



Local Government Performance Assessment

Rubanda District

(Vote Code: 616)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	67%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	38%
Educational Performance Measures	32%
Health Performance Measures	28%
Water Performance Measures	47%

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>Annual Performance Contract Submitted & received at MoFPED on 27/7/2018 which is within the timeline date of 1st August 2018.</p>	Yes
Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY by 30th June (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>LG submitted the budget that includes the procurement plan for FY 2018/19 on 27th July 2018 as per data at MOFPED.</p>	Yes
Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			

<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>LG submitted Annual Performance Report on 31st August 2018 which is outside the timeline date of 31st July</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>Quarterly Budget performance report submitted as follows: Q1 dated 10/1/2018 Q2 dated 21/02/2018 Q3 dated 27/05/2018 Q4 dated 31/8/2018 which was outside the timeline date of 31st July</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 line with applicable laws.</p>	<p>From MoFPED's Inventory/record of LG submissions of statements entitled "Actions to Address Internal Auditor General's findings",</p> <p>Check:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LG submitted a 'Response' (and provide details), then it is compliant • If LG did not submit a 'response', then it is non-compliant • If there is a response for all –LG is compliant • If there are partial or not all issues responded to – LG is not compliant. 	<p>Rubanda district provided and submitted information to the PS/ST on the implementation of both OAG and Internal Auditor General findings for the financial year 2017/2018 in a single letter REF CR/D/252/01 dated 18th April, 2018 which was received by the Directorate of Internal Audit (MoFPED) on 19th April 2018 . This was before the deadline of 30th April 2018 as required by the PFMA.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>The external audit report for the FY 2017/18 was unqualified.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a district/ municipality has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 1. 	<p>There were no physical planning committee minutes to considers new investments</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 District had not submitted the 4 sets 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>The absence of Physical Development Plan rendered all the infrastructure investments to be inconsistent</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 had not made any attempt to prepare an Action area plan</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2. 	<p>Under Education and Health sectors had priorities such as: Buying roofing materials like iron sheets, and roofing nails for constructed classroom blocks at Bishaki, Ilemera, Kivunga, Kyenyi, Bugunga primary schools in Muko sub county. Latrine Construction and rehabilitation for the following Primary schools; Bushura, Nyamiringa in Bubare Sub county, Ikamiro & Bwindi in Muko sub county. Upgrading of Mpungu HCII to HCIII, Renovation of maternity ward for Ruhija, Construction of public latrine AWP pg 118 & 98 of the 5 year Development plan (2016/2017-2019/2020) which are all based on the outcomes of the budget conference held on November 8th, 2017</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>AWP page 52 under Education and health sectors have priorities such as: Buying roofing materials like iron sheets, and roofing nails constructed classroom blocks Bishaki, Ilemera, Kivunga, Kyenyi, Bugunga primary schools in Muko sub county. Latrine Construction and rehabilitation for the following Primary schools; Bushura, Nyamiringa in Bubare Sub county, Ikamiro & Bwindi in Muko sub county. Upgrading of mpungu HCII to HCIII, Renovation of maternity ward for Ruhija pg 118, Construction of public latrine in of AWP pg 118 & 98 of the 5year Development plan (2016/2017-2019/2020)</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 assessment established that the Project profiles were not developed and discussed by TPC.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual statistical abstract, with gender-disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum score 1. 	<p>A copy of the Annual Statistical Abstract with Gender aggregated data has been compiled by the DLG and was made available for assessment.</p> <p>However, the annual statistical abstract was not discussed by the Technical Planning Committee</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>Using Health and water sectors as a case in point on Page 55 & 68 of the AWP and Budget Performance reports, infrastructure projects as follows; construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Hamurwa HCIV at UGX 23,000,000, Protection of 8 water springs in Ruhija, Hamurwa, Bufundi, Nyamweru and Bubaare sub counties at a cost of UGX 20,352,271, Construction of 5 stance vip latrine at Habuhutu RGC in Bufundi sub county at shs 16,571,887, Design of solar powered water system at Rwemihova-Bushura in Bubaare sub county at shs 21,350,448, Rehabilitation of Ndego Gravity flow scheme shs 51,360,683, construction of 4 Rain water tanks of 30m3 in Ruhija and Bubaare sub counties shs 100,754,649, Construction of a Rain water tank at FAO Building in Muko sub county at shs 25,120,250, Construction of Rain water tank at Muko high school in muko sub county SHS 24,704,556, Construction of Rain water tank at st charles Lwanga senior secondary school in muko sub county shs 23,868,990, construction of Rain water tank at mukibungo primary school in muko sub county at shs 25,226,785 were some of the infrastructure projects implemented that show linkage with the approved budget by the Council.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>From the review of payments certificates for the following investments in the department of Health and Works & Technical services i.e. construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Hamurwa HCIV at shs 23,000,000, Protection of 8 water springs in Ruhija, Hamurwa, Bufundi, Nyamweru and Bubaare sub counties at a cost of shs 20,352,271, Construction of 5 stance vip latrine at Habuhutu RGC in Bufundi sub county at shs 16,571,887, Design of solar powered water system at Rwemihova-Bushura in Bubaare sub county at shs 21,350,448, Rehabilitation of Ndego Gravity flow scheme shs 51,360,683, construction of 4 Rain water tanks of 30m3 in Ruhija and Bubaare sub counties shs 100,754,649, Construction of a Rain water tank at FAO Building in Muko sub county at shs 25,120,250, Construction of Rain water tank at Muko high school in muko sub county shs 24,704,556, Construction of Rain water tank at st charles Lwanga senior secondary school in muko sub county shs 23,868,990, construction of Rain water tank at mukibungo primary all these investments were completed as per work plan by end of FY. DLG has already issued Final certificates of completion indicating 100% execution</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&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>From the District Annual budget performance report a number of projects have been reported completed within the budget and these include: Construction of Administration block partial completion at UGX 89,532,000, construction of slaughter slabs at Bubare in Bubare S/.C, Karukara in Hamurwa S/C, C Nyakabungo in Nkuba S/C, Karengyere in Muko S/C each at a cost of 4,616,000, Routine mechanized road maintenance along muko-kaara road UGX 9,040,000, Karukara-Bwindi UGX 4,556,250, Kashasha-Ihunga UGX 4,866,000, Murulunga-Nyamasizi UGX 2,943,750, Rwere -Nangara-Nyamweru road 15,459,000, Kagarama –Heisesero road UGX 15,459,000, Nangara-Kashenyi-Nyamyaga UGX 14,471,000, construction of 5 stance VIP latrine at Hamurwa HCIV at UGX 23,000,000, Protection of 8 water springs in Ruhija, Hamurwa, Bufundi, Nyamweru and Bubaare sub counties at a cost of UGX 20,352,271, Construction of 5 stance vip latrine at Habuhutu RGC in Bufundi sub county at UGX 16,571,887, Design of solar powered water system at Rwemihova-Bushura in Bubaare sub county at UGX 21,350,448, Rehabilitation of Ndego Gravity flow scheme UGX 51,360,683, construction of 4 Rain water tanks of 30m3 in Ruhija and Bubaare sub counties UGX 100,754,649, Construction of a 303 Rain water tank at FAO Building in Muko sub county at UGX 25,120,250, Construction of Rain water tank at Muko high school in Muko sub county UGX 24,704,556, Construction of 3 Rain water tank at st charles Lwanga senior secondary school in Muko Sub County UGX 23,868,990, and construction of Rain water tank at Mukibungo primary School.</p> <p>All the above projects were completed within approved budget</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>Assets and projects in need of maintenance were not reviewed and costed as per the guidelines</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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was not possible to verify files of all HoDs in Rubanda district. It was claimed that files were not available where they were supposed to be i.e registry. It is therefore clear that some of the files were/are misplaced. Of the few (5 files) viewed, only two HoD positions were substantively recruited. These are: District Education Officer, Magezi Celestino - appointment letter dated 24.05.2018 signed by Murimira Aggrey and minute extract DSC/01/2018(ii). and District Health officer, Abdon Marias Birungi – appointment letter dated 24.05.2018 signed by Murimira Aggrey and minute extract DSC/06/2018. • For the rest of the files, there was no evidence of appointment letter verified or viewed from their personal files because files themselves were absent. Thus 2 out of 11 represents 18%. 	<p>0</p>
---	---	--	----------

