HC III and Abirabira HC II) but with uneven levels of transparency and accountability (with some postings inside offices, hence inaccessible to the public).</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The DHO belatedly submitted the HD input to the DLG procurement plan (i.e. 17th/7/2018, hence not before 30th April 2018). The late submission was attributed to changes in IPFs (with a 4th/7/2018) Invitation Letter seen to a Mbale Regional Dissemination Workshop of Sector Grant Guidelines for Education and Health – 16th – 31st July 2018. The changes in IPFs led to delays. The HD's submissions were complete – i.e. (i) List in submission covered all investment items seen in the approved health sector AWP for the FY 2018/19. The submitted inputs and requests were complete in the sense of providing BOQs, Drawings, Scope of Works, Technical Specifications and ToRs. 	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2. 	<p>The DHO submitted Procurement Form PP1 on the 21st/9/2017, hence submitted in time (i.e. by the end of the Q1 for FY 2017/18). A sample covering stationery was signed and stamped by office typist on the 13th/9/2017; the approval of procedure was signed and stamped by DHO on the 20th/9/2017; and the confirmation of funding signed and stamped by CAO on the 20th/9/2017;</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"> Evidence that the DHO/ MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4. 	<p>Sampled some of the vouchers and noted that DHO certified and recommended service providers in time for payment as seen below:</p> <p>Voucher#15243522 from Can Pwonyi Construction for completion of a theatre at Kalaki H/C III requisition was submitted on 23/08/2017 was certified for payment on 20/09/2017 and was approved for payment on 25/09/2017</p> <p>Voucher #15654495 had a requisition date of 23/08/2017 and was paid on 15/11/2017. Recommended for payment by DHO on 20/09/2017</p> <p>Voucher #15629339 that was paid on 21/03/2018 had a requisition for payment submitted on 20/03/2018 and recommended for payment by DHO ON 20/03/2018</p> <p>Voucher 16516590 that was paid on 25/01/2018 had a requisition raised on 15/12/2017 was recommended for payment by DHO on 24/01/2018</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the 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 	<p>The Health sector did not comply with the requirement to submit the Annual performance Report for the previous FY (with availability of all quarterly reports by the 15th of July for consolidation.</p> <p>While all the 4 consolidated quarterly reports had been prepared by the planning unit and submitted to MoFPED by the time of the assessment, transmittal emails from the Ag.DHO to the Senior Planner, for the submission of the Q4 report indicated that the report was transmitted to the Planning Unit on the 24th of August 2018, which was after the expiry of the deadline of 15th July 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If sector has no audit query: Score 4 • If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: Score 2 points • If all queries are not responded to Score 0 	<p>The sector had one issue pointed out in the 4th Quarter regarding unaccounted for funds and the issue is yet to be received.</p> <p>One item was identified in Q3 regarding unaccounted for funds and there's no evidence this was rectified.</p> <p>One item was observed regarding unaccounted for funds and there is no evidence on how this was resolved.</p>	<p>0</p>
---	---	--	----------

Social and environmental safeguards

<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30 % women: score 2 	<p>Based on a sample of 4 HFs (see table), only 25% of the HUMCs met the gender composition requirement, hence the HD did not meet this requirement. However, the overall average for Kaberamaido DLG was 34.0% (see table). A division of the sum of the said 2 figures by 2 is way below 50% (i.e. $25+34= 59 \div 2= 29.5\%$). Therefore, the HD did not meet the gender composition requirement because the average of the sample hovers way below the 50% composite rate. The HD had not commission assessments to find out the composition of committees or functionality of the committees.</p> <p>Name of HF HUMC Members Female Members %/Female</p> <p>Abirabira HC II 6 3 50.0</p> <p>Alwa HC III 7 2 28.6</p> <p>Kaberamaido CoU HC II (Alem) 7 2 28.6</p> <p>Kaberamaido HC IV 7 2 28.6</p> <p>Average Gender Composition 34.0</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2. 	<p>The HD possessed received circulars at HFs (dated 27th/4/2018). The HD had a Dissemination Reporting Format for Sanitation Data for Rural Infrastructure (Pages 1-2) MIN 3, 27/04/2018 Bullet 6. However, there were glaring gaps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No sampled HFs (0%) offered proof that they had received communications from the HD on promoting gender-sensitive sanitation (including having access to the issued guidelines on the separation of facilities for female and male), At the time of this assessment, none of the the DLG, HD and HFs toilet facilities visited had separate facilities for ,men and women as required by the guidelines. 	<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"> Evidence that all health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 2 	<p>All HF infrastructure projects were screened before approval for construction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The HD implemented 2 health infrastructure projects in the FY 2017/18 all dated 2nd/2/2018. The EO had 2 signed and stamped Environment Screening Forms covering health infrastructure projects for FY 2017/18. The forms outlined risks and mitigation plans. The 2 projects included the (i) Construction of Kalaki HC III – Theater; and (ii) Construction of Maternity Ward – Aperikira HC II. 	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 2 	<p>At the time of the assessment (15th/9/2018), the HD, the EO and CDO did not provide signed and stamped Site-Visit Reports to help confirm that the identified mitigation plans to address the risks were complied with.</p>	<p>0</p>

