



## Local Government Performance Assessment

Kween District

(Vote Code: 612)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	67%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	56%
Educational Performance Measures	60%
Health Performance Measures	60%
Water Performance Measures	54%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From MoFPED's inventory/schedule of LG submissions of performance contracts, check dates of submission and issuance of receipts and:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If LG submitted before or by due date, then state 'compliant'</li> <li>o If LG had not submitted or submitted later than the due date, state 'non-compliant'</li> </ul> </li> <li>• From the Uganda budget website: <a href="http://www.budget.go.ug">www.budget.go.ug</a>, check and compare recorded date therein with date of LG submission to confirm.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG submitted to MoFPED Annual Performance contract for the FY 2018/19 on the 25th July 2018.</li> </ul>	Yes
Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY by 30th June (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From MoFPED's inventory of LG budget submissions, check whether:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The LG budget is accompanied by a Procurement Plan or not. If a LG submission includes a Procurement Plan, the LG is compliant; otherwise it is not compliant.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG submitted to MoFPED Budget that included Procurement Plan for the FY 2018/19 on the 25th July 2018.</li> </ul>	Yes

Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports

<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted report to MoFPED in time, then it is compliant</li> <li>• If LG submitted late or did not submit, then it is not compliant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG submitted to MoFPED the Annual Performance Report for FY 2017/18 on 10th August 2018.</li> </ul>	<p>No</p>
<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY by end of the FY; PFMA Act, 2015).</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of quarterly reports submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the quarterly performance reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted all four reports to MoFPED of the previous FY by July 31, then it is compliant (timely submission of each quarterly report, is not an accountability requirement, but by end of the FY, all quarterly reports should be available).</li> <li>• If LG submitted late or did not submit at all, then it is not compliant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Though the LG submitted to MoFPED the Budget Performance Reports for all four Quarters FY 2017/18 the Performance Report for Quarter 4 was submitted on 10th August 2018 which was past the due date. The others were submitted on the following dates:</li> </ul> <p>Quarter I report: 21st/12/2017</p> <p>Quarter II report: 20th/03/2018</p> <p>Quarter III report: 30th/04/2018.</p>	<p>No</p>

Audit

<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 find- ings where the Internal Audi- tor and the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action in lines with applicable laws.</p>	<p>From MoFPED’s Inventory/record of LG submissions of statements entitled “Actions to Address Internal Auditor General’s findings”,</p> <p>Check:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted a ‘Response’ (and provide details), then it is compliant</li> <li>• If LG did not submit a’ response’, then it is non-compliant</li> <li>• If there is a response for all –LG is compliant</li> <li>• If there are partial or not all issues responded to – LG is not compliant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG had submitted information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General’s findings for the previous financial year 2016/17 on 18th April,2018 for all findings as per copy verified from MOFPED’s inventory records of LG submissions of statements of “Actions to address Internal Auditor General’s findings”. The mandatory deadline for submission was 30th April 2018 (PFMAS 11’2g).Therefore, the LG was compliant,</li> </ul> <p>Further analysis of the information submitted above revealed that, the Internal Auditor General’s office raised a total of 20 queries during the FY 2016/2017, out of which 13 were cleared and 7 were pending, whereas, the office of the Auditor General raised none.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG Financial Statement was not adverse or disclaimer, it was unqualified opinion.</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a district/ municipality has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Physical Planning committee was constituted under CAO's letter dated 8th/June 2015. Members included District Engineer, District Physical Planner, DEO, DCDO, DAO, DHO, DNRO, and Town Clerk Binying TC. Lacked a physical planner in private practice.</li> <li>• Though 4 sets of Committee minutes were reviewed (for 07th/09/2017, 20th/11/2017, 06th/3/2018 and 16th/5/2018) which affirmed that some plans had been approved e.g. under Min 3/07/09/2017 and Min.03.16th/05/2018, timeliness of the approvals could not be ascertained since the building plan register did not capture the date of submission.</li> <li>• The LG had not approved building plans for projects contained in its approved AWP 2018/19 but only for private individuals and institutions e.g China State Co-operation Engineering Co. Ltd.</li> </ul>	0
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that district/ MLG has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD score 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG had not submitted minutes of District Physical Planning committee to MoLHUD as at time of assessment.</li> </ul>	0

<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All infrastructure investments are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan: score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG did not have an approved Physical Development plan (PDP) therefore consistency of investments with PDP could not be assessed.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action area plan prepared for the previous FY: score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District did not have action area plans.</li> <li>• However Binyiny TC had an approved plan running 2011-2021 while public display period for Kapraron TC plan had elapsed and had been submitted to National Physical Planning Board for approval.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>

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

development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and

budget conferences and

have project profiles

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.

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

- The Budget Conference report for FY 2018/19 dated 20th November 2017 prepared by District Planner identified some priorities under pages 16-28 in the various sectors that are also contained in the AWP FY 2018/19. These included completion of Administration block, construction of store at district headquarters, completion of fencing of Administration offices, completion of Kaptum HC III OPD with latrine, Health office completion, completion of Kabukoch HC II OPD, construction of Sundet HC OPD phase I, construction of placenta pits, construction of 2 classrooms in Kitawoi, construction of 10 stance latrine in Chepkwom and Sumaton, construction of 4 classrooms each in Mengya and Kapchekwok PS, roads –manual and routine mechanised maintenance, protection of 4 springs, construction of production wells phase II in Ngenge, construction of GFS in Kitawoi/Kwosir/Benet.

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If differences appear, a justification has to be provided and evidence provided that it was approved by the Council. Score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>All capital investments in in the approved AWP FY 2018/19 had been drawn from the approved DDP 2015/16-2019/20. They included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 projects in Administration (pg. 90 of AWP and 121-122 of DDP)</li> <li>• 6 projects in Water (pg. 17, 67-68, 134-136 of AWP and 120, 128 of DDP)</li> <li>• projects under roads (pg. 16, 127-128 of AWP and 120, 128 of DDP)</li> <li>• 2 projects under Education (pg. 15, of AWP and 120, 127 of DDP)</li> <li>• projects under Health (pg.120 of AWP and 121, 125-127 of DDP)</li> <li>• 1 project under production (pg.109 of AWP and 121 &amp; 124 of DDP)</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>
--	---	--	----------



<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Though Project profiles had been developed for all the investments in the AWP FY 2018/19 and discussed by DTPC in meeting of 13th/6/2018 under Min. 4/DTPC/6/2017, O&amp;M and environmental and social mitigation had not been costed.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual statistical abstract, with gender-disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum score 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LG had prepared an Annual Statistical Abstract dated April 2017 -draft form. Though there was an attempt to incorporate some of the statistics from the abstract e.g. district population by SC and gender into the budget conference report FY 2018/19, there was no evidence of presentation of the abstract to TPC to support budget allocation and decision making.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>