<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the absence of some of the files of HoDs, it was not possible to view and ascertain status of appraisals for these senior staff. A file containing appraisal forms presented did not have completed appraisal forms. Therefore, no HoD file had evidence of HoDs in Rubanda District having been appraised. 	<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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to DSC minutes and submission lists viewed (dated 19.1.17, 20.12.17) in Rubanda district, a total of 167 positions were submitted for recruitment at DSC during FY 2017/18. Submission lists were consulted and contained all the 167 candidates considered. Minute extracts that were used to consider these staff were as follows: 73/DSC/2017, 74/DSC/2017, 78/DSC/2017 all of 24th July 2017; 76/DSC/2017, 88/DSC/2017, 81/DSC/2017, 88/DSC/2017 all of 25th July 2017. Adverts run earlier in New Vision newspaper (dated 14/4/2017 showed that all the 167 positions submitted were considered for recruitment. These submissions and adverts viewed indicate that all the 167 positions were considered for recruitment. That is 100% 	<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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being a young district and still in the process of establishing systems, there were no submissions of staff eligible for confirmation during the FY 2017/18 in Rubanda District. There was no evidence of such submission in documents viewed. Thus absence of staff submission to DSC considered for confirmation represents 100% score FY 2017/18. 	<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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the submission list (dated 02/8/2017) looked into for Rubanda district, there were no cases submitted to DSC for disciplinary action. 	<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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Of the 153 staff verified as recruited during FY 2017/18 in Rubanda District, all were verified and confirmed as having entered salary payroll over 4 months of recruitment in Rubanda district. This is indicated by salary payroll register pay slip register presented and dated June 2018 for. All these recruited staff were appointed as per minute extracts DSC 74-91/2018 of 24th July 2017 and 25th July 2017. Others accessed payroll register of April 2018 as per payroll register of April viewed. There was no other evidence in form of staff pay slip presented to prove that staff recruited accessed salary payroll within less than the first two months of recruitment. 	<p>0</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>Rubanda district LG had 11 staff who retired during FY 2017/18. The staff pension payroll list presented and verified indicated that there is no retired staff who accessed pension payroll within 2 months of retirement. For example, Peter Buregyeya retired on 25.5.2017 and accessed pension payroll in June 2018; Baine Night retired on 1/7/17 as per letter dated 9.5.2017 and accessed pension payroll in May 2018; Catherine Bitarakwate retired on 1.7.17 as per letter with ref: COM162/323/01 and accessed pension payroll in June 2018; Tumusiime Ida retired on 14.8.2017 as per letter dated 10.2.17 signed by Turyasasiraa but only accessed pension payroll in April 2018; Braryamwisaki John retired on 12.11.2017 as per letter dated 16.11.2017 but accessed pension payroll in June 2018; Turinomuhangi Badda retired on 03.06.2017 by letter dated 23/1/2018 and has not yet accessed pension payroll at the time of assessing the district (in Sept 2018). There being no evidence of staff accessing pension payroll within 2 months of retiring during FY 2017/18, the score awarded is therefore 0. i.e 0 out of 11 is 0%.</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>The district LG increased its OSR by 43% from UGX 108,984,391 in the FY 2016/17 to UGX 155,616,655 in the FY 2017/18. This is more than 10%. (Source: Rubanda District financial statements for FY 2016/17 and 2017/18)</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within <p>+/- 10 %: then score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0.</p>	<p>The actual/budget revenue collection ratio for the FY 2017/18 was 34% (UGX 155,616,655/457,328,000). This resulted in a budget variance of 66% which is higher than 10%.(Source: budget and financial statements for FY2016/17)</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	<p>The financial statements for the FY 2017/18 indicated that Local Service Tax (LST) amounting to UGX 71,394,250 was collected at the District Level, out of which the UGX 19,388,688 was remitted to Lower LGs, which was 27% of the total LST. (Source: Rubanda DLG accounts and the cash book for the FY 2016/17). The rest of the revenue was collected by the LLGs. This was lower than the statutory remission requirement of 65% (source: financial statements for FY 2017/18).</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 spent UGX 140,050,000 in the FY 2017/18 on Council allowances and emoluments compared to UGX 108,984,391 collected in the FY 2016/17. This constituted 129% of OSR for the FY 2016/17 (more than 20%) as per Section 4 of the Local Governments Act.</p> <p>It was possible that the above spent amount on council emoluments and allowances included grants from Central Government because the district accountant indicated that it was not possible for him to separate central government grants contribution to emoluments and allowances in order to retain only the expenditure figure relating to local revenue in the FY 2017/18..</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 had substantively appointed procurement officer by the names of (Asiimwe Medard Katabazi) in appointment letter dated 12th December 2017 under DSC minute No. 88/DSC/2017 and signed by CAO (Dembe Beyeza Davis) on 13th January 2018 but there was no senior procurement officer.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	<p>For the 5 sampled projects three of them (construction of a slaughter slab at Mulore cetral ward Rubanda town council, renovation of Rubanda town council offices and construction of a 3 stance toilet at Hamurwa health centre iv) had proof that the TEC had produced reports and submitted to the contracts committee on 23rd February 2018, 2nd and 23rd March 2018 respectively. The contracts committee approved under minute no. RUBA616/WRKS/2017/2018/00002, RUBA616/WRKS/2017/2018/00001 and RUBA616/WRKS/2017/2018/00009 respectively. For partial completion of Rubanda district administration block and construction of a 3 stance VIP latrine at Bukombe P/S had no proof of evaluation since evaluation reports were not available however, there was proof of approval by the contracts committee under minute number RUB616/WRKS/2017/18/00017 and RUBA616/WRKS/2017/18/00016 respectively.