



Local Government Performance Assessment

Pader District

(Vote Code: 547)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	50%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	46%
Educational Performance Measures	49%
Health Performance Measures	77%
Water Performance Measures	83%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From MoFPED's inventory/schedule of LG submissions of performance contracts, check dates of submission and issuance of receipts and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If LG submitted before or by due date, then state 'compliant' o If LG had not submitted or submitted later than the due date, state 'non-compliant' • From the Uganda budget website: www.budget.go.ug, check and compare recorded date therein with date of LG submission to confirm. 	<p>Pader District LG submitted the Final Performance Contract on 29th July 2018 as per the submission schedule of MoFPED which was before the deadline of 1st August 2018.</p> <p>Note: The PFMAA LG Budget guidelines require the submission to be by 30th June. However, this date was changed to 1st August 2018 as per the request from MoFPED.</p>	Yes
Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			

<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY by 30th June (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From MoFPED's inventory of LG budget submissions, check whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The LG budget is accompanied by a Procurement Plan or not. If a LG submission includes a Procurement Plan, the LG is compliant; otherwise it is not compliant. 	<p>Pader District Local Government submitted a Budget for FY 2018/2019; including a Procurement Plan for FY 2018/2019 on the 29th July 2018 as per the submission schedule of MoFPED. The District Council approved the Budget under Min.6/13/6/PDLG/2018 during the Council meeting held on 30th May 2018.</p> <p>The submission of the Budget for FY 2018/2019; including a Procurement Plan for FY 2018/2019 was done before the deadline of 1st August 2018 as required.</p> <p>Note: The PFMAA LG Budget Guidelines require the submission to be by 30th June. However, this date was changed to 1st August 2018 as per the request from MoFPED.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports</p>			
<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted report to MoFPED in time, then it is compliant • If LG submitted late or did not submit, then it is not compliant 	<p>The Annual Budget Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 was submitted to MoFPED on 17th August 2018 and approved on 20th August 2018.</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline of 31st July 2018</p>	<p>No</p>

<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY by end of the FY; PFMA Act, 2015).</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/ inventory of LG submission of quarterly reports submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the quarterly performance reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted all four reports to MoFPED of the previous FY by July 31, then it is compliant (timely submission of each quarterly report, is not an accountability requirement, but by end of the FY, all quarterly reports should be available). • If LG submitted late or did not submit at all, then it is not compliant. 	<p>All the four Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for Pader DLG for FY 2017/2018 were submitted to MoFPED as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter One Report was submitted on 4th January 2018 to MoFPED and approved on same date (as per Submission Schedule of MoFPED). • Quarter Two Report was submitted on 23rd March 2018 to MoFPED and approved on the same date (as per Submission Schedule of MoFPED). • Quarter Three Report was submitted on 8th May 2018 to MoFPED and thereafter approved on 15th May 2018 (as per Submission Schedule of MoFPED). • Quarter Four Report was submitted on 17th August 2018 and approved on 20th August 2018. <p>The reports for the first three quarters were submitted by the end of the FY; PFMA Act, 2015. However, the Quarter Four Report was submitted on 17th August 2018, which was after the end of FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Audit</p>			

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and the Auditor General's findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action in lines with applicable laws.</p>	<p>From MoFPED's Inventory/record of LG submissions of statements entitled "Actions to Address Internal Auditor General's findings",</p> <p>Check:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted a 'Response' (and provide details), then it is compliant • If LG did not submit a 'response', then it is non-compliant • If there is a response for all –LG is compliant • If there are partial or not all issues responded to – LG is not compliant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A copy of Internal Auditor General's report for FY 2016/2017 dated 28th March 2018 Ref No. IIA50/260/01 showed that 4 queries were raised which were duly responded to by the Accounting Officer. • Submission of status of implementation of Internal Auditor General's findings for FY 2016/2017 was belatedly made to PS/ST on 18th April 2018 Ref No. CR/251/1 contrary to the recommended time limit of by 28th February 2018 as provided for in the PFMA 2015 Section 11 2g. • Four (4) queries were raised by the Auditor General for FY 2016/2017 and they were all cleared. Evidence of submission of Action taken by the Accounting Officer on queries raised by Office of the Auditor General was belatedly made to the PS/ST on 20th April 2018 Ref. No. CR/111/1 contrary to the recommended time limit of by 28th February 2018 as provided for in the PFMA 2015 Section 11 2g. 	<p>No</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>Pader DLG obtained Qualified "Except for" Audit Opinion for FY 2017/18</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a district/ municipality has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a functional District Physical Planning Committee (as evidenced by the set of minutes of the meeting held on 11th October 2017). However, evidence was not availed to ascertain whether the members of the DPPC were appointed by CAO / Pader in writing. • A registration book in which submitted plans for new investments should be recorded was not availed at the time of assessment. <p>Therefore, it was not possible to ascertain whether the committee considers new investments in time or not.</p>	0
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that district/ MLG has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD score 1. 	<p>The DPPC had not submitted any set of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD:</p>	0

<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All infrastructure investments are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan: score 1 or else 0 	<p>Pader District did not have a Physical Development Plan.</p> <p>Consequent upon the above, the consistency of the plans of all new infrastructure investments with the Physical Development Plan could not be ascertained.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action area plan prepared for the previous FY: score 1 or else 0 	<p>The District developed two Action area plans during FY 2017/2018 for the rural growth centers of Lapulcwida and Dure.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.	<p>The priorities in AWP for FY 2018/2019 were based on the outcomes of the Budget Conference held on the 25th October 2017. For example, the priorities in the health sector in AWP (pages 56 - 58) were based on the Budget Conference priorities (Pages 21 - 23)</p>	<p>2</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If differences appear, a justification has to be provided and evidence provided that it was approved by the Council. Score 1. 	<p>The capital investments in the Approved Annual Work Plan and Budget for 2018/2019 were derived from the Second Five-Year Development Plan (2015/2016 – 2019/2020). For example, under education the investments in the Pader District Local Government AWP FY 2018/2019 (Pages 60 - 63); were derived from the Pader DDP – Chapter Three: District Strategic Direction and Plan (Section 3.5: Summary of Sectoral Programmes / Projects - Page 161).</p>	<p>1</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 2. 	<p>The project profiles were developed as part of the DDP (i.e. Chapter Seven – Pages 185 - 278), discussed and presented to the District Council.</p> <p>Furthermore, the DTPC discussed profiles for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning Guidelines (NPA, April 2014) in the DTPC meeting held on 5th June 2018 under minute DTPC Min.5: Project Profiles for Projects for FY 2018/2019.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual statistical abstract, with gender-disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum score 1. 	<p>The Annual Statistical Abstract (2017/2018) was compiled and discussed in the DTPC on 25th November 2017.under minute DTPC Min. 4: Information of Statistical Abstract 2017/2018</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2 	<p>The infrastructure projects implemented during FY 2017/2018 (as indicated in the Local Government Quarterly Performance Report (Quarter 4) for 2017/2018 were derived from the AWP and Budget for FY 2017/2018 approved by the District Council.</p> <p>For example, Construction of 1 block of two classrooms at Ongany bardyang (Pg.65 of Q3 Report) was derived from the AWP and Budget for FY 2017/2018 approved by the District Council (Page 45)</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>The contracts register availed at the time of assessment lacked vital information on the completion status of each project by the 30th June 2018.</p> <p>Therefore, it was not possible to ascertain completion status of investment projects implemented in FY 2017/2018 as per work plan.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	<p>The contracts register availed at the time of assessment lacked vital information on the actual expenditure on each project by the 30th June 2018.</p> <p>Therefore, it was not possible to ascertain completion of investment projects implemented in FY 2017/2018 within approved budget -. Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	<p>Pader DLG budgeted UGX 69,503,012 on O&M during FY 2017/2018, and spent UGX 53,877,100 (i.e. GL Account Nos. 228002 & GL Account Name: Maintenance – Vehicles; GL Account Nos. 228003 & GL Account Name: Maintenance – Machinery; GL Account Nos. 228004 & GL Account Name: Maintenance – Other).</p> <p>This was 77.5% of the budget for O&M as per Pader DLG Draft Final Accounts for the Year Ended 30th June 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