<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>All the following infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in FY 2017/18 were drawn from the approved AWP &amp; budget for the said year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of Administration block phase V (pg. 35 of Q4 report, pg 29 of AWP)</li> <li>• Completion of plant clinic (pg 48 of Q4 report, pg 41 of AWP )</li> <li>• Construction of Kaptum HCIII OPD phase II (pg. 57 of Q4 report, pg 45-46 of AWP)</li> <li>• Renovation of theatre at Kaproron HCIV (pg. 57 of Q4 report, pg 46 of AWP)</li> <li>• Construction of District Health office block (pg. 58-59 of Q4 report, pg 47 of AWP)</li> <li>• Construction of 2 classroom blocks in Songenwo PS (pg 60 of Q4 report, pg 48 of AWP)</li> <li>• Construction of 5 stance pit latrine each in Kaptum PS and Binyiny TC (pg. 61 of Q4 report, pg 48 of AWP)</li> <li>• Maintenance of 74.4km of roads in Binyiny and Kapronon TCs (pg of Q 4 report, pg 50 of AWP)</li> <li>• Maintenance of 108km of roads in 11 LLGs using gangs and machinery 2lines of culverts installed, and rehabilitation of 2 bridges at Yemtony upper (pg. 65 of Q4 report, pg 51 of AWP)</li> <li>• Protection of 4 spring wells (pg 68 of Q4 report, pg 53-54 of AWP)</li> <li>• 2 GFSs extended, construction of solar powered borehole and pump house (pg 68 of Q4 report, pg 54 of AWP)</li> </ul>	
---	--	---	--

<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY.</li> <li>o 100%: score 4</li> <li>o 80-99%: score 2</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	<p>All the 16 projects (100%) implemented by the LG in the previous FY were completed as per workplan. Examples of completed projects included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of Administration block phase V spent 195,250,000 against budget of 113,252,000 (pg. 35 of Q4 report, pg 29 of AWP)</li> <li>• Completion of plant clinic spent 134,214,000 against budget of 42,632,000 (pg 48 of Q4 report, pg 41 of AWP )</li> <li>• Construction of Kaptum HCIII OPD phase II spent 42,500,000 against budget of 45,000,000 (pg. 57 of Q4 report, pg 45-46 of AWP)</li> <li>• Renovation of theatre at Kaproron HCIV spent 14,000,000 against budget of 15,000,000 (pg. 57 of Q4 report, pg 46 of AWP)</li> <li>• Construction of District Health office block spent 47,500,000 against budget of 50,000,000 (pg. 58-59 of Q4 report, pg 47 of AWP)</li> <li>• Construction of 2 classroom blocks in Songenwo PS spent 59,847,000 against budget of 60,449,000 (pg 60 of Q4 report, pg 48 of AWP)</li> <li>• Construction of 5 stance pit latrine each in Kaptum PS and Binyiny TC spent 38,214,000 against budget of 38,214,000 (pg. 61 of Q4 report, pg 48 of AWP)</li> </ul>	
---	---	---	--

<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Based on the following sample of projects whose total expenditure was 531,525,000= against a total budget of 364,547,000=, representing + 45.8% variance, the LG expenditure was over and above the approved budget limits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of Administration block phase V spent 195,250,000 against budget of 113,252,000 (pg. 35 of Q4 report, pg 29 of AWP)</li> <li>Completion of plant clinic spent 134,214,000 against budget of 42,632,000 (pg 48 of Q4 report, pg 41 of AWP )</li> <li>Construction of Kaptum HCIII OPD phase II spent 42,500,000 against budget of 45,000,000 (pg. 57 of Q4 report, pg 45-46 of AWP)</li> <li>Renovation of theatre at Kaproron HCIV spent 14,000,000 against budget of 15,000,000 (pg. 57 of Q4 report, pg 46 of AWP)</li> <li>Construction of District Health office block spent 47,500,000 against budget of 50,000,000 (pg. 58-59 of Q4 report, pg 47 of AWP)</li> <li>Construction of 2 classroom blocks in Songenwo PS spent 59,847,000 against budget of 60,449,000 (pg 60 of Q4 report, pg 48 of AWP)</li> <li>Construction of 5 stance pit latrine each in Kaptum PS and Binyiny TC spent 38,214,000 against budget of 38,214,000 (pg. 61 of Q4 report, pg 48 of AWP)</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was not evident that the LG had conducted a systematic review of assets and infrastructure (aside from roads and water projects) that required maintenance.</li> <li>Only health sector (aside from roads and water) had budgeted and spent on O&amp;M for renovation of theatre at Kaproron HCIV -spent 14,000,000 against budget of 15,000,000 (pg. 57 of Q4 report, pg 46 of AWP)</li> </ul> <p>The AFA FY 2017/18 had a consolidated expense under 'Construction of Health Facilities' of 109,901,090= (Code 263209, Annex iii-Trial balance)</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Human Resource Management</p>			

<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>Only 22% (2 out of 9) positions of HoDs had been filled as per the approved structure dated 24/01/2017. The positions of the CFO and DCDO are substantively filled under DSC Min.KW/DSC/89/2013 and 59/2016 respectively. The district advertised the positions of DPMO, DE, DEO DNRO and DHO in October 2017 and failed to attract suitable candidates because of the required work experience (principal level) and academic qualifications among others.</p>	<p>0</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"> <li>• Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The annual performance reports for FY 2017/18 for HoDs were on the respective files. For example, the annual performance report for CFO was on file, dated 20/8/18 while the DCDO filed the appraisal form on 5/7/18 but the report was not yet signed by the CAO because she has been on sick leave for a long time.</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"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>In FY 2017/18, 88.6% (47 out of 53) posts submitted for filling had been considered by DSC as per minute extracts of the 79th and 81st KDSC meetings held on 2/2/18 and 16/4/18 ; under Min. Nos: KN/DSC/41/2017, KN/DSC/50-59/2018, and KN/DSC/82/2018 (a&amp;b) respectively.</p> <p>A total of (53) posts were submitted to DSC for filling by the CAO as per the (2) submission letters dated 2/10/17 and 9/4/18.</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"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>In FY 2017/18, 100% (All the 52) LG staff submitted for confirmation had been considered by DSC. Refer to the minute extracts of the 76th, 77th, 78th, and 83rd of DSC meetings under the following DSC minutes: KN/DSC/36/2017, KN/DSC/42/2017 (a&amp;b), KN/DSC/44/2017, KN/DSC/45-49/2017, KN/DSC/61-82/2018, and KN/DSC/85/2018 (c), respectively.</p> <p>The CAO submitted (52) confirmation files as per the individual submission letters dated between 11/10/17 and 13/12/18.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was no disciplinary cases submitted to DSC by CAO in FY 2017/18. This was confirmed in writing by the Ag.PHRO (Mr.Kiplimo Robert) on 7/9/18.</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"> <li>• Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>From a list of new employees recruited in FY 2017/18, it was found that 100% (All the 45) new staff appointed on 17/4/2018 accessed the salary payroll in May 2018 which is within the required timeframe of two months after appointment. Refer to the Uganda Government Payslip for the period (11) May 2018, Vote (612), and the sampled IPPS nos. 1024145, 1024110, 10244117, 1024055, 1023988, 1024012, 1023984, 1024068, 102407, etc.</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>In FY 2017/18, none (0%) of the 2 LG staff who retired on 2/3/18 (IPPS no.248855) and 2/4/18 (IPPS no.248372) had accessed the pension payroll. It was reported that the process is ongoing; files were certified by Ministry of Education and submitted to MoPS for consideration.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Revenue Mobilization</p>			
<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets) from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10 %: score 4.</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 2.</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>There was an increase of 90.6% in LG OSR in the FY 2017/18 as compared to the FY 2016/17.</p> <p>Review of annual financial accounts for the previous two years(2016/2017 &amp; 2017/2018) revealed that the LG has increased LG own source local revenues from shs 115,477,983 in the FY 2016/2017 to shs 220,107,984 in the FY 2017/2018, up by shs 104,630,001 which is 90,61% of the previous year but one (2016/2017). This percentage increase of 90.6% is higher than 10%</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>LG revenue collection ratio was +6.9 % which is within the acceptable variance of +/-10%</p> <p>Review of both annual budget and financial accounts for the previous year 2017/2018 revealed that the LG local revenue collection ratio was within the standard deviation of +/- 10% against the budget as demonstrated below:</p> <p>Total Local Revenue Planned/Budgeted for FY 2017/2018 was Shs 205,953,000, whereas the total actual local revenue collected was shs 220,105,984, representing a percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the FY 2017/2018 of 106,88%.<math>(220,105,984/205,958,000) \times 100\% = 106.88\%</math></p> <p>Total revenue collected over and above the budget was shs 14,152,984 , representing 6.9% of the budget <math>((220,105,984 - 205,958,000) / 205,958,000) \times 100 = 6.9\%</math></p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>LG had remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues.</p> <p>Review of annual financial statements together with remittances from the district in a statement entitled " Local service tax transfers to LLG for FY 2017/2018" revealed that the District has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues of 65%</p> <p>Local Revenue collections subjected to sharing with LLGs amounted to Shs 23,167,500 (raised from local service tax), whereas local revenue actually remitted to LLGs (including municipality and town councils) was Shs 18,299,000.</p> <p>Examples of remittances to sub-counties, town councils and municipality from the district during the year 2017/2018 were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kwanyiy sub-county received shs 2,375,000</li> <li>Kaproron Town council received shs 3,100,000</li> <li>Kaptoyoy sub-county received shs 3,000,000</li> <li>Kaptum sub-county received shs 1,093,000</li> <li>Benet sub-county received shs 1,117,000</li> <li>Ngenge sub-county received shs 1,155,000</li> <li>Kwosir sub-county received shs 1,216,000</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>