</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 Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	<p>There was no evidence that the contracts committee considered the recommendations of the TEC because three out of five sampled projects (renovation of Rubanda town council offices, construction of a slaughter slab at Mulore cetral ward Rubanda town council and construction of a 3 stance toilet at Hamurwa health centre iv) had evaluation reports and the other two (construction of a 3 stance VIP latrine at Bukombe P/S and partial completion of Rubanda district administration block) had no evaluation reports.</p>	<p>0</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>There was evidence that the procurement and disposal plan for FY 2018/2019 availed which was received on 17th July 2018 covers all Infrastructure projects in the approved AWP for the current FY 2018/2019 received by the registry on 1st August 2018 and signed by the CAO.</p> <p>Considering the sampled projects there was no adherence to the procurement plan in the previous FY 2017/18 because one of the sampled projects (construction of a 3 stance VIP latrine at Bukombe P/S) did not exist in the annual work plan and budget of the previous FY 2017/2018.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/ infrastructure by August 30: score 2 	<p>According to the procurement plan for the FY 2018/2019, there were 25 infrastructure projects and none had approved bid documents which is 0%. This meant that less than 80% of the bid documents were prepared by August 2018.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 LG had a contracts register for the previous FY 2017/2018 which was not up to date and all the sampled projects were registered with missing information and procurement activity files were incomplete.</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>According to PPDA guidelines 2008 the LG did not adhere to procurement thresholds because one of the sampled projects (partial completion of Rubanda district administration block) the method of procurement which was used is selective and yet the project value was 89 million Uganda shillings. This showed a violation of PPDA guidelines that require all works projects above 50 million to be procured by open domestic bidding.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates <p>for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</p>	<p>For all the sampled projects; renovation of Rubanda town council offices, construction of a 3 stance toilet at Hamurwa health centre iv, construction of a slaughter slab at Mulore cetral ward Rubanda town council, construction of a 3 stance VIP latrine at Bukombe P/S and partial completion of Rubanda district administration block, no interim and completion certificates were available.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>For all the sampled projects; renovation of Rubanda town council offices, construction of a 3 stance toilet at Hamurwa health centre iv, construction of a slaughter slab at Mulore cetral ward Rubanda town council, construction of a 3 stance VIP latrine at Bukombe P/S and partial completion of Rubanda district administration block had no site boards.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management</p>			
<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4 	<p>The monthly bank reconciliation statements (BRS) for the FY 2017/18 were all produced including up to August 2018.</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2. 	<p>In the education and water sectors, all the 15 sampled payments were cleared on time (within 30 days) as provided for in the contracts ie there were overdue payments. However, in the health sector it was not possible to establish if the payments were overdue because the contracts (all of them LPOs) did not have payment timelines.</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 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 Internal Auditor (Mr Livingstone Natukunda) was substantively appointed a Principal Internal Auditor (scale U2) by the District Service Commission under minute NO.DSC74/2017(d) as per appointment letter dated November 20, 2017 signed by the Chief Administrative Officer. This position is higher than a Senior Internal Auditor position as per the LGPA Manual.</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 DIA produced 4 quarterly Internal Audit reports. First quarterly report was signed by Principal Internal Auditor on 27th November 2017. The Second quarter report was dated 26th February 2018. The 3rd quarter report was dated 17th May 2018 and the 4th quarter report was dated 10th August 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of</p> <p>internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports: score 2.</p>	<p>There was evidence that internal audit reports for the FY 2017/18 were submitted to both AO and LGPAC on the following dates respectively : : 1st quarter report on 27th /11/2017</p> <p>2nd quarter report on 27th /02/2018</p> <p>3rd quarter report on 18th /05/2018</p> <p>4th quarter report on 10th /09/2018</p> <p>However, there was no evidence of review and follow up of internal audit issues for the FY 2017/18. The LGPAC minutes presented to the consultant were in respect of the internal audit findings for the FY 2016/17.</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>There was evidence that internal audit reports for the FY 2017/18 were submitted to both AO and LGPAC on the following dates respectively : : 1st quarter report on 27th /11/2017</p> <p>2nd quarter report on 27th /02/2018</p> <p>3rd quarter report on 18th /05/2018</p> <p>4th quarter report on 10th /09/2018</p> <p>However, there was no evidence of review and follow up of internal audit issues for the FY 2017/18. The LGPAC minutes presented to the consultant were in respect of the internal audit findings for the FY 2016/17.</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 up- dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	<p>The LG maintained an assets register for the FY 2017/18. However, there was no assets register for the FY 2018/19 meaning that some assets for the FY 2018/19 may not have been recorded.</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>The external audit report for the FY 2017/18 was unqualified.</p>	<p>4</p>
--	--	--	----------

Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2 	<p>There was evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues. The district availed a set of minutes for the FY 2017/18 as follows: 2/05/2018; 29/3/2018; 20/3/2018; 29/03/2018; 5/08/2018; and all the sets of minutes provide proof that Council met and discussed service delivery related issues including TPC reports, quarterly review reports, monitoring reports & challenges of project implementation</p>	<p>2</p>
---	---	--	----------

<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 1. 	<p>Ms Kobugabe Joanita Communication officer is the designated person to handle complaints as per the letter of schedule of duties dated 22/3/2018</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>There was no clear system for recording,investigating and responding to grievances</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2 	<p>The LG Payroll & Pensioner Schedule for month of June 2018 was displayed on the public notice board.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1. 	<p>The LG Payroll & Pensioner Schedule for month of June 2018 was displayed on the public notice board.</p> <p>Procurement Plan was for 2018/2019was available on the Notice Board and some copies of the awarded contracts for 2017/2018 and amounts were displayed.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1. 	<p>The perfomance assessment results for the previous year were not published</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>The HLG didn't communicate and explain guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY</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 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>The District didnt conduct any Baraza or radio programme with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG gender focal person and CDO have provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion into their activities score 2. 	<p>The GFP and CDO provided guidance to sector departments as evidenced in the minutes of the of the district technical planning committee held on 15th September 2017 under minute MIN3/09/DTPC/2017/18 approved by the CAO.</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 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>The LG GFP and CDO had planned for seminars/workshops, trainings, monitoring of projects and resettling and reintegrating of children among others as evidenced in the Annual Departmental Work Plan for the FY 2018/2019 which was approved and signed by the CAO on 3rd July 2018. However there was no proof that more than 90% of the previous year's budget was implemented because most of the activities that were supposedly done had no approved supporting documents.</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 screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 1 	<p>For all the five sampled projects (renovation of Rubanda town council offices, construction of a 3 stance toilet at Hamurwa health centre iv, construction of a slaughter slab at Mulore cetral ward Rubanda town council, construction of a 3 stance VIP latrine at Bukombe P/S and partial completion of Rubanda district administration block) there was no available proof of environmental screening and no proof of budget for the mitigation measures.</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>No proof of integration of environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents for all the sampled projects.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>For all the sampled projects that were implemented there was no proof of land ownership.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO: score 1 	<p>For all the sampled projects that were implemented none had a completed and signed certificate by the environmental officer and the 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>No evidence that environmental and social clearance was done for projects before payment certification.</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 that the environmental officer and CDO report monthly therefore no completed check lists and observed deviations for the sampled projects.</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>Some P7 schools in Rubanda District like Shebeya P.S, Iyamuro, PS do not meet the minimum requirements of 7 teachers and a head teacher per school, because they had six teachers, Iyamuro had no head teacher, but worse still, some schools like Mungara P.S, Ncundura, Kashongati II (P7 class) had only one teacher budgeted for according to the PBS generated on 20/07/2018, 11:57am</p>	0
<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>According to the evidence from the PBS generated on 20/07/2018, 11:57am , Some schools did not meet a minimum requirement of deploying a head teacher and a minimum of seven teachers for P.7 classes, or corresponding minimum deployment for schools with less than 7 classes. Examples are many but to cite Iyamuro, Nangaro, Kishaki, Mukibaya etc.</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>With the available wage bill reflected in the performance contract Generated on 27/07/2018 02:31, and the PBS generated on 20/07/2018 11:57am (and as per the district teacher lists), the district still fell short of filling some primary school positions as highlighted above, because they have not planned the distributions. Some schools have one teacher budgeted and running the school, while others miss a teacher or two, yet there are schools with over twelve teachers who could otherwise be distributed in the lacking schools.</p>	0

