



## Local Government Performance Assessment

Soroti District

(Vote Code: 553)

Assessment	Scores
Accountability Requirements	50%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	69%
Educational Performance Measures	84%
Health Performance Measures	65%
Water Performance Measures	84%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From MoFPED's inventory/schedule of LG submissions of performance contracts, check dates of submission and issuance of receipts and:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If LG submitted before or by due date, then state 'compliant'</li> <li>o If LG had not submitted or submitted later than the due date, state 'non-compliant'</li> </ul> </li> <li>• From the Uganda budget website: <a href="http://www.budget.go.ug">www.budget.go.ug</a>, check and compare recorded date therein with date of LG submission to confirm.</li> </ul>	<p>Soroti District Local Government was compliant with the PFMAA and LG budget submission guidelines. Performance Contracts were submitted on line on the 30th of July 2018 by the CAO and received by MoPED (by the Desk Officer for Soroti DLG who made comments on the submission) on the same date and requested the CAO to make changes as recommended by the desk officer. The Performance Contract was eventually approved by MoFPED on August 2nd 2018, as reflected on the inventory/schedule of LG submissions of Performance contracts generated at the MoFPED on the 28th of August 2018.</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>
Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			

<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY by 30th June (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From MoFPED's inventory of LG budget submissions, check whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The LG budget is accompanied by a Procurement Plan or not. If a LG submission includes a Procurement Plan, the LG is compliant; otherwise it is not compliant.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Soroti district was not compliant with the PFMAA and LG budget submission guidelines. Budget Estimates (with a procurement Plan as an appendix) were submitted on line on the 2nd of August 2018 and duly received at the MoFPED on the same date as reflected on inventory/schedule of LG submissions of Performance Contracts generated at the MoFPED on the 28th of August 2018. This was after the submission deadline of the 2nd of August.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports</p>			
<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>From MoFPED's official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted report to MoFPED in time, then it is compliant</li> <li>• If LG submitted late or did not submit, then it is not compliant</li> </ul>	<p>Soroti district was not compliant with the budget preparation and submission guidelines as per PFMA Act, 2015. The Annual Performance Report was submitted online to the MoFPED, on the 2nd of August 2108 as reflected on the on inventory/schedule of LG submissions of Performance contracts generated at the MoFPED on the 28th of August 2018. This was outside the submission date deadline of 31st July 2018.</p> <p>Reasons cited for the delay by the planner included the limited skills by the various sector staff in using the newly introduced PBS system, coupled with the fact the district had to produced almost all mandatory reports ( performance contract, annual performance report and end of year final accounts ) before the end of 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"> <li>• If LG submitted all four reports to MoFPED of the previous FY by July 31, then it is compliant (timely submission of each quarterly report, is not an accountability requirement, but by end of the FY, all quarterly reports should be available).</li> <li>• If LG submitted late or did not submit at all, then it is not compliant.</li> </ul>	<p>Soroti district was not compliant with the submission guidelines of the quarterly reports as per PFMA Act, 2015. While the quarterly reports for the 1st, 2nd and 3rd quarter had been submitted to MoFPED by the 31st July 2018, the quarter 4 reports was submitted late on the 5th of September 2018 as per confirmation by the Planner and the CAO. The MoFPED inventory/schedule of LG submissions of mandatory reports generated on the 28th of August 2018 did not reflect the Q4 report of Soroti district.</p> <p>Reasons mentioned by the CAO and the Planner for the delayed submission included but limited to the limited skills by the district staff in the use of the newly introduced PBS, and the work load experienced by staff during the months of June and July as almost all the mandatory reports had to be produced and submitted to the relevant line ministries by the end of July 2018.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Audit</p>			