<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the total Council expenditures on allowances and emoluments- (including from all sources) is not higher than 20% of the OSR collected in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The LG total expenditure on council allowances and emoluments exceeded the the mandatory 20% of OSR collected in the FY 2017/18.</p> <p>Review of the annual financial statement revealed that the total council expenditures on allowances and emoluments (including from all sources), vote 210003, exceeded the mandatory 20% of the LG own source revenue collected as demonstrated below:</p> <p>Total expenditure on council allowances during FY 2017/2018 was Shs76,300,000 as per the vote 210003 in the annual financial statement, whereas total actual local revenue collected was only shs 220,105984, representing 34.67% of OSR used.</p> <p>The reason for over expenditure was that there were few local revenue sources.</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"> <li>Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The district has filled the position of Procurement Officer substantively but does not have a Senior Procurement Officer as is required</p> <p>The district is supported by an Assistant Procurement Officer</p> <p>Procurement Officer: Kiptoo Mark was recruited in this position under DSC Min. No. KN/DSC/ 115/2011(b)</p> <p>Assistant Procurement Officer: Cherotwo Joel was recruited in this position under DSC Min. No. KN/DSC/82/2013(h)</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee. For instance one of the items on the agenda of the Contracts Committee meeting held on 23/11/2017, was on the approval of the evaluation report for Open National Bidding, Selective Bidding and request for quotation bidding</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Contracts Committee meetings held 6/2/2018, 14/3/2018, and 1/6/2018 considered recommendations of TEC on various issues with no deviations</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Procurement and Disposal plan for current FY is in place and endorsed by CAO. The plan contains all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan.</p> <p>In the Previous FY, the LG largely adhered to the procurement plan of the previous FY. All 16 investment projects in the approved annual work plan were procured</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/ infrastructure by August 30: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>For the current FY, the district intends to prepare bid documents for 42 infrastructure projects. Only 12 (29%) of them were complete by August 30th. Bid documents for Open National Bidding were ready but none of the bids for Selective Bidding was ready even at the time of assessment</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The LG has an updated contracts register for 2017/2018 in place.</p> <p>The procurement activity files were complete as is required by the key records to check on the procurement file designed by PPDA, April 2008</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>For the previous FY, the LG adhered with procurement thresholds i.e. for procurements over 50m, the LG used the Open Bidding method and the Selective Bidding Method for procurements below 50m. For instance;</p> <p>(a) Completion of the Plant Clinic was planned at 20m and awarded at 19,094,250/= under selective bidding;</p> <p>(b) Construction of OPD Kapthum HC III was planned at 47,500,000/= but awarded at 50,029,840/= under Open National Bidding;</p> <p>(c) Construction of the GFS at Benet was planned at 57,347,000/= but awarded at 41,415,000/= under Selective Bidding;</p> <p>(d) Rehabilitation of Kapnarkut bridge was done under Force Account/no threshold;</p> <p>(e) Construction of 2 classes in Songweno was awarded at 51,173,062 under Open National Bidding</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Sampled projects were appropriately certified; For instance;</p> <p>(a) Completion of the Plant Clinic (Phase II) at the District HQs. Two payment certificates were issued against this investment-</p> <p>Interim certificate dated 13/4/2018 final/completion certificate dated 29/6/2018</p> <p>(b) Construction of OPD Kapthum HC III</p> <p>Interim certificate dated 15/5/2018</p> <p>final/completion certificate dated 15/6/2018</p> <p>(c) Construction of the GFS at Benet</p> <p>Interim certificates dated 25/6/2018</p> <p>Final/completion certificate dated 29/6/2018</p> <p>The certification was based on technical supervision guided by the BOQs</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of assessment, the district had not started implementing any works project</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Financial management</p>			
<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had made up-to date bank reconciliations at the time of the assessment..</p> <p>Review of bank reconciliations which were manually recorded in the various cashbooks for individual bank accounts revealed that, the LG made monthly bank reconciliations and were all up-to-date , e.g.</p> <p>(1) Stanbic bank a/c 9030005665042-Kapchorwa branch , in the names of " Kween District Finance and Planning "was reconciled and approved as at 31/8/2018 , with balance as per cash book of shs 546,108.</p> <p>(2) Stanbic bank a/c 9030005665018-Kapchorwa branch, in the names of" Kween District Administration account" was reconciled and approved as at 31/8/2018 , with balance as per cashbook of shs 47,676.</p> <p>(3) Stanbic bank a/c 9030005665107-Kapchorwa branch, in the names of" Kween District Statutory account" was reconciled and approved as at 31/8/2018 , with balance as per cashbook of shs 119,039.</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</li> <li>– no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had made timely payment of suppliers during the FY 2017/18</p> <p>Review of payments together with their supporting documents attached( including contracts), revealed that the LG made timely payments to suppliers.</p> <p>Examples of contracts verified include;</p> <p>(1) Procurement no.Kwe 612/supls/16-17/12, for supply of stationary by Vest General Enterprises, contract price (open), date of payment 13/9/2017, payment voucher no,30/9/2017, amount paid shs 131,800 .</p> <p>(2) Procurement No.Kwe 612/souls/17-18/00033, for supply of stationary by Grace multipurpose co. ltd, contract price (open), date of payment 24/5/2018, payment voucher no,20/5, amount paid shs 5,550,000 , LPO NO.8907, invoice number 044 dated 14/5/18,contract signing date 26/2/18..</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor: 1 point.</li> <li>• LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had a substantive Senior Internal Auditor</p> <p>as per the .appointment minute ref: KN/DSC/62/2018, dated 14/4/2018 in the names of Chelengat Ruth, (the current head of audit department), for the post of District Internal Auditor ( on promotion from senior internal auditor), with a salary scale, U2 .</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had produced all quarterly Internal Audit Reports for FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarter 1 internal audit report was dated 31/10/2017.</li> <li>• Quarter 2 internal audit report was dated 29/1/2018</li> <li>• Quarter 3 internal audit report was dated 29/4/2018</li> <li>• Quarter 4 internal audit report was dated 31/7/2018.</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports: score 2.</p>	<p>The LG had provided information to the council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings as indicated below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarter 1 internal audit report was submitted to LG Accounting officer, LG-PAC on 30/10/2017(duly stamped received and signed)</li> <li>• Quarter 2 internal audit report was submitted to LG Accounting officer, LG-PAC on 29/1/2018(duly stamped received and signed)</li> <li>• Quarter 3 internal audit report was submitted to LG Accounting officer, LG-PAC on 29/4/2018(duly stamped received and signed)</li> <li>• Quarter 4 internal audit report was submitted to LG Accounting officer, LG-PAC on 31/7/2018(duly stamped received and signed).</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Though internal audit reports for the previous FY 2017/2018 were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC in the order shown below, there was no evidence showing that they were either reviewed or followed up e.g lack of letters of follow up on internal audit recommendations, together with lack of review minutes by PAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarter 1 was received and stamped by CAO and LG PAC on 30/10/2017.</li> <li>• Quarter 2 was received and stamped by CAO and LG PAC on 29/1/2018.</li> <li>• Quarter 3 was received and stamped by CAO and LG PAC on 29/4/2018.</li> <li>• Quarter 4 was received and stamped by CAO and LG PAC on 31/7/2018.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG maintains an up- dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG did not maintain a detailed and up-to-date assets register, neither was it in the format prescribed in the accounting manual e.g Land had no values (cost/valuation) and were not separated into Agricultural, lease hold and milo land, items of ICT Equipments, furniture and fittings had no values</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unqualified audit opinion: score 4</li> <li>• Qualified: score 2</li> <li>• Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG Financial Statements 2017/2018 had unqualified audit opinion.</li> </ul>	<p>4</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			