<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>According to the staff structure approved by Ministry of Public Service in May 2017, Ref:ARC135/306/1, for Rubanda District, the local government is supposed to have two school inspectors. Indeed two positions were filled with 1 senior inspector appointed on 12th December 2017 by DSC Minute number 74/DSC/2017 and 1 inspector of Schools appointed on 12th Dec 2017, under minute number 73/DSC/2017</p>	6
<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>The education department had not submitted a recruitment plan for FY 2018/19, they said that they had an excess of five primary school teachers positions had been filled therefore they didn't have a reason to recruit. However, as said previously, some schools have very few teachers and a plan for re-allocation was not available as well. However, this is a requirement that should be adhered to no matter whether positions are filled but especially for this district which needs internal re-allocation of teachers to schools with less numbers.</p>	2
<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>The education department had not submitted a recruitment plan for FY 2018/19, because they had all inspectorate positions had been filled therefore they didn't have a reason to recruit. However, as said previously, some schools have very few teachers and a plan for re-allocation was not available as well. However, this is a requirement that should be adhered to no matter whether positions are filled.</p>	2
Monitoring and Inspection			

<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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are two School Inspectors in Rubanda district, as shown by the list of inspectors and personnel files. There is no evidence of appraisal for the two inspectors of schools. In fact one of the inspectors was categorically confident to express that he cannot chase school head teachers for appraisals but only entertain them when they need to be transferred. Therefore both school inspectors were not appraised and this represents a percentage of 0%. 	<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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sample of 10% of 110 schools was made i.e. 11 Primary Schools. Personal files of only 4 Head Teachers were produced as a majority of them were said to be still kept in the parent district of Kabale. Registry Officer travelled to Kabale to retrieve them for the purpose of assessment but returned without them – claiming that the files are not available. Of the 4 personal files viewed, one of the head teacher was appraised. Those head teachers not appraised therefore represents 0%. 	<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>Only the MDD circular was available at the DEO's office. But there was no evidence of communicating this circular to schools.</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>No evidence was found to show dissemination of the circulars to the schools.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all registered primary schools²</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59 % score 1 o Below 50% score 0. 	<p>A minimum of at least one inspection per term was not adhered to in this district. Inspection reports were not available for licensed schools. The Senior Inspector of Schools provided a summary of the schools visited, but it lacked corresponding reports and of those schools, not even 20% were licensed schools. They attributed limited inspection to logistical challenges and lack of reports to limited space for storing reports.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>Since there were no inspections, there were no reports/recommendations and no evidence provided to show any discussions of inspection reports</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 found of submission of school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES. This was attributed to the contested position of senior inspector of schools (currently in courts of law)</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed- up: score 4. 	<p>No evidence was available for following up the recommendations since there was no evidence of inspection.</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>The list of schools in the PBS had a slight difference with that provided by the MoES: the PBS had 110 while the MoES list had 133, however, when the private (15) and Annex (8) schools were filtered out of the MoES list, the two (PBS and MoES lists) were consistent.</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>The enrolment data for 2017 at the district was 58,427 while that from the MoES list was 58,689. The small difference was attributed to the enrolment fluctuations experienced at different times of the year.</p>	<p>0</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>Council Committee responsible for Education met on the following days: 25/5/2018; 14/3/2018; 13/12/2017; where issues like attendance to duty, Recruitment of teachers were discussed.</p>	<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>13/12/2017 from these minutes there is proof that the education sector committee presented issues that required approval of Council.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO/ MEO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80 % schools: score 0 	<p>A file with approved SMCs was accessed at the DEO's office, although it did not have minutes. In the sampled schools, records of SMCs meeting minutes were found.</p>	<p>0</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 e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	<p>There were lists on the DEO's wall showing the primary schools that received the non-wage recurrent grant. All the five sampled schools has this grant displayed as well in their staff rooms or head teachers' office.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The LG Education department has submitted input into the LG procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to the Procurement Unit that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	<p>There was a procurement prepared and submitted to the procurement unit, although it was received later (04/May/2018) than the 30th April.</p>	<p>4</p>