Human Resource Management

<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3 	<p>There were 10 HoD at U1 salary scale in the approved establishment / organisation structure. Only the District Engineer was substantively appointed. Appointment letter DSC/156/4</p> <p>Nine were performing duties in acting capacities as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The duties of the District Production Officer were being performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Veterinary Officer U3 as per the appointment letter CR/156/2 of 1st July 2005 The duties of the CFO were being performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Accounts Assistant as per the appointment letter CR/159/2 of 5th June 2006 and assigned the responsibility of CFO as per letter CR/156/5 of 30th June 2016 The duties of the District Natural Resources Officer were being performed by an Officer whose substantive appointment was Land Officer U4 as per his appointment letters 156/3 of 1st August 2010 and confirmation of appointment letter CR/156/4 of 1st July 2008 The duties of the District Education Officer were being performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Inspector of Schools U3 as per the appointment letter CR/160/2 of 1st July 2005 The duties of the Deputy CAO were being performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Assistant Secretary scale U3 as per the assignment of duties letter CR/156/5 of 7th March 2018 	<p>0</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

		<p>6. The duties of the District Commercial Officer were being performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Commercial officer scale U3 as per his appointment letter CR/160/1of 1st May 2014</p> <p>7. The Duties of the District Planner were being performed by an Officer whose substantive appointment was Population Officer U4 as per her appointment letter CR/1/156/4-4/12002 and confirmation of appointment CR159/2-5/6/2006</p> <p>8. The duties of the District Community Development Officer were being performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Community Development Officer U3 as per the appointment letter CR/160/1of 1st May 2014</p> <p>9. The Duties of the DHO were being performed by an Officer whose substantive appointment was Principal Health Officer as per the appointment letter CR/156/5of 1st March 2012</p>	
<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>There were Ten (10) Heads of Department. Only nine (9) were assessed between June and September 2018 as per the appraisal reports seen as follows'</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. District Engineer (Principal Executive Engineer) – 3rd September 2018 2. District Planner (Population Officer) 30th June 2018 3. District Production Officer (Senior Production Officer) – 16th July 2018 4. District Natural Resources Officer (Land Officer) – 16th July 2018 5. Chief Finance Officer (Senior Accounts Assistant) – 16th July 2018 6. District Community Development Officer (Senior Community Development Officer) 16th July 2018 7. District Health Officer (Principal Health officer) – 16th July 2018 8. Education Officer (Senior Inspector Of Schools) 9th March 2018 9. D/ CAO (Senior Assistant Secretary) 7th March 2018 <p>There was no evidence that the Officer performing the duties of District Commercial Officer was appraised.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 % of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	<p>Thirty nine (39) vacant positions were submitted to the DSC for recruitment of new employees for the FY 2017/18 on 7th March 2018 and received by the DSC on 9th March 2018 as follows”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thirty (30) positions of Parish Chiefs. 2. Five (5) positions of Animal Husbandry officers 3. One (1) position Environment Officer 4. Two (2) positions of Veterinary Officers 5. One (1) position District Health Officer <p>They were considered during the DSC meeting sitting on 11th and 12th June 2018 minutes number. 5/2018</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	<p>Five (5) names From Pader Town Council were submitted for confirmation of their appointment on 14th December 2017 and received on 28th February 2018. They were considered during the DSC meeting held on 23rd May 2018. DSC minutes number 4/2018</p> <p>Thirty one (31) names were submitted on 16th January 2018 and were received by the DSC on 26th February 2018. They were considered during the DSC meeting held on 27th and 28th February 2018. DSC minutes number 29/2018</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"> • Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	<p>No disciplinary action cases were submitted</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3 	<p>There was no evidence that the district recruited any new employees during FY 2017/18. The DSC only considered submissions for confirmations of appointments as per extracted minutes of DSC meetings;</p> <p>DSC minutes number 29/2018 of 27th and 28th February 2018.</p> <p>DSC minutes number 29/2018 of 19th March 2018</p> <p>DSC minutes number 4/2018of 23rd May 2018.</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"> • 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 	<p>The list of employees who retired was not availed and there was no evidence that those who retired accessed the pension payroll within the stipulated timeframe</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"> •• If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets) from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10 %: score 4. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 2. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>Total of OSR for FY 2016/2017 Shs. 225,243,661 (Excluding disposal of Assets). As per Final accounts for FY 2016/2017 page 10.</p> <p>Total of OSR for FY 2017/2018 Shs. 305,079,632 (Excluding disposal of Assets). Draft Final Accounts FY 2017/2018 page 7</p> <p>Increase Shs. 79,835,971</p> <p>Percentage 35.4%</p> <p>This good performance was attributed to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sales from Forest Products amounting to Shs. 83,400,000 boosted the OSR in FY 2017/2018. 	2
<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0. 	<p>Total Local Revenue Planned/Budgeted (Original not Revised budget) for FY 2017/2018 was Shs.558,303,000 (As per original budget for FY 2017/2018 but excluding sale of assets) Ref. Draft Final Accounts FY 2017/2018 page 7</p> <p>Total Local Revenue collected during FY 2017/2018 was Shs. 305,079,632. Ref. Draft Final Accounts 2017/2018 page 7</p> <p>The budget realisation fell short by 45.4% of what had been planned in the original budget for FY 2017/2018. The LG had planned to collect over 100 million from sale of boarded off assets in FY 2017/2018 which never materialise due to delayed valuation process.</p>	0
<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	<p>The District collected Shs. 136,000,000 for Local Service Tax in FY 2017/2018 out of which only Shs. 17,650,502 was remitted to Pader Town Council.</p> <p>The balance of Shs. 118,349,498 which was subject to sharing with the LLGs was all retained by the District as none was remitted to the 11 LLGs representing a sharing formula of 13% : 87% which was contrary to recommended formula of 65% : 35% in the LGA as amended 85 (4).</p>	0