<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of six (6) sets of District Council minutes for meetings held on 24th/8/2017, 10th/11/2017, 12th/1/2018, 1st/2/2018, 28th/3/2018 and 31st/5/2018 indicated that though Council had discussed some service delivery issues performance assessment results for FY 2017/18 and LG PAC reports had not been discussed. Though LG PAC report had been tabled to Council under Min. 43./KDCM/03/2018 of 28th/3/2018 it was not discussed but instead was straight away referred to the CAO for implementation.</li> <li>Examples of issues discussed included approval of supplementary budgets (Global Fund for HIV/AIDS &amp; malaria and for UNICEF/UNFPA –polio immunisation) under Min. 08/KDCM/08/2017 of 24th/8/2017, approval of revised procurement plan for Sub County projects under Min. 33/KDCM/02/2018 and Committee reports /district status report under Min30/KDM/02/2018 both of 1st/2/2018.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Though an internal memo by the CAO dated 4th July 2017 designated the Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Mr. Chepsikor Dison Juma, as Focal point person for grievance handling, it was not evident that any complaints had been responded to as at time of assessment.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which should be displayed at LG offices and made publically available: score 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG had not designed, displayed and made publically available a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances as at the time of assessment.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG payroll July 2018 and Pensioner schedule 2018 had been published on the notice board at the district headquarters.</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Procurement plan for FY 2018/19 and awarded contracts &amp; amounts had not been displayed/published at time of assessment.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The LG had not published/displayed its performance assessment results for FY 2017/18.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG had communicated and explained circulars and guidelines to LLGs for example the budget process and DDEG guidelines, both for FY 2018/19, were discussed under Min.04/DTPC/11/2017 in DTPC meeting of 10th/11/2017 attended by some LLGs.</li> </ul>	1
<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG had conducted discussions with the public in FY 2017/18, as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A report of baraza held on 20th August 2017 in Benet SC prepared by Principal Assistant Secretary, Ms. Cheptock Juliet.</li> <li>• Qtr 4/Annual report FY 2017/18 which indicated that 4 radio talk shows were held on Kapchorwa KTR on trade development, cooperatives, market linkage and industrial development.</li> </ul>	1
Social and environmental safeguards			
<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG gender focal person and CDO have provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion into their activities score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The LG has made some efforts to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion in their activities. For instance a training report seen indicates that Heads of Department and Political Leaders were trained on mainstreaming gender into work plans and budgets. The activity was held at Kween District HQs on 15th November 2017</p>	2

<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the gender focal point and CDO have planned for minimum 2 activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and address vulnerability and social inclusions and that more than 90 % of previous year's budget for gender activities/ vulnerability/ social inclusion has been implemented: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The Department has planned more than 2 activities for the current FY to strengthen women's roles and address vulnerability and social inclusion. These include: Building of a GBV Shelter, support to women and PWD groups to start income generation activities, support to women, youth and PWD Councils, settling abandoned children,</p> <p>From the Department and Accounts, it was established that in the previous FY, Community Based Services Department planned for 520,134,943. Of this, 414,407,225 was released. This translates into 80% of the planned budget implemented</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Projects have been screened and each was assigned class C which means that no full EIA is required for any of them. Screening was done in October and November 2017. Mitigation measures for environmental and social issues are documented and the environmental certification forms for each of these projects indicate that some environmental mitigation measures were implemented. Also, the bids indicate that these measures were budgeted for;</p> <p>For instance in the construction of a two classroom block at Songweno, the following was planned;</p> <p>Site preparation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Top soil –cut to spoil- 96,000/=</li> </ul> <p>Disposal of excavated materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Return, fill and ram, 32,000/=</li> <li>Surplus excavated materials on site, 48,000/=</li> </ul> <p>Maintenance for excavations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain sites of excavations-50,000/=</li> <li>Keeping excavations free from surface water-50,000/=</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The LG has made some effort to integrate environmental issues in the bid documents. However, the social management issues are not captured</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The district is in the process of acquiring land titles for some of the Government land such as the land on which the OPD Kapthum HC III is due to be constructed. However, for other projects such as those implemented on church, community and or private land, there was no agreement or any other document defining the tenancy of the LG with the land owners</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Completed projects have environmental certification but the CDO did not endorse the form for any of the projects</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance (new one): Score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The payment certificate has no provision for environmental and social certification and neither is it attached to any payment</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that environmental officer and CDO monthly report, includes a) completed checklists, b) deviations observed with pictures, c) corrective actions taken. Score: 1</li></ul>	<p>No monthly reports on environmental matters by environmental officer and CDO were availed at the time of assessment</p>	<p>0</p>
---	---	--	----------