The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management

Maximum 4 points

- 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.

Few HFs in Kaberamaido DLG had access to guidelines on waste segregation in form of a chart for waste sorting. Even for those that had them there was always limited evidence offered on the source of the guidelines in use by the HFs. On closer scrutiny, though, from the other evidence garnered through the assessment, it was clear that the HD's and HFs' records offered the following evidence:

1. A signed and stamped HD's set of Dissemination Minutes (dated 27th /7/2017) on Guidelines and Policy on Health Care Waste Management (MIN 3, 27/07/2017) stated under Communication from the Facilitator. For this, only 1 out of the 4 sampled HFs offered evidence that they had access to medical waste management guidelines in form of charts..
2. A HD distribution list (dated 16th/8/2015) on sanitation charts to environment staff (i.e. targeting 11 HFs), IN: FILE (OPENED 28th/3/2013): HEA: DISTRIBUTION OF HEALTH ITEMS.

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the district Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below average coverage: score 10 o If 80-99%: Score 7 o If 60-79: Score 4 o If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>Kaberamaido district has a safe water average coverage of 82% with the sub-counties of Ochero (68%), Bukulu (66%), Kalaki (74%), Otuboi (63%) and Anyara (77%) below the district average. In the AWP of the current FY, the district has targeted the construction of 10 deep boreholes in Anyara (1), Otuboi (2), Kalaki (1), Bululu (2), Kobululu (1), Aperkira (1) and Ochero (2). It can be observed that the sub-counties with water supply below the district average have been targeted which accounted for 80% of budget allocations in the current FY.</p>	7

<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"> • 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"> o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 15 o If 80-99%: Score 10 o If 60-79: Score 5 o If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>In the previous FY (2017/18), the district had a safe water average coverage of 83.8% with the sub-counties of Anyara (77%), Aperkira (82%), Bululu (66%) and Ochero (68%) below the district average as evidenced by the Uganda Water Supply Atlas 2017 page 76. From the AWP of previous FY (2017/18), the district planned to 11 deep boreholes in the sub-counties of ; Kaberamaido (1), Aperkira (1), Kobululu (1), Ochero (1), Alwa (1), Otuboi (1), Anyara (1), Apapai (1), Kakure (1), Kalaki (1) and Bululu (1). As evidenced from the information above, it can be observed that the sub-counties below the district average were targeted. The annual progress report dated 16th July, 2018 showed that the construction of the 11 planned deep boreholes was completed and they are functional accounting for 100%..</p>	
Monitoring and Supervision			

<p>The district Water department carries out monthly monitoring of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the district Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15 • 80% - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10 • 70 - 79%: score 7 • 60% - 69% monitored: score 5 • 50% - 59%: score 3 • Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored: score 0 	<p>The district water department monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually For instance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evidence of supervision of ongoing construction of water sector projects was found the report dated 11th / December/ 2017 where supervision was done on the siting, drilling and installation of the 11 deep boreholes as distributed in the sub-counties of Aperkira, Kobulubulu, Ochero, Alwa, Kaberamaido, Bululu, Kakure, Otuboi, Anyara, Apapai and Kalaki. - There was also inspection done on the construction works for Alwa piped water system (Phase 3) as evidenced in the report dated 25th October 2017. - There was also monitoring done between October to November 2017 on the progress of the work being done for the construction of 11 boreholes. 	<p>10</p>
<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the district has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: Score 5 • List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>According to the PBS, it is evident that the LG submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY.</p>	<p>5</p>