<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the total Council expenditures on allowances and emoluments- (including from all sources) is not higher than 20% of the OSR collected in the previous FY: score 2 	<p>The LG collected Shs. 225, 243, 661 in FY 2016/2017 out of which 20% of which was Shs. 45,048,732 meant for Council allowances and emoluments in FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>However, Shs. 54, 640,000 was instead spent on Council allowances and emoluments in FY 2017/2018 representing 24% more than the recommended 20% as per the provision in the LGA Cap 243 as amended. $54,640,000/225,243,661 \times 100=24\%$</p> <p>The District Chairperson wrote to the Minister of Local Government on 14th/3/2018 Ref. COU/112/1 seeking authority to over spend Shs. 67,740,000 on Council allowances and emoluments which the Minister granted vide his letter to the District Chairperson dated 17th/4/2018 Ref. ADM/F.55/01 to overspend Shs. 135,490,000.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2 	<p>The district did not have a Senior Procurement Officer, Duties were performed by an Assistant Procurement Officer as per the appointment letter CR/156/4 of 1st July 2008</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	<p>The TEC conducted its business on 16th, 17th and 18th October 2017 and evaluated all projects under Open Domestic bidding and an Evaluation report was prepared for each of the evaluated projects. The projects under Selective bidding were evaluated on 12th March 2018</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	<p>The Contracts Committee sat on 19th October at 11:00 am and considered all the projects under Open Domestic bidding and awarded the smaller project under Selective domestic bidding on 12th March 2018 in the afternoon immediately after the TEC meeting in the morning. The Contracts Committee based its decisions to award contracts on the recommendations of TEC</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"> • 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 	<p>The District procurement and Disposal plan for 2018/19 covered all the infrastructure projects as appeared in the AWP and they included drilling of 7 deep boreholes, Low cost sealing of 0.38 km road in Pader TC worth 327.5m, Construction of Teachers' house at Tumalyek Primary school worth 70m, Grading of ogonyo Odun road 6.8 km worth 172,450,000, and others. The procurements for 2017/18 FY were found to have adhered to the procurement plan according to the reviewed procurement plans and Budget for 2017/18.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/ infrastructure by August 30: score 2 	<p>The bid documents for infrastructure/investment were not prepared by 30th August 2018. The documents were still being prepared by the time of Assessment. There was no single bid document seen by the assessment as they were not yet printed.</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"> • For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2 	<p>The district did not have updated Contract register as the provided Contract Register book had incomplete information. Vital information like the contract award date, amount paid on the contract so far, and the project status was missing. The procurement files for all projects executed in the previous year were complete and available.</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"> • For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	<p>The sampled 5 projects implemented in 2017/18 FY complied with the Procurement thresholds with projects worth 50 million and above awarded through Open Domestic bidding and those below 50 million awarded through Selective bidding. (The sampled projects were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low cost sealing of 0.7 km Road in Pader Town Council worth 391,819,228. 2. Construction of a 3 classroom block at OnganyBardyang PS, worth 78,422,790. 3. Construction of a 3 classroom block at Ogole-angor worth 57,199,792. 4. Construction of a cattle Market at Kilak 33,000,000. 5. 4 Stances drainable Pit latrine at Dure market Latany sub-county worth 17,441,600. 	2
<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2 	<p>The works projects implemented in 2017/18 were appropriately certified with interim certificates for example some of the sampled projects were issued with interim certificates as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low cost sealing of 0.7 km Road in Pader Town Council issued on 4th may and 23rd May 2018, • 3 classroom block at Ongany Bardyang PS, issued on 21 June 2018 • A 3 classroom block at Ogole-angor issued on 15th may 2018. • Cattle Market at Kilak issued on 20th June 2018 • 4 Stances drainable Pit latrine at Dure market issued on 20th June 2018 	2
<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2 	<p>The labeling of projects was not done properly as only one of five sampled projects, the Cattle Market at Kilak had site board.</p>	0

Financial management			
<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4 	<p>The District had been rolled on IFMS and it operated 2 bank accounts namely:</p> <p>General Fund Collection A/c and TSA A/c.</p> <p>These accounts were reconciled monthly as at 30/06/2018, prepared by the respective sector Accountants, and approved by the Head of Finance.</p> <p>However, the LG failed to produce monthly bank reconciliations from July 2018 – August 2018 due to delays by MoFPED to update the system set-ups of the IFMS users like Sector Accountants' profiles were not yet set up in the system.</p>	0
<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2. 	<p>There was evidence of timely payment of suppliers during FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M/s Ajalo Company Ltd requested for payment of Shs. 8,036,261 on 18/12/2017 for construction of one classroom block plus office & store at Labworomo P/S which was paid on 21st /12/2017 within 3 days vide payment voucher number PV-ED01191. M/s Adoma (U) Ltd requested for payment of Shs. 807,300 on 19/10/2017 for retention on supply of 54 3-seater school desks to Paipir P/S which was paid on 19/12/2017 vide payment voucher number PV-ED011200 within 2 months. M/s Pader District Hand Pump Mechanics Association requested for payment of Shs. 11,258,380 on 19/6/2018 for rehabilitation of 10 bore holes within Pader District which was paid on 25/6/2018 vide payment voucher number PV-WK01579 within 6 days. 	2

<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor: 1 point. • LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2. 	<p>The District did not have a substantive Principal Internal Auditor but had a Senior Internal Auditor who was appointed on promotion by the District Service Commission on 2/5/2014 under Min. DSC/09/2013.6 (f).</p> <p>He was assigned by CAO as Ag. District Internal Auditor on 8/7/2005</p> <p>The LG had advertised for the post of Principal Internal Auditor but failed to attract any candidate. The LG failed to avail a copy of the print media advert at the time of the assessment.</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"> • LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2. 	<p>The District produced all the 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/2018 which were addressed to the District Speaker in accordance with the LGA Cap 243 as amended section 90 (2).</p> <p>Q1 on 5/10/2017 not referenced.</p> <p>Q2 on 30/1/2018 not referenced.</p> <p>Q3 on 30th /4/2018 not referenced.</p> <p>Q4 on 30/7/2018 not referenced.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports: score 2.</p>	<p>Submission of information on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for FY 2017/2018 was made to only Council and for only 1st quarter audit finding on unaccounted for funds as per CAO' letters to DHO, DEO, DNRO, DCDO, SAS, Health Inspector, Senior Clinical Officer, Senior Accountant copied to the District Chairperson.</p> <p>No submission on status for 2nd, 3rd and 4th quarter internal audit findings and no evidence of follow-up was availed to the assessment team.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1. 	<p>All the 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/2018 were submitted to the Accounting Officer on 5/10/2017 for 1st quarter, 30/1/2018 for 2nd quarter, 30/4/2018 for 3rd quarter and 30/7/2018 for 4th quarter all of which did not bear reference numbers.</p> <p>No evidence of submission of all the 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/2018 to LGPAC and no evidence for LGPAC having reviewed them as no minutes regarding the same nor report to council were availed to the assessment team.</p>	<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"> • Evidence that the LG maintains an updated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	<p>The District Assets register was maintained but Land was mistakenly combined with Motor vehicles & Motorcycles and Small items like computers, photocopiers and their accessories.</p> <p>The format used was contrary to that recommended in the Local Government Accounting Manual 2007. Form AC 33 (a) for General assets, Form AC 33 (b) for Motor Vehicles & Heavy Plants and Form AC 33 (c) for Land & Buildings.</p>	<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"> • Unqualified audit opinion: score 4 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0 	<p>Pader DLG obtained Qualified "Except for" Audit Opinion for FY 2017/18</p>	<p>2</p>

Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2 	<p>The District Council of Pader met and discussed service delivery related issues as highlighted below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Min.6/14/5/PDLG/2018 –Questions to Secretaries of Council Committees on Service delivery issues in the Sectors; and Min.8/14/5/PDLG/2018 – Second reading of \Food and Environment Ordinance (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 28th June 2018). • Min.6/13/6/PDLG/2018 –Approval of the Budget for FY 2018/2019 (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 30th May 2018). • Min.8/12/5/PDLG/2018 –Standing Committee Reports (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 13th March 2018). • Min.9/11/5/PDLG/2018 –Standing Committee Reports (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 30th January 2018). • Min.9/10/5/PDLG/2017 –Standing Committee Reports (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 7th November 2017). • Min.9/9/5/PDLG/2017 –Standing Committee Reports (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 12th - 13th September 2017). 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/ complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 1. 	<p>The CAO / Pader DLG assigned Ms Ajok Alice Okello (ACAO), Focal Point Person in Charge Complaints (as per appointment letter Ref: CR/156/5 dated 10th August 2017.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/ complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which should be displayed at LG offices and made publically available: score 1 	<p>The district introduced a complaints book in the Office of the Focal Point Person in Charge Complaints, where complaints were recorded and thereafter channeled to the CAO to decide and give directives to appropriate HoD departments for solutions.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2 	<p>The district had displayed the LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards at the education department block and health department block at Pader District headquarters.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Procurement Notice: PADE 547/2018/2019. Pre-Qualification, Open Domestic Bidding, Selective Bidding and Framework Contracts' was published in the New Vision newspaper (of 28th August 2018 – Page 34) displayed on the Notice Boards at the PDU Block, and Administration Block at Pader District Headquarters. • The procurement plan was not displayed on any Notice Board. 	<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"> • Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1. 	<p>There was no evidence that the District performance assessment results and implications were published.</p> <p>A recording of the proceedings of a DTPC meeting held on 5th September 2018 was provided but its contents were not focused on dissemination of results but to plan for the forthcoming assessment, i.e. for FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1 	<p>There was evidence to demonstrate that the District communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>For example, a letter from the CAO / Pader DLG to all Senior Assistant Secretaries (Ref: CR/551/1 dated 7th June 2018) regarding 'Ban on Forestry Products'.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1. 	<p>A report was availed which, indicated that the district conducted a baraza in Ogom Sub-county on the 22nd June 2018. The purpose was to disseminate the health services available in Ogom HC III, and discuss challenges in order to come up with recommendations for action.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG gender focal person and CDO have provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion into their activities score 2. 	<p>The district Gender Focal Person provided guidance and support provided to sector departments on how to mainstream gender in their activities through especially mentoring visits to departments. The Gender Focal Person conducted Gender audit on development projects and report submitted on 7th March 2018, Conducted training for water user committees in 12 sub counties in September and October 2017 got a report dated 30th October 2017. Mentoring visits on gender mainstreaming were conducted in different departments as follows; production unit on 14th February 2018, Planning unit on gender budgeting on 11th December 2017, commercial office on improvement of entrepreneurship skills for women on 11th June 2018 and health department on Reproductive Health on 22nd November 2017.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <p>and social inclusions and that more than 90 % of previous year's budget for gender activities/ vulnerability/ social inclusion has been implemented: score 2.</p>	<p>The gender focal person had planned activities like Quarterly meetings with women councils, monitoring of gender activities at sub county level, mentoring departments on gender mainstreaming. The district annual work plan contained the above mentioned activities with approved budget of 4,672,000 in the 2018/19 FY. The budget of 4,538,000 allocated for gender mainstreaming activities in 2017/18 FY and the 2,000,000 provided for International women's day celebrations was fully utilised.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 1 	<p>Environmental screening was not done for projects as there were no forms presented/ seen during assessment.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	<p>The reviewed bid documents for the 5 sampled projects did not indicate the integration of environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the bid document. The bids lacked sections on the integration of environmental and social management and health and safety.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1 	<p>All the implemented projects were done on public land with exception of boreholes where the district enters into agreement with the land owner before the borehole was drilled. The 5 sampled projects were all on government/public land</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO: score 1 	<p>The Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form was not completed for completed projects as there was no certificate signed by the Environmental Officer and CDO</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance (new one): Score 1 	<p>The reviewed contract payments for the 5 sampled projects mentioned above did not have certificates on environmental and social clearance as a requirement for contract 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"> • Evidence that environmental officer and CDO monthly report, includes a) completed checklists, b) deviations observed with pictures, c) corrective actions taken. Score: 1 	<p>There was no evidence of monthly reports written on projects by either the Environmental officer or the Community Development Officer.</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"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 	<p>The Education budget under Vote 547 for FY 2018/19 had a budget for all the 837 teachers and head teachers in the 116 schools. The budget estimates for education was dated 29/5/2018. The total amount was 6,644,399 billion.</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"> Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 	<p>All Schools had a head teacher. The staff and school list obtained from the DEO's Office indicated that most schools did not meet the minimum requirement of 1 Head Teacher and at least 7 teachers per school in Primary Schools with P7. Akelikongo P/S had 3 teachers and 1 head teacher, Lapananat P/S had 5 teachers including the Head Teacher and Angagura had 6 Teachers. Thus the LG did deploy some teachers but not as per the minimum requiremenn</p> <p>There were 116 Primary schools in 12 sub counties in the LG.</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"> • Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100%: score 6 o If 80 - 99%: score 3 o If below 80%: score 0 	<p>There was a wage bill provision for 2018/19, No. EDC/162/2. The wage bill provision is for 20 Head Teachers, 55 Deputy Head Teachers, 20 Senior Education Assistants and 318 Education Assistants. The wage bill document number CR/156 was dated and stamped on 14th/ 2/2018.</p> <p>There was evidence that the LG filled some structure for Primary School Teachers. The total number of teachers was 837 for 116 schools. Thus an average of 7 teachers per school, below the minimum requirement of 7 teachers and 1 head teacher per P/S. The LG thus required a minimum of 928 teachers to meet the minimum requirement. thus the LG filled 90.1% of the P/S structure.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	<p>The approved staff structure for the LG indicates that there were two (2) positions: Inspector of Schools and Senior Inspector of Schools. Evidence from the Staff list showed that both positions were filled by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Olwoch Francis appointed on 24th/10/2015. Appointment reference No. CR/156/3 as Inspector of Schools. • Mr. Akera Menya Ignatius appointed on 22/12/2015. Appointment reference Number CR/156/4 as Inspector of Schools. • Mr. Ojok Jogi Anthony is the substantively appointed Senior inspector of Schools although he functions in the department as DEO. <p>Technically there were three (3) Inspectors of Schools, although one has taken on the role of DEO pending substantive appointment.</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"> • Primary Teachers: score 2 	<p>There was a recruitment plan at the DEO's Office for 413 teachers. The approved plan for teacher recruitment was dated 14/2/2018 and submitted to HRM for recruitment.</p> <p>There was also plan for recruitment on replacement basis for 11 Head Teachers, 1 Senior Education Officer and 11 Education Assistants II dated and stamped 14/1//2018</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Inspectors: score 2 	<p>There was evidence that there were plans to recruit schools Inspectors.</p> <p>The two (2) positions: for Inspector of Schools and Senior Inspector of Schools were duly filled, thus there was no need to submit a related plan. But there was need to plan for the recruitment of a DEO.</p> <p>The Senior Inspector of Schools currently functions as DEO although his appointment letter is for Senior Inspector of Schools.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Monitoring and Inspection</p>			
<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% school inspectors: score 3 	<p>The district had three Inspectors of School there was evidence that only one (1), the Senior Inspector of School was appraised on 4th September 2018</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary school head teachers o 90 - 100%: score 3 o 70% and 89%: score 2 o Below 70%: score 0 	<p>The district had one hundred and sixteen (116) primary schools Head Teachers as per the district staff list seen.</p> <p>There was no evidence that they were appraised</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"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1 	<p>For the FY 2017/18, there was evidence that guidelines below were received from the MoES and issued at the LG level to schools and copies filed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revised rates of daily facilitation allowance. 2. Enforcement of closure of illegal schools. Circular /2018 3. Circular on adherence to School charges from the MoES dated 15/2/2017 4. Adherence to school Calendar, dated 2/10/2017. 5. Circular no. 05/2017 on MDD. 6. Standing instruction no. 06/2018 7. Enforcing of illegal schools circular ADM/104/212/01. Dated 26/3/2018 <p>There was no evidence on the notice boards, in the sampled schools and in the files that the guidelines were disseminated</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"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 2 	<p>There was no evidence of meetings with School Heads and the education department to disseminate the issued guidelines.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education De- partment has effectively inspected all registered primary schools2</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59 % score 1 o Below 50% score 0. 	<p>School inspection was at 57.1%. (50-59%=1)</p> <p>A total of 199 inspections were done between July 2017 and June 2018 in 116 schools, but at different times. Each inspection did not however cover all the 116 schools. 2nd term 2017 inspection covered 74 schools, 16 of this inspection was a Flying inspection. Term I inspection 2018 covered 51 schools and term II 2018 covered 74 schools. Thus average inspection stood at 66.3.</p> <p>66.3 out of 116 schools represent 57.1%.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspec- tions, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and fol- lowed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	<p>There was evidence that Education Department met on 7/November/2017, In a Sectoral Committee (Education & Health) meeting. Under minutes EDUC/151/1 pages 1-4 and discussed school inspection report.</p> <p>Another meeting took place on 25th/8/2017 under minutes no. EDUC/151/1 and the third meeting took place on 18th/3/2018. It can be found on page 5 of the minutes.</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspec- tions, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and fol- lowed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 	<p>There was no evidence of submission of School Inspection reports to DES & or, MoES according to the requirement.</p> <p>The Matrix for submission of monitoring, work plans, reports & accountability obtained from DES was blank for Pader LG, implying that the Inspection reports were not submitted.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspec- tions, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and fol- lowed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed- up: score 4. 	<p>There was no evidence from the sampled schools that the LG Department provided recommendations from the inspection reports and followed-up.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>A comparison of the school list and the PBS generated list on Pader LG for the FY 2018/19 was a match. The Inspection Team sampled 5 schools randomly and found that all 5 out of 5 school lists were a match.</p> <p>The sampled schools were:</p> <p>Awere P/S, Dure P/S</p> <p>Tumalyec P/S, Olam P/S & Pader P/S.</p>	<p>5</p>