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and the Auditor General's findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action in lines with applicable laws.</p>	<p>From MoFPED's Inventory/record of LG submissions of statements entitled "Actions to Address Internal Auditor General's findings",</p> <p>Check:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted a 'Response' (and provide details), then it is compliant</li> <li>• If LG did not submit a 'response', then it is non-compliant</li> <li>• If there is a response for all – LG is compliant</li> <li>• If there are partial or not all issues responded to – LG is not compliant.</li> </ul>	<p>Soroti District submitted the verification report on the status of implementation of audit recommendations as per the communication dated March 21, 2018 though not referenced. This was however, received on March 23, 2018 and there was response for all recommendations made.</p> <p>Since the performance indicator refers to submission by April 30 as amended we find the submission of March 23, 2018 to be within the stipulated time and thus the LG is compliant.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>		<p>From the Auditor General's report the LG obtained an unqualified report for FY 2017/18</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a district/ municipality has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Soroti district has a functioning physical planning committee that considers new investments. The committee was appointed by the CAO on 1/11/2017 as per letter ref. No. CR/2/14/68. The committee is comprised of the following officers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- District Health Officer</li> <li>- District Education Officer</li> <li>- District Engineer,</li> <li>- Supervisor of Roads</li> <li>- Environment Officer</li> <li>- District Community Development Officer</li> <li>- Natural Resources Officer</li> <li>- District Surveyor</li> <li>- Agricultural Officer,</li> <li>- Physical Planner ( sec. to the committee</li> <li>- CAO ( Chairperson to committee)</li> </ul> <p>The committee meets on a quarterly basis (also dependent on the number of plans submitted for approval). Five meetings were held during the previous FY on the following dates: 9/02/2017, 7/06/2017, 7/08/2017, 6/12/2017/ 19/04/ 2018. Minutes of the meetings held were available at the Physical Planner's office in the file of Minutes of the Physical Planning Committee.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that district/ MLG has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>While the minutes of the committee meetings were available at the office of the Physical Planner. The minutes had not yet been shared with the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development at the time of assessment ,as per records at the MoLHUD record book of Submission of Minutes of Physical Planning Committee meetings by Local Governments ( seen at the MLHUD on the 29th of August 2018). The Physical Planner also confirmed that they had not yet shared the minutes with the ministry.</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"> <li>• All infrastructure investments are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan: score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>Soroti district does not have a Physical Development Plan hence it was not possible to verify whether all infrastructure projects were consistent with the Physical development Plan.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) in a district are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action area plan prepared for the previous FY: score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>	<p>Action area plans ( copies of the Physical Development Plans were presented to the Assessor) were developed for the following New Growth Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Acumio - Apalamio town board in Katine sub county</li> <li>- Adamasiko Trading Centre in Katine sub county</li> <li>- Enangu Trading Centre in Kamuda Sub County.</li> </ul> <p>The Plans were developed in May 2017.</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"> <li>Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence that the priorities in the AWP for the current year were based on the outcomes of the budget conference. The district Planner, by the time of the assessment ( 10th-12th September), could not trace neither the minutes of the budget conference nor the Budget Conference Report to enable the Assessor verify whether the prioritised investment were based on discussions at the budget conference. The district however, has an approved 5 Yr Plan duly approved by Council.</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"> <li>• Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If differences appear, a justification has to be provided and evidence provided that it was approved by the Council. Score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>The capital investments in the approved Annual Work Plan for the current FY were derived from the approved five-year development plan 2015/16- 20-2019/20. A review of the five year plan revealed the capital investments per sector as per pages and sectors indicated in the 5 year plan and AWP respectively as indicated in the examples follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Health sector investments – Pages 112-115 (5 Yr Plan) and page 16 ( AWP)</li> <li>- Natural Resources- Pages – pages 104-109 ( 5Yr Plan) , Pages 22 ( AWP)</li> <li>- Education Sector- Pages – 115-117 (5Yr Plan) and Pages 18 (AWP)</li> <li>- Production Sector- Pages-110-111 ( 5Yr Plan) and Pages 46 (AWP)</li> <li>- Water Sector- Pages-98-100 (5Yr Plan) and pages 19 ( AWP)</li> </ul>	
--	---	---	--