<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>The water facilities that are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS include;</p> <p>Boreholes in sub-counties of ; Kaberamaido (1), Bululu (2), Ochero (1), Kobulubulu (1), Kalaki (2), Alwa (1), Anyara (1), Otuboi (1) and 1 piped water supply scheme at Alwa sub-county</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The district Water department has submitted input for district's procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted input for the district procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	<p>Submission of the procurement plan was made on the 4th July, 2018 for the procurement of ;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Sitting, design, deep boreholes drilling and installation of 10 hand pumps: Anyara (1), Otuboi (2), Kalaki (1), Bululu (2), Kobululu (1), Aperkira (1), Ochero (2). Rehabilitation of 7 hand pumps in various sub counties Construction of piped water system Alwa Trading Centre in Alwa sub county – Phase 4 Repair of motor vehicle <p>However, the submissions were made past the deadline of 30th April</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"> If the contract manager prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2 	<p>The contract manager of the projects is the DWO Mr. Kyazze Ronald appointed on 4th/8/2017. There was evidence of monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as evidenced by the monitoring reports of June 2018 dated; 4th July, 2018; May 2018 date; 8th June 2018; April 2018 dated; 4th May 2018; December 2017; dated; 9th January, 2018; November 2017; dated; 11th December 2017 amongst others.</p> <p>Additionally, there were site meetings that were held for example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community mobilisation site meeting held at Alwa trading center on 26th October, 2017 (Alwa piped water scheme) Community mobilisation/site meeting held at Oweria B village on 16th August, 2017 (Borehole drilling) 	<p>2</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	<p>The water and sanitation facilities were found to be constructed as per design. From the sampled boreholes of Owerai village, Omorokin village, Oyalem village and Omoratok village were as per stipulated design. They were well protected, had water discharge pit and right pump handle used.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	<p>The contractor did hand over the completed WSS facilities as evidenced by;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Report on commissioning and handover of 6 boreholes (Lot 2) to the various sub-counties of Kaberamaido district, FY 2017/18; Dated: 5th Feb. 2018 -Report on commissioning and handover of 5 boreholes (Lot 1) to the various sub-counties of Kaberamaido district, FY 2017/18; Dated: 5th Feb, 2018. -Report on commissioning of a piped water supply system at Alwa trading center, Alwa sub-county, Kaberamaido district; Dated: 5th Feb, 2018. 	<p>2</p>

<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2 	<p>Completion certificates were prepared and filed by the DWO as to Clause 18, sub-clause 33.1 of the Contract Agreement. For example;</p> <p>1) Project: Sitting, design & construction of 6 deep boreholes in Kaberamaido district; Contract No: KABE514/WRKS/2017-2018/00008 – LOT2; Contractor; M/s Multec Consults (U) Ltd; Contract Sum: UGX. 111, 312,182; Dated; 16th April, 2018.</p> <p>2) Project: Siting, design & construction of 5 deep boreholes in Kaberamaido district; Contract No: Kabe514/WRK/2017-10/00007 – LOT 1; Contractor: M/s Multec Consults (U) Ltd; Contract sum: UGX. 92,476,600. This was dated 16th April, 2018</p> <p>3) Project: Construction of a piped Water Supply System at Alwa Trading (Phase III); Contract No: Kabe514/Wrks/2017 – 2018/00009; Contractor: M/s Pera Investment Ltd; Contract Sum; UGX. 111,886,916; Dated: 26th April 2018</p> <p>4) Project: Borehole rehabilitation of 9 hand pumps; Contract No: Kabe514/Wrk/2017-18/00071; Contractor: M/s Mastak Investments Ltd; Contract sum: UGX.45,200,000; Dated: 8th May, 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district Water department has certified and initiated payment for works and supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<p>Reviewed request for payment dated 12/02/2018 for sitting, design and construction of 6 deep boreholes in Kaberamaido had it recommended for payment by the Water Officer on 12/02/2018 and payment was done on 12/03/2018</p> <p>Payment voucher 17497607 that was paid on 25/04/2018 had a requisition submitted on 04/04/2018 from Mastak Investments Ltd and recommended by the water officer on 17/04/2018;</p> <p>A payment to Multec Consults Ltd on Voucher #16997074 had a request submitted on 08/02/2018 and payment was done on 12/03/2018 and water officer had approved on 12/03/2018</p> <p>The review of documents indicated that the District water officer makes timely recommendations and certifications for the suppliers' requests for payment.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