<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS: score 5 	<p>There was evidence of Enrolment data for all 116 primary schools at the DEO's Office which was consistent with the PBS list print out. An indication that LG submitted accurate & consistent data according to EMIS & PBS formats.</p>	<p>5</p>
<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"> • Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>The Standing Committee for Education and Health met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2017/2018 as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 9th May 2018 (under Min.4/9th .May .PDLG/2018 – Presentation of Sector reports) • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 27th February 2018 (underMin.5/27th.Feb.PDLG/2018 – Departmental reports) • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 11th December 2017 (underMin.5/12/2017– Departmental reports /Discussions) 	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG committee re- sponsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>The Standing Committee for Education and Health presented issues that required approval to the District Council. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Report for Education and Health Sector Committee of 26th February 2018 Conducted in Education Boardroom to Full Council Meeting of the 13th March 2018. Further evidence was in the Minutes of District Council meeting held on 13th March 2018 (Min.8/12/5/PDLG/2018 – Standing Committee Reports). 	<p>2</p>

<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO/ MEO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80 % schools: score 0 	<p>There was evidence that Primary Schools in the District had SMCs and that these SMCs were functional. The Assessment Team reviewed files of SMCs of the various schools, and found out that 96 out of 116 schools had SMCs. This was equivalent to 83% (80-99% = 3) presence of SMCs in Schools.</p> <p>Also, 5 Random SMC files were sampled at the DEO's Office. The random sample indicated all five SMCs met at least twice during the last term. The schools whose SMCs met were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Angakotoka Primary School. the meeting took place on 13th /10/2017 and on 19/10/2017, minute 3/2017 to discuss budget estimates. • Amokolagwai Primary School SMC meeting was on 3/10/2017 minute 02/03/2017 to discuss staff finance. • Kibong Primary School SMC met on 4/10/2017 minute no. 04/10/2017. It was a finance committee meeting. • Labongo Primary School SMC met on 22/3/2018 to discuss the work plan for the school. • Papaa Primary School SMC met on 18th /7/2018. 	<p>3</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non- wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants <p>e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</p>	<p>There was no evidence on the notice board that the LG made public all the schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants for FY 2017/18.</p>	<p>0</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"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	<p>Procurement input to PDU for FY 2018/19 for staff house construction for Tumalyec P/S was received by PDU on 28th/4/2018.</p> <p>On the same list, there was input for a drainable latrine for Opolacen P/S and Kilak Corner P/S and other inputs.</p>	4
Financial management and reporting			
<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3. 	<p>There was evidence of timely certification and recommendations for payments to contracted works/supplies in FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M/s Della Will Enterprises Ltd requested for payment of Shs. 9,570,514 on 30/11/2017 for construction of one classroom block plus office at Apiri P/S. This was certified on 28/11/2017 under Certification No. 00006 and paid on 21/12/2017 vide payment voucher number PV-ED01193 within 3 weeks. • M/s Can Deg Miny Trading &Construction Co. Ltd requested for payment of Shs. 25,984,857 on 20/6/2017 for construction of one block of 3 classrooms at Ongany Bar Dyang P/S. This was certified on 18/6/2017 under Certificate No. 2 and paid on 25/6/2017 vide payment voucher number PV-ED01436 within 5 days. 	3

<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15th of July for consolidation: score 4 	<p>The Education Department submitted the annual performance report for FY2017/2018 to the Planner on the 16th July 2018 for consolidation (as per Email from the PBS – Re: Reg. Head of Department Validation' dated 16th July 2018 alerting the Planner / Pader DLG about the submission by the DEO.</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline of 15th July 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If sector has no audit query score 4 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 o If all queries are not responded to score 0 	<p>The LG Education department had 3 queries in all the quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/2018 and none was cleared.</p> <p>Queries raised were: unaccounted for funds, delayed transfer of UPE funds to Pader Ongany P/S and missing acknowledgement receipts.</p> <p>CAO wrote to the DEO on 2nd /11/2017 Ref. CR/103/1 directing him to submit responses to him latest 27th /3/2018 but no evidence was availed at the time of the assessment.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			