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>The LG education department certified and recommended payments to suppliers on time because the 5 sampled contracts (agreements) were paid for within 30 days stipulated in the contracts.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15th of July for consolidation: score 4 	<p>There was no evidence of the departmental submission of the annual performance report and other quarterly to the planning unit. However, the Local Government was using online reporting and the planner was able to consolidate the quarter 4 by 31/8/2018.</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 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 Education department had 4 audit queries in the third and fourth audit reports but there was no evidence of any responses on the status of implementation of those queries.</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>The DEO's office provided evidence in form of a circular NO 15/2017, dated 11th October 2017 to all Primary and Secondary schools talking about gender mainstreaming and reproductive health issues. This circular instructed head teachers to ensure that on a weekly basis, issues of reproductive health are discussed with the children in their schools.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2 	<p>There was no evidence to show that the departments had explained the guidelines. The training handouts provided were of 2014 which pre-dates the 2017 guidelines.</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 the School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	<p>The Guidelines on gender composition for the SMCs says the committee should have at least 2 females on the team. All the schools adhered to this guideline: for example for the sampled schools; Rwere P.S had 5 females, Kagoma P.S had 4females, Karengere P.S had 4 females, Bukombe P.S had 3 females and Kagarama P.S: had 6 female representatives on committees of 12 members.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guide-lines 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 of issuing 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>No evidence was provided.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1 	<p>No evidence was provided.</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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the performance contract 2018/19 and approved structure revealed that there are 234 established position filled. • Review of wage IPFs for the current year revealed that there 234 positions of health worker with a wage bill provision for the year 2018/19. Hence 100% of the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY has been filled 	8
<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan for primary health care workers to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/re- quest to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of primary health care workers: score 6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no staff recruitment plan covering the vacant positions of primary health care workers for the year 2018/19 submitted to the HRM. Hence no submission letter available • The explanation given by the district was that the wage IPF received for the year 2018/19 did not cover health workers to be recruited in 2018/19 hence they saw no need to submit a recruitment plan 	0

<p>The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital In- charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 2 Health Centre 4s in Rubanda district with In-charges as follows: <p>In-charge of Hamurwa HC4 (Dr. Turanzomwe Stewart) has no appraisal report or agreement found in his personal file. This indicates that the in-charge of this health C 4 was not appraised during FY 2017/18.</p> <p>In-charge of Muko HC4 (Dr. Katunguka Johnson) – no evidence of appraisal found in his personal file also.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therefore, out of 2 HC4s, none of In-charges was appraised during FY 2017/18, that is 0%. 	<p>0</p>
<p>The Local Government Health department has deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY, and if not provided justification for deviations: score 4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of midwives and enrolled nurses deployed at Muko HC IV (e.g. 3 midwives), Hamurwa HC IV (e.g. 3 midwives & 7 enrolled nurses), Bubare HC III (e.g 3 midwives & 2 nursing assistants) , Nyamabale HC II (e.g. 1 enrolled nurse & 1 enrolled midwife) as counted on the respective duty roasters are consistent with the staff lists submitted together with the budget 2018/19 	<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>There was no evidence (a communication letter) to indicate that the DHO communicated ALL of the following guidelines issued by the national level in the FY 2017/18:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Health Guidelines for Local Government Planning Process Health Sector Supplement – 2017 Ministry of Health, Sector Grant and Budget Guidelines to Local Governments FY 2018/19 Ministry of Health, Policy Strategies for Improving Health Service Delivery 2016-2021 	<p>0</p>
<p>The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>DHT meetings held on the 25th October 2017, 12th December 2017, 4th April 2018 and on the 6th June 2018 did not indicate discussions with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: score 3</p>	<p>The district provided 2 instead of the mandatory 4 integrated support supervision reports by the DHT for the FY 2017/18.</p> <p>Quarter 1 report dated 3rd August 2017 covered only Hamurwa HC IV and omitted Muko HC IV, quarter 4 report dated 10th June 2018 Muko HC IV and omitted Hamurwa HC IV.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT/MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>The DHT provided no evidence (copies of support supervision reports) for Rubanda East and Rubanda West HSD.</p> <p>Review of the supervision log book at Bubaale HC II revealed that it had been supervised by the HSD only once (30th May 2018) in the FY 2017/18</p> <p>Review of the supervision log book at Nyamabale HC II revealed that the facility had not been supervised by the HSD in the FY 2017/18</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>The district provided 2 instead of the mandatory 4 quarterly integrated support supervision reports by the DHT for the FY 2017/18. Hence no meetings discussed reports to make recommendations in each quarter</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 the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 	<p>There was no evidence of follow up of recommendations as these were no support supervision reports in each quarter in the first place.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10 	<p>The lists of health facilities receiving PHC funding (in PBS) is NOT consistent with the list received from MoH (health facilities reporting 2018/19).</p> <p>There are 25 health facilities receiving PHC – Wage however Kagunga HC II and Ihunga HC II are not on the list of Health facilities received from MoH (health facilities reporting 2018/19).</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>Council Committee responsible for health met on the following days: 25/5/2018, 14/3/2017; where issues like supervision of Health facilities; monitoring reports were discussed</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>From the minutes dated 13/12/2017 there were work plans, supervision of Health facilities programmes; monitoring reports that were forwarded to Council for approval.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 6 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>Only 1 health facility (Bubare HC III) of the 5 sampled facilities had held four mandatory HUMC meetings and meetings minutes presented.</p> <p>Muko HC IV, Hamurwa HC IV and Nyamabale HC II presented only 3 HUMC meeting minutes because appointment of new HUMC member happened after the 1st quarter</p> <p>Rubanda PHC HC III did not hold a HUMC meeting until 13/07/2018</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 posting on the public notice board at the DHOs office of a list of all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants. The amount received by each Health facility was also indicated</p>	<p>4</p>
<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>A copy of the AWP that was submitted to PDU was availed however there was no corresponding letter of submission from the DHO to the DPU to indicate that the AWP was submitted on time by April 30.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2. 	<p>There was a copy of form PP1, Subject of procurement – Supply of Stationary to DHO`s office) was submitted by DHO to the PDU. It was submitted before 30th September 2017</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO/ MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4. 	<p>It was not possible to determine whether the LG health department certified and recommended payments to suppliers on time because the sampled 6 contracts (all of them LPOs) did not specify delivery and payment deadlines. The Health department did not have any infrastructural projects. The only available contracts were LPOs for simple supplies of goods and services.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	<p>There was no evidence of departmental submission of the annual performance report and other quarterly reports to the planning unit. However, the LG was using online reporting (PBS) and the planner was able to consolidate the quarter 4 by 31/8/2018</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If sector has no audit query: Score 4 If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: Score 2 points If all queries are not responded to Score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG health department had not responded to the audit findings in the 3rd and 4th quarterly reports where a number of accountability issues were raised on the utilization of funds . There was no evidence of responses from the Health department. 	<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>All Health Unit Management Committees (HUMCs) at the sampled health facilities met the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum of 30% females on the HUMC).</p> <p>Bubare HC III (3 female & 4 male)</p> <p>Muko HC IV (4 female & 5 male)</p> <p>Hamurwa HC IV (4 female & 5 male)</p> <p>Nyamabale HC II (2 female & 3 male)</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 no evidence LGs has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities (No communication letter from the LG was provided). No guidelines were found at the sampled facilities. Toilets at Bubare HC III were not separated (labeled for Male and Female)</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>The health department did not implement any health facility infrastructure projects during FY 2017/18 hence no evidence to indicated that health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects and that risk mitigation plans were developed.</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 site visit reports by the district EO or CDO were availed as the health department did not implement any health facility infrastructure projects during FY 2017/18</p>	<p>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 is- sued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal2: score 4. 	<p>ALL 5 sampled HFs (Bubare HC III, Muko HC IV, Hamurwa HC IV, Nyamabale HC II & Rubanda PHC HC II) had a chat on medical waste management guidelines pinned in either the laboratory or maternity or both.</p>	<p>4</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 indicated that the average safe water coverage for Rubanda District for FY 2017/18 was 74%. The Sub-counties with safe water coverage below the District average were; Bubaare (62%) and Muko (51%).</p> <p>From the Annual Work plans and PBS for FY 2018/19, out of the total Sector Development Grant of UGX 459,378,000/=, the total budget allocation to Sub-counties below the District average was UGX 167,000,000/= representing 36% of the total Sector Development Grant and was distributed as follows:-</p> <p>Bubaare S/C: UGX 163,500,000/=</p> <p>Muko S/C: UGX 3,500,000/=</p>	0