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>The LG education de- partment has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>The approved budget in the performance contract for FY 2018/19(LG Work Plan page 55) indicates sh. 2,789,741,000 for 439 teachers in 37 government aided primary schools. This budget caters for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school in the LG.</p>	4
<p>The LG education de- partment has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence from the school list and LG staff list show that the LG had not deployed a head teacher and at least 7 teachers in each of the 37 government aided primary schools. One school called Kitawoi primary school is primary seven level school with only 7 teachers without a head teacher. According to the DEO, this school is in a hard-to-reach area.</p>	0
<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100%: score 6</li> <li>o If 80 - 99%: score 3</li> <li>o If below 80%: score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The staff sealing for 37 primary schools is 509, of which 435 teachers are in post. The approved budget in the performance contract for FY 2018/19(LG Work Plan page 55) provides sh. 2,789,741,000 for 439 teachers in 37 government aided primary schools. The wage bill for 435 teachers in post as per LG staff list indicates 2,789,740,980. Translating to 100% filled structure of the primary teachers with the provided wage bill.</p>	6



<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6</li> </ul>	<p>The Approved LG structure approved in two (2) position of school inspectors, and both have been substantively filled. The two inspectors of schools by names: Cherotich Michael (Ag DEO) and Cherono Stephen were recruited under the DSC Min no.136/2004 and DSC under minute no: KN/DSC/83 2018(a) respectively.</p>	<p>6</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary Teachers: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG Education department had submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY 2018/2019, to fill positions of primary teachers.</p> <p>The plan that had been submitted to Ministry of Public Service on 16th of March 2017 and forwarded as evidence had expired in August, 2017. It had indicated the recruitment of 16 headteachers and 37 education assistants II, and stated that these vacancies were to be filled August, 2017.</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"> <li>• School Inspectors: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was no need for the LG Education department to submit a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY 2018/2019, to fill positions of school inspectors, since both positions had been filled.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Monitoring and Inspection</p>			

<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% school inspectors: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>50% (1 out of 2) inspectors of schools had been appraised for FY 2017/18. The (2) positions of Inspectors of Schools as provided in the approved structure are substantively filled under the DSC Min no.136/2004 (ii) and KN/DSc/83/2018 (a). The annual performance report 2017/18 for the Senior Inspector of schools (Cherotich Michael) was on file, stamped and signed by CAO on 20/8/18. However, the annual performance report 2017/18 for Mr.Cheronno Stephen-Inspector of Schools was Not on file</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"> <li>• Primary school head teachers o 90 - 100%: score 3</li> <li>o 70% and 89%: score 2</li> <li>o Below 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>None (0%) of (37) head teachers had been appraised for calendar year 2017. There are (21) substantively appointed head teachers and (16) Acting HTs. The annual performance appraisal for all primary head teachers for calendar year 2017 was not conducted. This was confirmed in writing by the Ag.PHRO on 7/9/18.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There is no evidence that LG education received all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools. Some of the circulars that were received had been communicated to reach schools as indicated by headteachers' meetings on 22nd of January 2018, and 9th of June 2018. These circulars include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Enforcement of the standard of operating procedures for private schools in Uganda, on 15th February 2018.</li> <li>(2) Guidelines of ECD</li> <li>(3) UNEB release of results 2017</li> </ol> <p>However, in sampled schools visited including: Chemwania PS, Cheminy Christian PS, Chepyakaniet PS, Kabukoch PS and Kapteror PS, there was no evidence of copies of circulars received, though some headteachers indicate that they had received them. Perhaps this is due to poor record keeping</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that the education department held meetings with headteachers among other stakeholders to explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level. For example,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Guidelines of ECD were received and discussed in the executive meeting of the headteachers on 9th of June 2018, where 11 members attended. They recommended that ECD start with immediate effect. Under minute 9/2018, a focal point officer to coordinate ECD was appointed by the CAO</li> <li>(2) On 22nd of January 2018, the department received UNEB results. On 2nd of March 2018, a meeting of stakeholders including headteachers was held to discuss causes of poor performance, and work plan to mitigate teachers' absenteeism and improve teachers' preparation was drawn in the meeting.</li> </ol>	<p>2</p>

The LG Education De- partment has effectively inspected all registered primary schools2

Maximum 12 for this performance measure

• Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced:

- 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.

Kween DLG has 37 government, 54 private and 18 community primary schools making total of 109.

The number of schools Inspected in 2017/18 were as follows:

	Government Community	Private % of inspection
coverage		
Term I 2018	37	35
	10	(82/109)*100=
75%		
Term III 2017	37	
39	12	
(88/109)*100= 81%		
Term I I2017	30	30
5		(65/109)*100= 60%
	104	104
	27	

Average inspection coverage =  $(75 + 81 + 60) = 216/3 = 72\%$

In the sampled schools( number of inspections) in FY 2017/18 include:Chemwania P/S(2/3=67%); Cheminey Christian private P/S(2/3 =67%) , Chepyakaniet P/S(3/3=100%), Kapteror P/S (2/3=67%) and Kabukoch P/S) (2/3=67%).

Average inspection coverage in sampled schools =  $967 + 67+67+100+67)/5 = 74\%$

Average inspection coverage =  $(72+74)/2 = 73\%$

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>Minutes of Routine meetings in LG education department indicate that the school inspection report discussed the finding and took corrective action. The three key recommendation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers whose attendance and time on task was low to be warned.</li> <li>• Private schools without minimum required to be closed</li> <li>• Parents to be encouraged supporting the feeding of their children at school.</li> </ul> <p>For example,</p> <p>On 6th March 2018 , the DEO sought advice from CAO about a teacher of Chemanga Primary School had absconded duty.</p> <p>On 23rd May 2018 , the DEO submitted to RDC , Kween District a list of illegal schools.</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"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The school inspection reports academic year 2017 were forwarded to DES on the following dates; 19th –March – 2018, report Term III 2017 , 9th –December -2017, report Term II 2017, 12th –may -2017 , report Term I 2017 .</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed- up: score 4.</li> </ul>	<p>(1) The teacher (III/2001/3538) of Kabukoch primary school, who had absconded duty was disciplined.</p> <p>(2) Illegal private schools were closed.</p> <p>(3) The SMCs of sampled schools had discussed school feeding program and sensitized the parents. Some schools had started contributing food rations to feed the children. For example, each parent contributed 4kg of maize and 5kg of beans for midday meal for the children at school.</p>	4
<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The list of schools in the office of LG education and PBS as well as EMIS data from MOES contains 37 government aided schools.</p>	5
<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>On whole, the total enrollment data for all schools submitted to the MoES is not accurate and consistent with EMIS and PBS. While the office of LG education 23359 pupils in April 2017 statistical returns from schools, MoES recorded 23068, with a difference of 291. The number of pupils that was used in PBS was 23280, indicating deviation of 79 from MoES.</p>	0
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The LG committee re- sponsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Review of 4 sets of Social Services Committee meetings of 2nd/8/2017, 18th/1/2018, 20th/3/2018 and 22nd/5/2018 affirmed that though some service delivery issues had been discussed performance assessment results for FY 2017/18 and LG PAC had not been discussed.</p> <p>Examples of issues discussed included Education Qtr 4 report FY 2016/17 under Min. 03/SCC/08/2017 of 2nd/8/2017 and the need to plan for Secondary schools in the Kitawoi and Kwasir SCs under Min. 04/SSCOM/03/2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG committee re- sponsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Social Services Committee had presented to District Council issues that required approval, for instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee report and recommendations under Min30/KDM/02/2018 of 1st/2/2018 e.g. recommended demotion of head teachers of schools that persistently perform poorly in PLE and the need to draft an Education ordinance.</li> <li>• Committee also laid to Council under Min. 40/KDCM/03/2018 of 28th/3/2018 budget estimates for 2018/19 and which were subsequently discussed and approved in Council meeting of 31st/05/2018 under Min. 50(a)/KDCM/05/2018</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>