<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills, etc.: Score 2 	<p>There was no evidence of dissemination of guidelines to senior women/men teachers' hygiene and reproductive health for girls and boys in schools about reproductive health, life skills & Hygiene.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2 	<p>There was evidence that the gender department disseminated guidelines on managing sanitation for girls and PWDs to all head teachers of the 116 P/S dated 27/ 11/2017.</p> <p>This was verified with Labong P/S, Paiula P/S and Agora P/S, randomly sampled</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	<p>The assessment team sampled 5 SMC files in the DEO's Office:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awere Lakoga P/S, 3 out of 13 members were female. • Pader Ongang P/S, 4 out of 13 members were female. • Tumalyec P/S, 4 out of 13 are female. • Dure P/S, 4 out of 13 members are female. 	<p>1</p>

<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 1: 	<p>There was no evidence that the Education department issued any guidelines on Environmental management.</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"> Evidence that all school infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 1 	<p>There was evidence that schools with development projects were screened for environment and social impact.</p> <p>The Assessment Team saw ESS screening forms for Onyang Bardyang P/S for three (3) class room block. However, the screening forms were stamped on 20/7/2018 for projects implemented in 2017, an indication that they were done in retrospect.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to check whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1 	<p>There was a report on site visitation for the above site of 3 class room construction. However, the report was dated 26th/ 7/2018 for projects which should have been reported on in 2017 during or soon after project execution. The assessment team got the impression the report too was written in retrospect.</p>	<p>0</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health care workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health care with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 80% filled: score 8 • 60 – 80% - score 4 • Less than 60% filled: score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the LG filled the structure for PHC with a wage bill provision seen stating that there were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 31 health facilities - 473 Approved posts - 341 Filled posts - 132 Vacant posts representing 72% compliance 	4
<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>The department submitted a recruitment request to HRM for filling the vacant positions of primary health care workers as per the submission letter, dated 17/July/2018 without reference number.</p>	6

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

Maximum 8 points for this performance measure

Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:

- o 100%: score 8
- o 70 – 99%: score 4
- o Below 70%: score 0

The district had a total of thirty six (36) health facilities and therefore 36 Officers in-Charge

- 1 Health Center IV
- 11 Health Center IIIs
- 24 Health Center IIs

Out of the thirty six (36) only twenty three (23) were appraised as per the appraisal reports seen, representing 64% compliance.

Eleven (11) Appraisal reports of Officers in Charge were sampled indicating that the appraisals were generally conducted between May and July 2018, as follows;.

1. Senior Clinical Officer - Okello Chrissy Korea 14th July 2018
2. Senior Clinical Officer – Okello John Solomon - 5th July 2018
3. Enrolled Nurse - Apito James 23rd May 2018
4. Enrolled Nurse Awam James 14th July 2018
5. Clinical Officer Odong Ciprian 23rd May 2018
6. Nursing Officer- Abar Margaret 28th June 2018
7. Senior Clinical Officer – Oola Paul 22nd May 2018
8. Senior Clinical Officer - Ongany Milton – 5th July 2018
9. Enrolled Nurse – Wokorach Simon Peter 31st July 2018
10. Enrolled Nurse - Atupa Niviesan Mark (Alim HC II) – 10th June 2018
11. Enrolled Nurse - Ojok Charles Omara (Oret HC II) 20th June 2018

<p>The Local Government Health department has deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY, and if not provided justification for deviations: score 4 	<p>? There was evidence that the LG deployed health workers in line with list submitted with the budget FY 2018/2019, as per the approved staff lists of different health facilities</p> <p>? The deployment list dated 20/3/2018 seen</p> <p>Supervision letter of 12/7/2018 from one of the health facilities, Pajule HC II indicated that health workers were appropriately deployed.</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"> Evidence that the DHO/MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 	<p>Guidelines, policies and circulars issued from the national level during the previous FY to health facilities, was indicated in the following documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Guideline entitled Sectors Grant and Budget Guideline for FY 2017/2018 National TB and Leprosy Guideline Control programme June 2017 These guidelines were also found at the 5 HCs sampled, i.e. Pajule HC III, Parugaka HC II, Payiula HC II, Ogako HC II and Loborom HC III . 	<p>3</p>
<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/MHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	<p>DHO/MHO held meetings with health facility in-charges to explained guidelines, policies, and circulars issued as per the Minutes of meetings held on 27/07/2018, at Pajule HC IV and Ogago HC II on family planning methods</p>	<p>3</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 HC IV at Pajule and there was evidence that DHT / MHT had supervised the health facility.</p> <p>? The supervision book seen at the HC was duly signed by all the supervisee for the 4 quarters. The supervision logbook was also signed by members of DHT on 16/06//2018.</p>	<p>3</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 super- vided lower level health facili- ties within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% supervised: score 3 • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60% - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0 	<p>Total number of HF -35</p> <p>The number of those supervised –10</p> <p>Representing 29% compliance</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"> Evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	<p>There was evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports were discussed and used to make recommendations as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shortage of manpower was responded to by the DHO writing as per the letter to the HRU seeking for permission to recruit HWs for 2018/2019 FY, Recommending for internal transfers from one HF to another, as per the letter dated 9th August/2018 <p>As result of follow up of the recommendations from the 4 supervision visits the following were implemented;</p> <p>? Discussions from the 1st quarter supervision resulted in the establishment of the Attendance Registers at all HC</p> <p>? Emergency HUMC meeting was held on 16th May 2018 following discussion of the 2nd quarter and as result construction of Aruu health facility was started.</p> <p>? For the 3rd and 4th quarters the discussion focused on internal transfers of HWs in order to bridge the deployment gaps as per the letter dated 17th July2018 without reference number.</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"> Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 	<p>There was evidence that the recommendations were implemented as it was agreed during the follow up meetings that internal transfers were implemented and a contract was signed with private firm to construct a new health waste pit at Pajule HC IV</p> <p>As per the minutes of meeting of the HUMC held on 9th August 2018 and in the supervision Log Book</p>	<p>6</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"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10 	<p>There was evidence that the LG submitted accurate constant data on HFs receiving PHC funds as per PHC Transfers to HF none wage for FY 2017/2018 as outlined below;</p> <p>Awere HC II-7,702,401=, Acholi bur HC III , 302401 Pajule HCIV 29,423597'= Paruseli HCII-2002, 382. = Mary Immaculate HCII-PNFP-5228589=</p> <p>The total HFs=41 ,Annual amount=2,288,764,896= Facility IPF wage=3,557,462,747. PHC (none wage)=316,474549=</p> <p>Submission letter by DHO to CAO. Titled Submission of facility IPF wage e bill and none wage bill of 6th June 2018. These were publicised and displayed on notice boards at the respective HCs.</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 is- sues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>The Standing Committee for Education and Health met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2017/2018 as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 9th May 2018 (under Min.4/9th May. PDLG/2018 – Presentation of Sector reports) • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 27th February 2018 (underMin.5/27th.Feb.PDLG/2018 – Departmental reports) • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 11th December 2017 (underMin.5/12/2017– Departmental reports /Discussions) 	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>The Standing Committee for Education and Health presented issues that required approval to the District Council. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Report for Education and Health Sector Committee of 26th February 2018 Conducted in Education Boardroom to Full Council Meeting of the 13th March 2018. Further evidence was in the Minutes of District Council meeting held on 13th March 2018 (Min.8/12/5/PDLG/2018 –Standing Committee Reports). 	<p>2</p>
<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 6 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 6 If 80-99 %: score 4 If 70-79: %: score 2 If less than 70%: score 0 	<p>There was evidence that health facilities and Hospitals had functional HUMCs / Board and held meetings as follows:</p> <p>Paiyiwula HC II met on 24th January 2018, Pajule HC IV on 16th May 2018 and Ogoka HC II on 18th December 2017 representing 100% compliance (the assessment team was unable to reach the 5 suggested facilities due to the long distances).</p>	<p>6</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 4 	<p>There was evidence that the LG publicised all HF receiving the grant as per the DHO letter to CAO dated 6/06/2018 in which she submitted a list of 35 HFs receiving the funds.</p> <p>It indicated names of 41 facilities including PNFP Institutional Annual Amount for 2017/2018 and 2918/2019.</p> <p>The document facility wage bill as well as PHC none-wage bill were displayed on the notice board.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has submitted input to procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2 	<p>The Health department submitted a procurement plan to the Procurement and Disposal Unit covering all investment items. The departmental procurement plan was submitted to PDU on 25th April 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2. 	<p>There was evidence that the Health Department submitted the procurement request as per the submission form PP1 dated 17th August 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/ MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4. 	<p>There was evidence that the LG Health department timely certified and recommended payment to suppliers of goods, works and services as for the case below:</p> <p>M/s Tem Gumi Company Ltd request for payment of Shs. 13,952,826 on 20/4/2017 for construction of Flush Water Toilet with Semi attached bathrooms at Pajule HC IV was certified under Certificate No. 02 on 11th/8/2017 and paid on 16/10/2017 vide payment voucher number PV-HE00408 within 2 months and 5 days.</p>	<p>4</p>