<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence that Project Profiles were developed for all investments and discussed at TPC meetings as per LG planning guidelines. The project profiles were duly discussed at the Technical Planning Committee that sat on the 24th January 2018 as per minute extract no. 10/24/2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual statistical abstract, with gender-disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Annual statistical abstracts were with gender dis-aggregated data were compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making. The abstracts were presented to the TPC meeting that sat on the 19th of February 2018 as per minute extract No. 07/TPC/02/2018. Statistical abstract booklets for the FY 2015/16 and 2016/17 exist at the District Planner's office.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence provided to the Assessor included an extract (of infrastructure projects) from the previous year's Annual work plan that were compared with the approved work plan by council. The projects were found to be consistent.</p> <p>The projects included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Education: Construction of 8 classrooms, construction of 10 -2 stance latrines &amp; 5 stance lined pit latrines, Renovation of 1 DEO's office block, supply of 370 school desks (page 20 of the Performance contract 2017/18).</li> <li>- Health: Construction of Maternity ward at Agirigirio HCII, Fencing of Tubur HC III (Page 16 of the performance Contract).</li> <li>- Water: Drilling of 8 boreholes, construction of 2 stance drain -able latrine at Adamasiko RGC, Works on the piped water supply (page 23 of the performance contract 2017/18).</li> </ul> <p>An extract from the AWP 2017/18 of all planned investments for FY 2107/18 dated 24th June 2017 was reviewed and the projects were consistent with those included in the AWP 2017/18.</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"> <li>• 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"> <li>o 100%: score 4</li> <li>o 80-99%: score 2</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The Investment projects (excluding water and road construction projects) implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by the end of the FY. This constituted a percentage completion of 88.7 %.</p> <p>A comparison was made of the planned investment projects in the Annual work Plan and Budget with the projects reported in the Annual Budget Performance Report and the final accounts available in the CFO's office.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>All investment projects in the previous FY were completed within the approved budget- Maximum 15% plus or minus of the original budget.</p> <p>A review of information contained in the Annual budget performance report (as part of the Q4 report submitted to MoFPED and the Annual Final Accounts confirmed that the projects were completed within the approved budgets.</p> <p>The planned infrastructure projects that included construction of maternity in Awaliwal HCII and Ocokican HC II both are at the stage of finishes with only painting and fitting glasses remaining whereas for Tubur HC III phase I is complete.</p> <p>Construction of administration Block under Non-Residential buildings that was budgeted at shs. 200,176,000 was paid up to shs. 176,174,000 which is a performance of 88%.</p> <p>Classroom block constructed in Takaramian primary school that was budgeted at shs.56,300,000 and shs. 53,485,000 was paid which is a performance of 95%</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence adduced by the Ag. District Planner to confirm that the LG spent at least 80% of the O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY. The Ag. District Planner stated that under sector budged of Education and Health and Water, there was no provision of O&amp;M other than the routine service and repairs of equipment. This was confirmed with at review of the infrastructure projects stated in the Annual work Plan and budget for FY 2017/18 that had no specific budget lines for O&amp;M. For the education sector, the routine O&amp;M costs are incurred by parents through the School Management Committees and/or the Parents and Teachers Associations. Major O&amp;M requirements are sorted out with the support of the sub counties. No provision was made for O&amp;M of the Water projects which were mainly the drilling of boreholes.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Human Resource Management</p>			

LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.

• Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3

The Soroti District staff structure for 2018/19 approved by Council under Minute No. COU.63/09/2017 that was also approved by Ministry of Public Service on 31st July 2018. Letter ref No: ARC 135/306/01 provides for 10 Heads of Department positions.

The substantively filled position are only 5 (including the DCAO) the rest of the 5 HoDS are in acting positions. The positions that are not substantively filled and reasons why they are not filled include:

o CFO pending recruitment, they are waiting for a technical person from MoF to shortlist applicants

o District trade and industry has been just been created in 2018/19 thus the LG has not been able to fill it.

o District Engineer; it has been very difficult for the District to attract candidates because of the stringent qualification and experience requirements.

o Production and marketing somebody was recruited but declined to take up the appointment.

Below is the sample of details of the HoDs both substantive and those in acting position.

Achaya Magret E: District Community Development Officer; appointed on promotion as DCDO on July 31, 2008 under DSC minute No: 18/2008

Ajotu Benjamin: Natural Resources Management; appointed on promotion as DNRO on May 2nd 2007 under DSC minute No: 16/2007.

Dr. Okadhi Stephen District Health Officer; appointed on promotion as DHO on July 20, 2011 under DSC minute No: 37/2011 (1).

Ocung Denis: Works; appointed as District Water Officer. He was however assigned duties of District Engineer on Aug 9th 2017 by the CAO. Letter ref No. CR/D/11594

Omutia David: Finance; appointed as Accountant. He was however assigned duties of Chief Finance Officer on 1st March 2018 by the CAO. Letter ref No. CR/D/10075

LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.

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

In 2017/18 the District had eight HoD positions (including Administration – DCAO) which have been increased to 10 in 2018/19. All the eight HoDs were appraised and performance reports were seen as detailed below.

Okello Everest DEO; the officer was appraised, copy of the 2017/18 performance report signed by CAO on 31/8/2018 seen.

Achaya Magret E DCDO; the officer was appraised, copy of the 2017/18 performance report signed by CAO on 15/8/2018 seen.

Ajotu Benjamin NRM; the officer was appraised, copy of the 2017/18 performance report signed by CAO on 3/8/2018 seen.

Dr. Okadhi Stephen DHO; the was appraised, copy of the 2017/18 performance report signed by CAO on 2/8/2018 seen.

Dr Eyudu Patrick Ag. DPMO; the officer was appraised, copy of the 2017/18 performance report signed by CAO on 10/8/2018 seen.

Ocung Denis Ag. District Engineer; the officer was appraised, copy of the 2017/18 performance report signed by CAO on 30/8/2018 seen.

Omutia David Ag. CFO; the officer was appraised as an accountant on 07/3/2018. This was done before elapse of the financial year because he was assigned duties of caretaking of the CFO positions.