<p>The district Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Plan- ning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	<p>The Water sector did not comply with the requirement to submit the Annual performance Report for the previous FY (with availability of all quarterly reports by the 15th of July for consolidation.</p> <p>While all the 4 consolidated quarterly reports had been prepared by the Planning Unit and submitted to MoFPED by the time of the assessment, transmittal emails from the Water Officer, to the Senior Planner, for the submission of the Q4 report indicated that the report was transmitted on the 15th of August 20 18, which was after the expiry of the deadline of 15th July 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The District Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 If sector has no audit query score 5 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 If queries are not responded to score 0 	<p>The sector had one issue pointed out in the 4th Quarter regarding unaccounted for funds and the issue is yet to be received.</p> <p>One item was identified in Q3 regarding unaccounted for funds and there's no evidence this was rectified.</p> <p>One item was observed regarding unaccounted for funds and there is no evidence on how this was resolved.</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"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3 	<p>Evidence was provided to the Assessor by the Clerk to council to confirm 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. The evidence presented included minutes of meetings held as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meeting of the 21/12/2017, discussed water related issues as per minute Extract no. 21/12/2017 - Meeting of the 26th -27th /09/2017/18. Discussed water related issues as per minute extract No. 04/10/2017/18. 	<p>3</p>
<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	<p>The Water Sector committee presented issues that required approval by council during the council meetings of 28/09/ 2017, 21/12/2017, 20/03/ 2017. Some of the issues requiring approval included: Operation and maintenance of water sources by water user committees, gazetting the district natural resources ordinance, and repairs of non functioning valley dams.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2. 	<p>There was no evidence of information sharing about the water development grant release, AWP, budget and expenditures displayed to the public to enhance transparency.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2 	<p>Four water projects were visited, they were found to be labelled indicating the name of the project, name of contractor but the source of funding was not included. For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Owerai village borehole; FY 2017/18; Kaberamaido-DLG; Contractor: Multec Consults -Omorokin village borehole; FY 2017/18; Kaberamaido DLG; Contractor: Multec Consult (U) LTD; 8th/10/2017 -Oyalem village borehole; FY 2017/18; Kaberamaido DLG; Contractor: Multec Consult (U) LTD; 9th/10/2017 -Omoratok village borehole; FY 2017/18; Kaberamaido DLG; Contractor: Multec Consult (U) LTD; 14th/10/2017 	<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"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	<p>Information on tenders and contract awards was found displayed on the district notice board e.g.</p> <p>Notice of Best Evaluated Bidder; under contract committee minutes CC/MIN/01/05/14/08/2018/2018/2019:</p> <p>Procurement reference number: Kabe514/Wrks/2018/2019/00014; Subject: Lot II. Siting, Design and construction of 7 deep boreholes fitted with hand pumps in the following sub-counties: Bululu (1), Ocheru (1), Otuboi (1), Kobulubulu (1) and Anyara (1)- DDEG; Name of provider: Multec Consults (U) Ltd; Total price: UGX: 138,950,000 (VAT inclusive).</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If communities apply for water/ public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	<p>Community does apply for water/public sanitation facilities; For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Application dated 13th/2/2017 by Agule village, Aperkira sub-county for a borehole - Application dated 28/8/2018 by Olio village; Anyara sub-county for a borehole - Application dated: 20/7/2018 by Owali village in Aperkira sub-county for a borehole. 	<p>1</p>

<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water and Sanitation Committees that are functioning evidenced by either: i) collection of O&M funds, ii) carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, iii) facility fenced/protected, or iv) they have an M&E plan for the previous FY: score 2 <p>Note: One of parameters above is sufficient for the score.</p>	<p>The water and sanitation facilities were in place however there was no evidence of their functionality as evidenced by either the collection of O & M funds, carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs .</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"> Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	<p>Environmental screening was done for all WSS projects as evidenced by the screening report dated 16th/02/2018 and screening forms of 18th /8/2017 for borehole siting and drilling in omoratok village, Alwa sub-county.</p> <p>Screening forms of 10th/8/2017 for borehole drilling in Amorokin village, Bululu sub-county e.t.c.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1 	<p>There was no evidence of follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	<p>The sampled contracts showed evidence of a clause on environmental protection i.e. "Cleaning site and planting of shade trees as recommended by the supervisor or his representative."</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The district Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If at least 50% WSCs are women and at least one occupying a key position (chairperson, secretary or Treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements: score 3 	<p>From the minutes of the community meetings, it was observed that women were inclusive in the committee and atleast took up some of the key roles on the committee. For example; Community meeting held on 25th/9/2017; the chairperson elected was Akuro Matgeret, treasurer was Florence Ecamu and Caretaker elect was Anyemo Maria.</p> <p>Additionally, in a community meeting held on 25th/8/2017; the treasurer was lumo Suzan and it had members such as Abinyo Hellen, Atado Alice etc.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/</p> <p>RGCs provided by the Water Department.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3 	<p>Public and sanitation facilities do have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs for example, the sanitation facilities at Oyama primary school that has separate blocks for boys and girls with each block have a stance for PWDs.</p>	<p>3</p>