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)

Maximum 15 points for this performance measure

- 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.

- o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs:

Score 15

- o If 80-99%:
Score 10

- o If 60-79: Score 5

- o If below 60 %:
Score 0

The review annual progress report for FY 2017/18 prepared by the District Water Office revealed that the following projects were implemented:

- Construction of 8 No. communal Rain Water Harvesting Tanks.
- Protection of 8 No. water springs.
- Construction of Ndeego Gravity Flow Scheme
- Construction of one 5-stance lined VIP latrine.
- Design of Kibuzigwe Gravity Flow Scheme

Out of the above projects, the following were implemented in the Sub-counties with safe water coverage below the District average:

- Protection of one water spring at Hamwiga village in Bubaare Sub-county.
- Construction of 2 No. Rain Water Harvesting Tanks at Kashenyi and Kibuzigye villages in Bubaare Sub-counties.
- Construction of 2 No. Rain Water Harvesting Tanks at Murukoro and Mukibungo villages in Muko Sub-county.
- Design of Kibuzigwe Gravity Flow Scheme in Bubaare Sub-county

In capital terms, about 25% of the budgeted water projects were implemented in the Sub-counties with safe water coverage below the District average.

<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 protected 8No. water springs in various Sub-counties, constructed 8 No. Rain Water Harvesting Tanks each of 30 m3 in various Sub-counties, rehabilitated the Ndeego Gravity Flow Scheme in Ikumba Sub-county and constructed one 5 –stance VIP latrine at Habuhutu village in Bufundi Sub-county. The availed inspection reports clearly revealed that all the new projects were regularly supervised and monitored. Data from MIS reports at the Ministry of Water and Environment indicated that there were functional 516 No. protected springs, one shallow well 18 No. deep boreholes, 343 Rain Harvesting Tanks and 231 Public Tap-stands. Monitoring reports on the files showed that about 150 water supply points were monitoring and supervision every Quarter during the FY 2017/18. It is estimated that about 600 water supply points out of 1,109 functional water supply points were monitored and supervised which represented about 54%.</p>	<p>3</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>The District Water Office submitted FORM 1 (Data Collection Form for Point Water Sources) and FORM 4 (Source Functionality, Management and Gender) Ministry of Water and Environment on 19th August 2018 and 17th April 2018 respectively for capture in the MIS. The list of facilities reported in the PBS were consistent with the MIS records at the Ministry of Water and Environment which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of 8 No. communal Rain Water Harvesting Tanks. • Protection of 8 No. water springs. • Construction of Ndeego Gravity Flow Scheme • Construction of one 5-stance lined VIP latrine. • Design of Kibuzigwe Gravity Flow Scheme 	<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 indicated in the Ministry of Water and Environment MIS reports were consistent with those in PBS as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of 8 No. communal Rain Water Harvesting Tanks. Protection of 8 No. water springs. Construction of Ndeego Gravity Flow Scheme Construction of one 5-stance lined VIP latrine. Design of Kibuzigwe Gravity Flow Scheme 	5
Procurement and contract management			
<p>The district Water department has submitted input for district's procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted input for the district procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	<p>The sector submitted in put for the District Procurement Plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on 30th April 2018.</p>	4
<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 Plans were made available and site visits were conducted to supervise the rehabilitation of Ndeego Gravity Flow Scheme in Ikumba Sub-county Under Procurement Reference No. RUBA 616/WRKS/2017 – 2018/00006 on 14th November 2017 and 15th February 2018. Supervision reports for the other sites were not available.</p>	0