<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO/ MEO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% schools: score 5</li> <li>• 80 to 99% schools: score 3</li> <li>• Below 80 % schools: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The 4 of 5 schools(80%) schools had functional SMCs in FY 2017/18 .</p> <p>At the time of assessment, the SMCs had expired in June 2018. However, in letter dated 7th – August -2018, the CAO had informed all headteachers to follow guidelines of the Education Act 2008.</p> <p>The files of five (5) sampled schools: (Chemanga P/S, Cheminey Christian private P/S, Chepyakaniet P/S, Kapteror P/S and Kabukoch P/S) were randomly picked and reviewed.</p> <p>There was evidence of minutes that they had conducted termly mandatory meetings in FY 2017/2018 , and number of meetings reported were as follows:</p> <p>(1) In Kapteror P/S, two meetings(67%) on 7th -06-2018 and 22th –February -2018 ,</p> <p>(2) Chemanga P/S, three meetings(100%) on 19th -06-2018 , 1st -3-2018 and 12th -10-2017 ,</p> <p>(3) Chepyakaniet P/S, three meetings (100%) on 13th -6-2018, 21st -3-2018 and 6th -12-2017 .</p> <p>(4)Cheminey Christian private P/S, had a different composition of SMC contrary to the Education Act 2008.</p> <p>Among issues discussed by SMCs included Approval of School Budget and Work Plans, which was reflected in all schools, feeding program of pupils, school land conflicts and absenteeism of teachers and pupils.</p> <p>For example, in Chemwania primary school, the SMCs had discussed about ploughing of school land to plant maize and beans to supplement what parents provide to feed children.</p> <p>In Kabukoch P/S, parents provide 10kg of maize and 5Kg of beans to feed children.</p> <p>In Chepyakaniet P/S, the SMC discussed land boundary issues and formation of procurement committee.</p>
---	--	---



<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non- wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</li> </ul> <p>e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</p>	<p>There was evidence on the notice board of LG Education showing display of previous Quarter UPE grants, and the individual schools had displayed the grants on walls of their 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,</p> <p>to the Procurement Unit that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>The Education Department did not submit any investment item for procurement by April 30th 2018. The DEO explained that they were requested to halt procurement's until new guidelines from MOES were in place. Meanwhile, at the time of assessment, no communication to this effect was produced</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG Education department timely certified and recommended suppliers for payment as per the contract terms and conditions.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of contracts verified are:</p> <p>(1)-Procurement Ref:Kwe 612/wrks/17-18/00010, by Bakasuku Agencies Ltd, for construction of 5 stance latrine at Binyiny p/school, with a contract price of shs 19,100,000, signed on 12/1/2018, date of completion 31/5/2018, and date of payment 29/6/2018,payment voucher no.24/6/2018, amount paid shs 19,100,000, contract price shs 19,100,000</p> <p>(2)- Procurement Ref:Kwe/612/wrks/17-18/00008, by Sky Extra Ltd, contract price shs 51,173,062. Contract period 4 months, planned date of completion 31/5/2018, actual date of completion 31/5/2018, Payment voucher No.29/6/18, amount paid shs 51,173,062(wht inclusive)</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15th of July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The actual dates of submission of annual performance report and quarterly reports for FY 2017/18 by Education department to planning unit could not be ascertained although all the said reports captured input from Education department.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</li> <li>o If sector has no audit query score 4</li> <li>o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2</li> <li>o If all queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The sector had provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the year 2017/18 and , action on queries raised by the Internal Auditor during FY 2017/2018 were as summarised below:</p> <p>Total number of queries raised were 4, 2 queries were raised in 1st quarter and 2 in 3rd quarter, but all queries were not yet cleared by the time of this assessment.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills, etc.: Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>In a workshop held on 4th April 2018, the gender focal point disseminated guidelines on child marriages and teenage pregnancy, reproductive health, to Head Teachers and Senior Women Teachers.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>In a workshop held on 4th April 2018, the gender focal point disseminated guidelines on hygiene and sanitation to Head Teachers and Senior Women Teachers</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The requirement of the gender composition as per the 2nd Schedule of the Education Act 2008 is at least 2 women on the Foundation Body which has a total of 6 people.</p> <p>The SMCs operating in the 37 Government Schools met the gender guidelines though their period expired in June 2018.</p> <p>Chemanga P/S, Cheminey Christian private P/S, Chepyakaniet P/S, Kapteror P/S and Kabukoch P/S at least 2 women members on each on the Foundation body of 6 members.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 1:</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence of such guidelines at the time of assessment</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all school infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 1</li> </ul>	<p>All school infrastructure projects have been screened and mitigation actions identified. The screened Education Facility projects were as follows ;</p> <p>(a) Construction of a 5 stance VIP Pit latrine in Binyiny P/S</p> <p>(b) Construction of a 5 stance VIP Pit latrine in Kaptum P/S</p> <p>(c) Construction of a 2 classroom block and office in Songweno P/S</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence of such visits by the environment and community development officer by the time of assessment</p>	<p>0</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health care workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health care with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than 80% filled: score 8</li> <li>• 60 – 80% - score 4</li> <li>• Less than 60% filled: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The LG Performance contract 2018/19 FY indicates the PHC wage bill provision of UGX 2,615,372,000 and the wage bill for staff in post of UGX 2,743,183,080 as per the staff list after the salary enhancement implying that all posts where the wage bill is provided are filled. From the approved annual work plan and budget, 85% of positions are filled.</p>	8
<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan for primary health care workers to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/re- quest to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of primary health care workers: score 6</p>	<p>A recruitment plan submitted to HRM in a letter dated 19th June 2018 was on file covering 41 positions</p>	6

<p>The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital In-charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100%: score 8</li> <li>o 70 – 99%: score 4</li> <li>o Below 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>100% of health facility in-charge had been appraised. The annual performance appraisal report (2017/18) for the health facility in-charge (Dr.Okariod Edward-Medical Officer) for Kaproron HC IV was on file and signed by Ag.DHO on 9/7/18.</p>	<p>8</p>
<p>The Local Government Health department has deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY, and if not provided justification for deviations: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>The deployed staffs in the sampled health facilities (Kaptum HCIV, Kproron HCIV, Chemwom HCIII, Atar and, Binyinyi HCIII) are as per the staff list in the performance contract 2018/19.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Monitoring and Supervision</p>			
<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DHO/MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was no evidence obtained to show the guidelines and circulars communicated to the health facilities</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO/MHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of assessment, there were no reports/minutes to show that policies, guidelines were explained to health facility in charges.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: score 3</p>	<p>The District has one HCIV and no hospital. Supervision was done for all quarters as per reports dated 20/9/2017 for Q1, 8/3/2018 for Q3, and 10/7/2018 for Q4. However, supervision for Q2 was not done due to Marbug outbreak.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% supervised: score 3</li> <li>80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2</li> <li>60% - 79% of the health facilities: score 1</li> <li>Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>All lower level health facilities were supervised as per the supervision log books e.g. report of 10/7/2018 for supervision done from 19/6/18 to 5/7/18, report dated 11/4/2018 for march supervision etc. However, Q2 supervision was not done due to Marbug outbreak.</p>	<p>0</p>



