

Addendum to/clarification of issues in the Local Government Performance Assessment Manual, 2018 (up-date of 2018 issues to 2019 LGPA)

During the training of the LG PA and QA teams the following clarifications of the LG PAM, 2018 were agreed between the assessors and the Government Task Force. These are still valid for the coming LGPA in 2019 with minor changes made in timing (year to be assessed).

List of Abbreviations:

Page xiii: DPU: District Planning Unit/District Procurement Unit (i.e. could be one of these units depending on the link in the performance measure).

Page x: change Operation and Management to “*Operation and maintenance*”

CROSS-CUTTING PERFORMANCE

Re. Human Resource Management

Re. Indicator 6: (Clarification): This does not deal with/cover the appraisal of the CAO or Deputy CAO (page 48)

Re. Indicator No. 7 (p. 49):

- Scoring Guide – first bullet change “The LG DSC has considered all the staff” to the word: “positions”
- Scoring Guide – second and third bullet change “The LG DSC has considered all the positions” to the word: “staff”

Clarification on Appraisal: This does also cover staff in “acting positions”.

Crosscutting PM 15; Water PM no. 11 bullet 2 - The indicators should be maintained. In case there are no projects being implemented for the current FY, then projects whose implementation started the previous FY and is still ongoing should be considered in the sampled projects for the assessment

Re. Financial Management:

Audit findings: Accountability requirement no. 6. For the time being this will be kept as NA in the results (until first week of January) where information is available.

Similarly with Audit opinion, the PM No. 20 in crosscutting, page 56: Keep it as NA (until the first week of January).

PM No. 9 (Clarification): If there is decline in own source revenue mobilization due to split of districts or other good reasons, the score will still be zero and the assessor will provide

narrative on this. One-off revenues do not encompass arrears which have been collected, as these are about efforts as well, hence should be included in the increase of OSR.

Generally on a number of PMs: If LG refers to IFMIS as reason for their non-performance, this should be ignored, and the assessors should still score in line with the requirements in the Manual. Hence scoring should be made without considering the reasons for non-performance.

Re. PM no 11, bullet No. two: Even if LGs have a waiver /or authorization to pass the ceiling on 20 %, then the assessors should still score as per requirement. The assessors should put the reasons for non-performance in the justification column in the OPAMS.

Re. PM no. 18 Internal audit, re. scoring guideline, add “at least “ so that the indicator will read:

*“Evidence that the LG **has at least** as Substantive Senior Internal Auditor..... (i.e. if they have a principle internal auditor this is also providing scores)*

Re. 19: Assets register: Even the LG is on IFMIS, they will have to comply with the requirements in the accounting manual. (e.g. they have to document the required performance, print out documents, etc.)

Re. Planning and good governance

(page 44) PM No. 1: The approved “action area plan” can be in form of a “detailed /or local physical development plan” (some LGs use these words for the same).

(Page 44) PM No. 1: Assessment procedures: Change the word in the first bullet to:

*“The current Physical Development Plan that was **recommended** by Council and submitted to the National Physical Planning Board for **approval**”.*

(page 56) PM No. 21: Add a footnote: after TPC reports which reads : “*pertaining issues which are dealt with by other levels, e.g. the district executive committee*”, may be summarized for the council deliberations (hence no requirement to discuss the full TPC report).

Re. Education

Performance measure No. 2: Clarify that under the section in the assessment procedure starting with: “If there is evidence of efforts....” ... that the efforts should also be calibrated from 0, 3 or 6 depending on the level of efforts (calibrated similarly to the text).

Performance measure no. 9 - Inconsistencies of lists of schools and enrollment submitted by LGs in EMIS and PBS - there is need to compare data submitted by the LGs in the MOES excel

template for IPF and compare it with PBS to ensure consistence. The indicator should therefore be kept but explained in the checklist.

PM no. 7: A food-note is missing after primary schools in the Performance measure column, hence please add "*Primary schools also include community schools*"

Re. **Health**

Clarify that sample size has to be as per the requirements in the Manual.

PM no. 10: Change the scoring under bullet 3 from "70-79%" to "**60-79%**" (so that 3 out of 5 sampled compliance units provides a score 2).

PM No. 12 (bullet one deals with input to **FY 2019/20** procurement plan).

PM No. 12, Bullet two deals with the performance on **FY 2018/19** (i.e. one year back). The form number should be changed from PP5 to PP1. The deadline for submission is by end of Quarter one, i.e. for this assessment review whether it was done **before September 30, 2018.**

Re. **Water**

PM 4; bullet 1, re. scoring, change "current FY " to "**previous FY**" Similarly in the assessment procedures, change from current FY to "*previous FY*"

PM 5, under assessment procedures, changes the word to DPU to "**PDU**"

Text formatting issues (text which has moved non-intentionally)

Education performance:

PM No. 5 belongs to thematic area A) Human resource planning and management

Water performance

PM No. 7 belongs to Thematic area C) Procurement and Contract Management

Check-list changes

Education

For appraisal is deals with the calendar **year 2018....**

Performance indicator No. 11 for education is missing in the check list, and has been added.

No. 14 from Education has been removed as it was covered by financial management

Water

PM 12, second bullet, check list has added: O&M plan and facility fenced /protected.

Checklist No. 15, changed sample to 3 in the checklist...