<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	<p>Approved Designs by the District Engineer for the Water and Sanitation facilities were availed to the Assessor and construction progress reports were reviewed. The Assessor also inspected Communal Water Harvesting Tanks each of capacity of 30m³ constructed at Bukwata village in Bubaare Sub-county and Rwensanziro in Ruhija Sub-county, inspected the rehabilitated Ndeego Gravity Flow Scheme in Ikumba Sub-county and protected water spring at Hamwiga village in Bubaare Sub-county. All of these water supply facilities were found functioning satisfactorily as per designs.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	<p>Certificate of Substantial Completion of works and Hand-over reports were available on files. E.g. The Certificate for Practical Completion for the rehabilitation of Ndeego Gravity Flow Scheme in Ikumba Sub-county Under Procurement Reference No. RUBA 616/WRKS/2017 – 2018/00006 was signed by all parties on 20th February 2018.</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. E.g. Under Procurement Reference No. RUBA 616/WRKS/2016 – 2017/00001 for the construction of 5 Stance VIP Latrine at Habuhutu RGC, Mugyera Parish, Bufundi Sub-county, Payment Certificate No.1 was duly certified by the District Water Officer on 21st June 2018.. Under Procurement Reference No. RUBA 616/WRKS/2017 – 2018/00013 for the construction of 30 cubic meter Rain Water Harvesting Tank at Mukibungo Primary School in Muko Sub-county, Payment Certificate No.1 was duly certified by the District Water Officer on 20th June 2018. Under Procurement Reference No. RUBA 616/WRKS/2017 – 2018/00006 for the rehabilitation of Ndeego Gravity Flow Scheme in Ikumba Sub-county, Payment Certificate No.1 was duly certified by the District Water Officer on 20th June 2018.</p> <p>Projection Completion Reports were prepared, certified and filed appropriately.</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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG Water department certified and recommended payments to suppliers on time as provided for the contracts A sample of 10 payment vouchers and contracts showed that all payments were certified and paid within a maximum of 30 days provided for in the contract. 	<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 District Water Department submitted to the District Planner the annual performance report for the FY 2017/18 on 22nd August 2018. The Quarter 1 performance report was submitted on 19th October 2017, the Quarter 2 performance report was submitted on 7th February 2018, Quarter 3 performance report was submitted on 16th April 2018 and Quarter 4 including annual performance report was submitted on 22nd August 2018. Therefore the annual performance report was submitted later than the stipulated date.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The District Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</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 	<p>The LG Water department did not have any internal audit findings for the FY 2017/18.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>findings for the previous financial year</p> <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 <p>If queries are not responded to score 0</p>		

Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<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 Rubanda District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee held meetings on 7th September 2017, 22nd March 2018 and 8th June 2018.</p> <p>The Standing Committee for Finance, Planning, Administration, Works and Technical Services held meetings on 5th September 2017 to discuss submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee meetings.</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>District Council held its 3rd meeting on 20th December 2017 and discussed among other matters submissions from the Standing Committee for Finance, Planning, Administration, Works and Technical Services on service deliver issues and LG PAC reports.</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2. 	<p>The was no evidence that the AWP, budget and the Water Development Grant releases and expenditures were displayed on the District notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2 	<p>The water supply projects which were sampled on 10th and 11th September 2018 were Communal Water Harvesting Tanks each of capacity of 30m³ constructed at Bukwata village in Bubaare Sub-county and Rwensanziro in Ruhija Sub-county, the rehabilitated Ndeego Gravity Flow Scheme in Ikumba Sub-county and protected water spring at Hamwiga village in Bubaare Sub-county. All the above projects were clearly labeled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding.</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"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	<p>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) were clearly displayed on the District Notice Boards.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If communities apply for water/ public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	<p>Application letters from communities for water supply facilities together with the minutes of the meetings held by communities were submitted to the District Water Office for action and were properly filed. E.g. Application Letter from Rushunga Village for extension of Kamuserwa Gravity Flow Scheme was submitted on 23rd March 2017. Application Letter from St. Charles Lwanga S.S.S Muko for Rain Water Harvesting Tanks was submitted on 13th July 2017. Application Letter from Rushaki LCI, Nangara Parish was submitted on 10th October 2017</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Water and Sanitation Committees and the sampled water supply facilities were properly maintained and in good state. The Hamwiga Water and Sanitation Committee was collecting UGX 500/= per month per household towards O & M of the protected water spring, The Ndeego Gravity Flow Scheme Water and Sanitation Committee was charging UGX 1,000/= per household towards O & M of the scheme.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	<p>Environmental screening reports were not available.</p> <p>What was presented was an Environment Assessment Report for the rehabilitation of Ndeego Gravity Flow Scheme in Kashaasha Parish Ikumba Sub-county was submitted on 13th July 2018</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>Since all projects were not initially subjected to environmental screening, environmental concerns could not be ascertained.</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>Sampled construction and supervision contracts did not have any clauses on environmental protection.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 4 (Source Functionality, Management & Gender) and the Annual Progress Reports 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.</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 existing two public sanitation facilities at Habuhutu Rural Growth Centre in Bufundi Sub-county and Muko Rural Growth Centre in Muko Sub-county were not marked to give direction as to which stances were for men, women and PWDs.</p>	<p>0</p>
--	--	--	----------