<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>Supervision reports were discussed as per minutes dated 28/3/2018 for Q1 report, 4/4/2017 for Q3 report and 8/8/2018 for Q4 report. The annual review meeting of 23/8/2018 further discussed issues arising out of the supervision reports.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence for clear actions undertaken e.g. introduction of attendance register was never enforced in health facilities.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>HMIS forms 105 and 108 for July 2018 were submitted through DHIS2 and MTRAC online systems and hard copies for August from health facilities exist at DHO's office. The list of facilities is consistent with PBS ( performance contract.</p>	<p>10</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of 4 sets of Social Services Committee meetings of 2nd/8/2017, 18th/1/2018, 20th/3/2018 and 22nd/5/2018 affirmed that though some service delivery issues had been discussed, performance assessment results for FY 2017/18 and LG PAC reports had not been considered.</li> <li>Examples of issues discussed included Health Qtr 4 report FY 2016/17 under Min. 03/SCC/08/2017 of 2nd/8/2017 – identified need for increased financing to the department and under Min 4/01/SSCOM/2018 of 18th/1/2018 the committee recommended sensitisation of communities on possibility of future Marburg outbreak and identified HCs that needed to be upgraded.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Social Services Committee presented to Council issues that required approval, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Committee report and recommendations were presented under Min30/KDM/02/2018 of 1st/2/2018 e.g. upgrading of HCs and creation of Tukumo HCIII in Binyiny SC and documentation of absenteeism by Health workers so as to sanction the culprits.</li> <li>The committee laid to Council under Min. 40/KDCM/03/2018 of 28th/3/2018 budget estimates for 2018/19 and which were subsequently discussed and approved in Council meeting of 31st/05/2018 under Min. 50(a)/KDCM/05/2018</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>

<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 6 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 6</li> <li>• If 80-99 %: score 4</li> <li>• If 70-79: %: score 2</li> <li>• If less than 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of assessment, two (2) out of the five (5) sampled health facilities had the HUMCs sit all quarters as per the minutes of their quarterly meetings. Others had only two sittings for two quarters and relevant issues were discussed i.e <math>2/5=40\%</math>.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non- wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence of displaying the health facilities receiving PHC non- wage on the notice board.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has submitted input to procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Submission was done in a letter dated 19/4/2018 listing all the projects in the health annual work plan.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of assessment, the department did provide evidence of submission of the PP form1. Procurements were handled by the PDU without request forms filled and submitted.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO/ MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DHO certified and recommended suppliers for payment timely .Sample contracts verified to determine terms of payment were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i)-Procurement no.Kwe 612/wrks/17-18/00005 for Construction of District Health Office phase iv, by Sabiny Trust (u) ltd, payment voucher no 13/6/2018 dated 26/6/18 of shs 49,959,500, contract price shs 49,959,600, commencement date 22/5/18, contract period 4 months, completion date 31/5/18.</li> <li>(ii)- Procurement no.Kwe 612/wrks/17-18/00006 for construction of OPD at Kaptum HC II, by Ngujjo Investments ltd , date of award 14/12/2017, contract price shs 50,029,840, completion date 15/5/2018.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>4</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The actual dates of submission of annual performance report and quarterly reports for FY 2017/18 by Health department to planning unit could not be ascertained although all the said reports captured input from Health department.</li> </ul>	0
<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If sector has no audit query: Score 4</li> <li>If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: Score 2 points</li> <li>If all queries are not responded to Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The health sector had provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the year 2017/18, and</p> <p>action on queries raised by the Internal Auditor during FY 2017/2018 are as summarised below:</p> <p>The total number of queries raised during the year were 9 and all were not cleared. Quarters 1 &amp; 3 had no queries, quarter 2 had 8 queries and quarter 4 had 1.</p>	2
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"> <li>Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30 % women: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Three (3) of the five (5) sampled health facilities meet the gender requirement of 30% females on the HUMC (Binyinyi HCIII, Kapraron HCIV and Atar HCII). The other two (2) i.e Chemwom has only men(0%) while Kaptum has 2 females out of 8people on the committee(25%).ie 60% met the requirement.</p>	0

<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>All the sampled facilities have sanitation facilities labelled for male and females.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Three projects done had environmental screening forms filled i.e construction of OPD at Kaptum HCIII and theatre at Kaproron HCIV the forms were filled on 22/11/2018 while the form for construction of the health office was filled on 27/11/2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Site visit reports for the three projects were done as per reports on file dated 8/6/2018 for OPD at Kaptum HCIII and 22/6/2018 for both the theatre at Kaproron HCIV and District health office construction.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal: score 4.</li> </ul>	<p>All five(5) sampled facilities had charts on segregation of medical waste and/or waste bins in different colours for separating medical waste. In addition, Kaproron HCIV has a manual incinerator for burning waste and Kaptum HCIII has safety boxes for sharps.</p>	<p>4</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the district Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below average coverage: score 10</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 7</li> <li>o If 60-79: Score 4</li> <li>o If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Kween District safe water coverage stands at 56.5%.</p> <p>According to MWE statistics, Kween LG has 83% rural and Urban 93%, with one sub county (Ngenge S/C) with National water and sewerage corporation coverage. DWO regards above statistical percentage as invalid and confirms there is no national water supply in the district.</p> <p>Kween LG has twelve sub counties, five sub counties are above district average, .i.e. benet – 72.9%, Kapraron 65%, Kaptoyoy – 58.7, Kitawoi – 77.8%, Ngenge – 62.2 seven are below district coverage.</p> <p>As par LG AWP, FY 2018/19, DWO budgeted and targeted one sub county below district safe water coverage; .i.e. kwosir – 55.6%.</p> <p>Three sub counties budgeted and targeted in FY 2018/19 were above district coverage; i.e. Benet S/C - 72.9%, Ngenge S/C – 62.2 and Kapraron S/C – 65.3%.</p> <p>Kween District had targeted three sub counties above the district average (56.6%) FY 2018/19, i.e. Ngenge S/C at 62%, Benet S/C at 72.9% and Kwosir at 55.6%.</p> <p>Total FY 2018/19 budget was UGX.142, 301,000 for three major GFS projects.</p> <p>Of the three projects, only one GFS kwosir, targeted served the sub county below district average.</p> <p>Kwosir GFS cost was UGX. 42,021,587, leading to 40% FY 2018/19 budget allocation to sub counties below district safe water coverage.</p>	0

<p>The district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</li> <li>o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs:</li> </ul> <p>Score 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 10</li> <li>o If 60-79: Score 5</li> <li>o If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>As evidenced in Kween LG AWP 2017/18, DWO implemented two gravity flow scheme projects, protection of four springs and a borehole; i.e. Extension of Kwasir GFS, Benet GFS and one solar powered borehole in Ngenge sub county.</p> <p>DWO budget for FY 2017/18 targeted three sub counties above district safe water coverage; i.e. Ngenge – 62.5% at UGX 68,040,000, Benet – 72.9% at UGX. 43,821,857 and Kaptum – 65.3 at UGX. 8,000.000</p> <p>Only one sub county below district safe water coverage was targeted .i.e. Kwasir GFS, twelve tap stands were constructed and completed under this GFS.</p>	<p>15</p>
---	---	---	-----------