Financial management and reporting			
<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	<p>The Health Department submitted the annual performance report for FY 2017/2018 to the Planner on the 15th July 2018 for consolidation (as per Email from the PBS – Re: Reg. Head of Department Validation' dated 15th July 2018 alerting the Planner / Pader DLG about the submission by the DHO).</p> <p>The submission was made on the 15th of July 2018</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If sector has no audit query: Score 4 If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: Score 2 points If all queries are not responded to Score 0 	<p>The LG Health department had one internal audit query in FY 2017/2018 regarding unaccounted for funds/doubtful expenditure and CAO wrote to the DHO, Health Inspector and Senior Clinical Officer on 2nd /11/2017, 9th /8/2017 and 9th/8/2017 respectively directing the DHO to submit responses to him latest 27th/3/2018 but no evidence to that effect was availed to the assessment team.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			

<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30 % women: score 2 	<p>From the sampled health facilities, there was evidence that the gender composition of the HUMCs met the guideline of 30% women membership</p> <p>1 Paiula HC II minutes of the meeting held on 24/07/2018 There were six members (6) of which 4 were female and 2 men</p> <p>2 Oguka HC II 5 members attended 2 were female and 3 male</p> <p>3 Parugo HC II 7 members attended 5 were male 2 female</p> <p>Dates of the meetings were as follows.</p> <p>31/10.2017 to approve funds from AVIS</p> <p>18/02/2018 -to suggest that the in charges and accountant prepare accounts report.</p> <p>16,05/2018-</p> <p>All the above met minimum requirement 30 percent,</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2. 	<p>There was evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities</p> <p>- The DHO held meeting with Officers in Charge of HFs II IIIs and IV at district headquarters on 24th July/ 2018 attended by 24 members.</p> <p>- In the sampled HC IV in Pajule there was poster on how to manage medical waste using colour coded bins displayed on the wall but had no date when it was issued,</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"> Evidence that all health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 2 	<p>Environmental screening was not done for Health facility infrastructure projects before approval of construction as there were no environmental screening forms completed for the projects</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 2 	<p>No evidence of site visits by the environmental officer as there were no reports written to that effect.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>All the 5 sampled HFs visited had colour code bins though some were old and. At some HC IIs buckets were used, i.e. Parugaka HC II, Payiula HC II, Ogako HC II.</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"> • Evidence that the district Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below average coverage: score 10 o If 80-99%: Score 7 o If 60-79: Score 4 o If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>Data from MIS reports at the Ministry of Water and Environment revealed that the average safe water coverage for Pader District for FY 2017/18 was 92.8%. The Sub-counties with safe water coverage below the District average were; Acholibur (88%), Atanga (61%), Laguti (81%), Lapul (91%), Latanya (88%) and Awere (71%).</p> <p>From the review of the Annual Work plan and PBS for FY 2018/19, the sub counties which were budgeted for included; Atanga, Awere, Laguti, Pader Kilak, Pajule, Purayanga, Lapul and Latanya.</p> <p>Therefore the Assessment team realized that there was allocation of Borehole to each of the sub-counties below district safe water coverage.</p>	10

<p>The district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: <p>Score 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 80-99%: Score 10 o If 60-79: Score 5 o If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>The review of the Budget and Annual Progress Report for FY 2017/18 submitted by the District Water Department revealed that the budgeted water projects in the targeted Sub-counties of Acholibur, Atanga, Laguti and Latanya were fully implemented. However Awere sub county which was among the targeted sub counties below the district safe water coverage was not implemented.</p> <p>The review Annual Progress Reports showed the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quarter 01 Report dated 4th October 2017; there was assessment for the sites for drilling of the boreholes. 2. Quarter 02 Report dated 16th January 2018; there was sensitization of community to fulfill critical requirements, training of WSCs and baseline surveys. 3. Quarter 03 Report; the construction and drilling of the boreholes commenced. 4. Quarter 04 Report; All the boreholes were completed and handed over. <p>During the field inspection, the recently constructed Boreholes at Langwai East (Pader Town council), Olang-Ganga (Latanya S/C) and Dokomit (Pajule S/C) were confirmed to be in place and functioning satisfactorily.</p>	
Monitoring and Supervision			

<p>The district Water department carries out monthly monitoring of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the district Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15 • 80% - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10 • 70 - 79%: score 7 • 60% - 69% monitored: score 5 • 50% - 59%: score 3 • Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored: score 0 	<p>The review of the Annual Progress Report revealed that the District Water Department implemented 8No New borehole drilling, Rehabilitation of 10No Boreholes and Construction of 1No Drainable Latrine. The filed inspection reports dated 22nd June 2018, 14th March 2018, 18th April 2018, 31st May 2018 and 13th June 2018 clearly indicated that all the water projects were regularly supervised and monitored.</p> <p>Data from MIS reports at the Ministry of Water and Environment indicated that there were functional 22 springs, 30 Shallow wells, 871 Deep borehole, 12 Rain Harvesting Tanks, 1 dam, 1 Valley tank, 33 Public Kiosks.</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"> • Evidence that the district has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: Score 5 • List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>FORM 1 (Data Collection Form for Point Water Sources) were submitted to the In-charge of Management Information System at the Ministry of Water and Environment on 18th July 2018.</p>	<p>5</p>

<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5 	<p>List of water facilities presented in the MIS reports at the MoWE were consistent with those in PBS. These WSS facilities included 06No Drilled boreholes, 10No Rehabilitated boreholes and 1No Drainable latrine</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The district Water department has submitted input for district's procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted input for the district procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	<p>The District Water Department submitted input for the district procurement plan that covered all investment items in the approved sector AWP and budget to PDU on 27th April 2018 which was within the stipulated deadline of 30th April 2018 as required. This included Deep Borehole drilling and installation 6No and 1 No 4-Stage Drainable latrine.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the contract manager prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2 	<p>The Contract Management Plan was incorporated in the AWP 2017/2018 page 10.</p> <p>DWO explained that site inspections were conducted and any issues pertaining to the project were incorporated in the site inspection reports.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	<p>Approved Designs for the WSS facilities were availed and the site inspection reports were prepared reviewed.</p> <p>The Assessment team sampled three facilities that were Boreholes at Langwai (Pader TC), Olang-Ganga (Latanya S/C), Dokomit (Pajule S/C) and 4 stance drainable latrine at Latanya market. All the three water supply and one sanitation facilities were functional and satisfactorily as per design specifications.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	<p>The contractor technically handed over all the 8No- Boreholes and 1 No 4-stance drainable latrine at Latanya market, and completion certificates were issued to the contractor.</p> <p>All the Three Boreholes i.e. Langwai (Pader TC), Olang-Ganga (Latanya S/C), Dokomit (Pajule S/C) and 1No 4 stance drainable latrine at Latanya market had been complete and fully functional and Completion certificates issued.</p> <p>Completion certificate approved by CAO on 05th July 2018 issued to Watsan Holdings Ltd for construction and drilling of 8 boreholes, and Completion certificate approved by CAO on 13th July 2018 issued to Model Partners' Limited for the construction of 4 stance drainable latrine at Latanya market.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2 	<p>Sampled Interim Payment Certificates showed that the District Water Officer had duly certified the Interim Payment Certificates. For instance Under Procurement Reference No. PADE547/WRKS/2017 – 2018/00002 for the sitting, drilling, casting and installation of boreholes in different sub counties, Interim Payment Certificate No.1 was duly certified by the District Water Officer on 14th June 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The district Water department has certified and initiated payment for works and supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<p>There was evidence of timely certification and recommendation for payment to suppliers as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M/s Pader District Hand Pump Mechanics Association requested for payment of Shs. 11,977,000 on 19/6/2018 for rehabilitation of 10 Bore holes. This was certified on 20//2018 under Certificate No. 01 and paid on 25/6/2018 vide payment voucher number PV-WK01579 within 5 days. M/s BM WAT – SAN Holdings requested for payment of Shs.116,249,328 on 11/6/2018 for drilling of 7 Bower holes. This was certified under Certificate No. 01 on 14/6/2018 and paid on 21/6/2018 vide payment voucher number PV-WK015674 within 10 days. 	<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 Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	<p>The Water Department submitted the annual performance report for FY 2017/2018 to the Planner on the 16th July 2018 for consolidation (as per Email from the PBS – Re: Reg. Head of Department Validation’ dated 16th July 2018 alerting the Planner / Pader DLG about the submission by the DWO).</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline of 15th July 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The District Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If sector has no audit query score 5 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 3 If queries are not responded to score 0 	<p>No queries raised by the District Internal Auditor</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3 	<p>The Standing Committee for Works and Technical Services met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2017/2018. For example, minutes of the Committee meeting held on 17th August 2017 (under Min. 05/08/2017 – Departmental Reports)</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	<p>The Standing Committee for Works and Technical Services presented issues that required approval to the District Council. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Report for the Works and Technical Services Committee to the 10th Meeting of the 5th Council on the 30th May 2018 in the District Council Chambers' Further evidence was in the Minutes of District Council meeting held on 30th May 2018 (Min.6/13/6/PDLG/2018 –Approval of the Budget for FY 2018/2019) 	<p>3</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2. 	<p>The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures were displayed on the notice board at DWO office. For instance On 10th October 2017 there was a display of Quarter one Release and expenditure for the FY 2017/2018, on 2nd January 2018 there was a display of Quarter two release and expenditure for FY 2017/2018</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"> All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2 	<p>The sampled WSS facilities were three Boreholes i.e. Langwai (Pader TC), Olang-Ganga (Latanya S/C), Dokomit (Pajule S/C) and 1No 4 stance drainable latrine at Latanya. None of the WSS facilities was labeled as described. The DWO officer told the assessment team that the contractor had delayed to label the facilities and therefore his retention money would not be paid until the labeling if completed.</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"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	<p>Due to limited sizes of the District Notice Boards, information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) earlier displayed on the</p> <p>District notice boards had been removed to give space to other information displays. Unfortunately there was no file copy available to verify this. The District Water Officer was then advised to always file the removed information displays for future reference</p>	0
<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If communities apply for water/ public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	<p>Application letters for WSS facilities from communities represented by sub counties together with the minutes of the meetings held by communities were submitted to the District Water Office as per sector critical requirements for action and were properly filed. For instance on 22nd June 2017, Latanya sub county applied for a new borehole while Acholibur sub county submitted a letter to the DWO outlining the sub counties priorities for FY 2017/18 dated 31st October 2016.</p>	1
<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water and Sanitation Committees that are functioning evidenced by either: i) collection of O&M funds, ii(carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, iii) facility fenced/protected, or iv) they an M&E plan for the previous FY: score 2 <p>Note: One of parameters above is sufficient for the score.</p>	<p>There was evidence that O & M funds were being collected by WSCs and the sampled water supply facilities [Langwai (Pader TC), Olang-Ganga (Latanya S/C), Odokomit (Pajule S/C)] were fenced, properly maintained and functioning satisfactorily.</p>	2
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			

<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	<p>General Environmental screening reports for the construction and drilling of boreholes 8No dated 6th Dec 2017 and for rehabilitation of 10 boreholes dated 8th Sept 2017 were presented to the assessment team. However no screening reports as per the templates for individual projects were available which would have been a basis of scoring.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1 	<p>There were no screening reports as per templates hence the assessment team could not verify whether there were any unacceptable environmental concerns that had not be addressed or any mitigation measures put in place.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	<p>There was a clause about Environmental protection in the contract documents. Contract ref; PADE547/Wrks/2017-2018/00001, Bill No: 1.7 under preliminaries emphasized on the Environmental Awareness, campaign and mitigation measures whereas Bill No: 04 of the same documents clearly emphasizes on the environmental protection.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The district Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If at least 50% WSCs are women and at least one occupying a key position (chairperson, secretary or Treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements: score 3 	<p>Review of information contained in FORM 1 and the detailed formation of WSCs per water source revealed that at least 50% WSCs are women and at least one occupied a key position (chairperson, secretary or treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements. Examples of the sampled facilities included Borehole at out of 9 WSC members at Langwai east borehole (Pader TC) 5 were women and out of 9 WSC members at Olang-Ganga borehole (Latanya S/C) 6 were women</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/</p> <p>RGCs provided by the Water Department.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3 	<p>The District water Department had budgeted and implemented only one 4 stance drainable latrine at Latanya market that was found satisfactory with the requirements of separate stance for men, women and PWDs and it had a ramp</p>	<p>3</p>