#### Monitoring and Supervision

<p>The district Water department carries out monthly monitoring of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the district Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15</li> <li>• 80% - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10</li> <li>• 70 - 79%: score 7</li> <li>• 60% - 69% monitored: score 5</li> <li>• 50% - 59%: score 3</li> <li>• Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Monitoring and supervision reports on file submitted to CAO, and Annual progress report (Q4) on the extension of Benet GFS and four springs, one in kaptum, two in Benet, one in Kapraron and one solar powered borehole in ngenge S/C.</p> <p>All projects were monitored and supervised.</p> <p>DWO, in the Memo dated 28/2/2018 inspected the entire three water sources.</p> <p>DWO, in the memo dated 3/30/2018 inspected three projects and noticed challenge of rain which affected construction progress.</p> <p>Meme dated 30/4/2018, kwasir construction was almost completed, and two springs at kaptum were completed.</p> <p>30th may 2018, kwasir contractor had completed, benet progress, piping was completed, spring installation was almost done.</p> <p>Memo dated 29/6/2018, all the contractors had completed and payment was done.</p> <p>According to monitoring file on table, 486 water sources were monitored in the FY 2017/18, as par copies submitted to MOWE.</p>	<p>15</p>
--	---	---	-----------



<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the district has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: Score 5</li> <li>List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>Data update in MIS/TSU FY 2017/18, Kween LG rural safe water coverage was at 85%, and DWO PBS latest data update, kween district stands at 56.5%</p> <p>MIS data update, Kween LG (Ngenge S/C) has national water. DWO.</p> <p>Water facilities in MIS and PBS are inconsistent. Twelve tap stands are recorded in Kwosir and four in Benet, totaling to 16, in MIS data update 15 tap stands.</p>	0
<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>Water facilities in MIS and PBS are inconsistent. Twelve tap stands are recorded in Kwosir and four in Benet, totaling to 16, in MIS data update 15 tap stands are recorded</p>	0
Procurement and contract management			
<p>The district Water department has submitted input for district's procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted input for the district procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	<p>Water department submitted procurement plan FY 2017/18 to PDU;</p> <p>Extension of kwosir GFS, Benet extension and protection of 4 springs.</p> <p>Date of acknowledgement of request by the PDU was 10th July 2018.</p> <p>PDU acknowledged receipt of the plan on 19th July 2018.</p>	0

<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the contract manager prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>In the letter dated 31/1/2018, District CAO appointed the contracts manager (DWO) and delegated him to appoint a supervisor in the names of Tomin Nelson.</p> <p>In the monitoring/ supervision file submitted to CAO, the DWO conducted monthly site visits to different water sources.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Water sources drawings (plan) and bills of quantities for all projects were on file, facilities were constructed as par the designs.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Benet GFS and 4 springs were handed over on 29th June 2018 by Tabagon contractors; Kwsir GFS was handed over on 2nd June 2018 by Trinity technical services.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>DWO issued Completion reports(on file) to contractors on the same day, projects were handed over;</p> <p>Benet GFS and 4 springs, by Tabagon contractors, completion report dated 29th June 2018.</p> <p>Kwosir GFS, by Trinity technical services; completion report dated 2nd June 2018</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district Water depart- ment has certified and initiated payment for works and supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DWO certified and recommended suppliers for payment timely .Sample contracts verified to determine terms of payment were as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i)-Procurement no .Kwe 612/wrks/17-18/00013 for Extension of Benet gravity flow scheme by Leverage Technical Services Ltd, date of award 14/12/2017, payment voucher Nos.13/6/18 of shs 43,800,000.Total contract price was shs 43,800,000, commencement date was 22/1/2018, date of completion was 31/5/2018, contract period 4 months.</li> <li>(ii)- Procurement No Kwe 612/wrks/17-18/00039 for Drilling, installation of 1 bore hole and construction of pump house at Ngenge sub-county,date of award 14/12/2017, payment voucher No 51/06/2018 dated 29/6/2018 of shs 68,040,000, commencement date 22/1/2018, completion date 31/5/2018, contract period 4 months, contract price 68,040,000, date of signing contract 12/1/2018.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>3</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

<p>The district Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Plan- ning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The actual dates of submission of annual performance report and quarterly reports for FY 2017/18 by Water department to planning unit could not be ascertained although all the said reports captured input from Water department.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>The District Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If sector has no audit query score 5</li> <li>If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3</li> </ul> </li> <li>If queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The water sector had not provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the year 2017/18.The internal auditor did not sample the sector to enable them raise the necessary queries in order to attract responses.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>Though Production, Works and Technical Services committee had met and discussed some service delivery issues it was not evident that they had discussed performance assessment results for FY 2017/18, LG PAC reports and submissions from the DWSCC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 sets of minutes of the Production, Works and Technical Services committee were reviewed held on 10th/11/2017, 17th/1/2018, and 21st/3/2018, 21st/5/2018 which affirmed that some service delivery issues were discussed e.g. under Min. 3/11/PROCOM/2018 of 10th/11/2017 –need for extension of piped water from Kaproron to Kaptum and rehabilitation of some springs in Kaptum, provision of water points to isolated settlements in the lower belt of the LG, follow up with MoWE on comprehensive plan for GFSs to supply water to all LLGs in meeting of 21st/5/2018 (pg.2 minutes not numbered).</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>The Production, Works and Technical Services Committee had presented to Council issues that required approval, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Committee report and recommendations was presented to council under Min. 14/KDCM/11/2017 of 10th/11/2017 e.g need for ecosan toilet in Rwanda IDP camp, need for extension of piped water from Kaproron HC IV to Kaptum SC and to institute disciplinary action against the technicians who had mismanaged water points in Ngenge and Kiriki.</li> <li>Committee laid to Council under Min. 40/KDCM/03/2018 of 28th/3/2018 budget estimates for 2018/19 and which were subsequently discussed and approved in Council meeting of 31st/05/2018 under Min. 50(a)/KDCM/05/2018</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>

<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The AWP, Budget and water development grant releases and expenditures were displayed on the district notice board by the time of assessment.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Of the four water sources visited, there was no labeling of name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source funding</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Information on tenders, contract awards and contract sum was displayed on the district notice board.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If communities apply for water/ public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Communities apply for water sources, as evidenced in the application from LC 1 Chepakandar village, Almon parish. Kaptum.</p> <p>Signed by the village LC 1.</p> <p>Acknowledgement of receipt of UGX. 50.000 as community contribution.</p> <p>Dated 29/1/2018.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water and Sanitation Committees that are functioning evidenced by either: i) collection of O&amp;M funds, ii) carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, iii) facility fenced/protected, or iv) they have an M&amp;E plan for the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul> <p>Note: One of parameters above is sufficient for the score.</p>	<p>Out of six water sources visited, two were fenced and collected O&amp;M.</p> <p>DWO should do more sensitization on formation of WSC, and encourage them to be active.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>In the memo dated 14th May 2018, the Ag DNRO recommended the hand over of kwosir and Benet GFS projects, having passed the environmental screening test.</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"> <li>Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Certificate of environmental restoration dated 29th May 2018; Environmental officer recommended construction of Kwosir GFS.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The construction and supervision contracts had no clause on the environmental protection.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If at least 50% WSCs are women and at least one occupying a key position (chairperson, secretary or Treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence on the formation of committees on most water sources, one WSC was active in Kaptum s/c, the rest were non functional.</p>	<p>0</p>



<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/</p> <p>RGCs provided by the Water Department.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3</li></ul>	<p>Kween DWO did not have sanitation facilities in the District at the time of assessment.</p>	<p>0</p>
--	--	--	----------