<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>From the review of the Declaration of vacancy file (DSC/156,1A Volume 2), it was found out that DSC received submission for recruitment for 19 positions. The commission met discussed and shortlisted all candidates for all the declared position (100%) during three meetings which were:</p> <p>a) Meeting of 30th April 2018 Minute No: 37/04/2018;</p> <p>b) Meeting of the DSC on 31st May to 1st June 2018 DSC Minute No: 42/06/2018; and</p> <p>c) Meeting of the DSC held from 18th to 21st June 2018 under DSC Minute No: 48/06/2018.</p> <p>However the DSC was not able to recruit staff for these positions because for most of the year the DSC was not composed. The term of the previous DSC expired in July 2017 and a new one was only reconstituted in February 2018.</p> <p>Other reported challenge affecting functionality of the DSC was inadequate funding. The commission receives between 9 to 10 million each quarter; this includes running adverts and allowances. Once adverts are made they receive very many submissions which will need to be shortlisted position by position that needs time and resource (many days of shortlisting). The District thus requests that the IPFs should be increased so that the DSC budget can be increased.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>From review of confirmation in appointments file (DSC/159/1 volume 2). It was found out that DSC received 8 submissions for confirmation in 2017/18.</p> <p>All the 8 submissions (100%) for confirmation received were considered in the DSC meeting from 5th to 7th March and 9th March 2018 under the DSC Minute No: 05/03/2018</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>There was one submission for disciplinary action that was submitted to DSC on 25th/10/2017. A disciplinary action on Orot Faustine for lack of requisite academic qualifications.</p> <p>This submission was considered by the DSC at the DSC meeting of 5th -7th March and 9th March 2018 under DSC minute No: 22/03/2018. The DSC resolution was to dismiss the officer with immediate effect.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>In 2017/18, the District didn't make any new recruitment. The last batch of staff recruited was in 2016/17 (29th May 2017) this was evidence from review of the updated staff list.</p> <p>It was reported that the District didn't recruit because they did not have a wage provision.</p>	<p>3</p>



<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>From review of the pension list it was found out that 19 staff retired in 2017/18. Of these only 5 were able to access the payroll. The other 14 had not accessed the payroll by the time of the assessment this was evidenced from review of the pension payroll and pension list. The only four staff that accessed the pension payroll are listed below:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name</th> <th>Due date of retirement.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Emaju Ajuo Ann Grace</td> <td>22/5/2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Enyimu Sammy Rogers</td> <td>3/8/2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Opolot Justine</td> <td>2/3/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Emaju John</td> <td>13/3/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eribu Everest</td> <td>20/8/2017 (Died)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>It was reported that their files are still in public service pending approval.</p> <p>To ensure that the people retiring access the payroll on time, the District requests that the MoPS should delegate the verification and approval function of the pensioners to internal audit department section of the District.</p>	Name	Due date of retirement.	Emaju Ajuo Ann Grace	22/5/2017	Enyimu Sammy Rogers	3/8/2017	Opolot Justine	2/3/2018	Emaju John	13/3/2018	Eribu Everest	20/8/2017 (Died)	<p>0</p>
Name	Due date of retirement.														
Emaju Ajuo Ann Grace	22/5/2017														
Enyimu Sammy Rogers	3/8/2017														
Opolot Justine	2/3/2018														
Emaju John	13/3/2018														
Eribu Everest	20/8/2017 (Died)														
<p>Revenue Mobilization</p>															
<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets) from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10 %: score 4.</li> <li>If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 2.</li> <li>If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>Total of OSR for FY 2016/2017 Shs. 318,666,670</p> <p>Total of OSR for FY 2017/2018 Shs. 417,410,150</p> <p>Increase/Decrease Shs.98,743,480</p> <p>Percentage 30.98%</p> <p>The information is extracted from the Draft financial statements for the FY 2017/18 a copy which was submitted to Accountant General on 30 Aug 218 but received on 31 Aug 2018. With a percentage increase in performance of 30.98% the LG scores maximum points.</p>	<p>4</p>												

<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0.</li> </ul>	<p>Total Local Revenue Planned/Budgeted for FY 2017/2018 was Shs. 548,600,000 as per the approved budget and work plan.</p> <p>Total Local Revenue collected during FY 2017/2018 as per the draft financial statements was Shs. 417,410,150</p> <p>The Performance therefore is 76%. The OSR that is not collected is approximately 24%. This falls outside the threshold of +/- 10% provided for in the performance measure hence, the LG doesn't score.</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"> <li>Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Local Revenue collections subjected to sharing with LLGs for the FY 2017/18 was Shs.62,619,655.</p> <p>Amount of local revenue remitted to LLGs during the financial year and as checked to the payment voucher and the RTGS transfer dated 30/11/2017 was Shs.6,795,000</p> <p>Status of compliance: The transfer made shows that only 10.8% of the mandatory amount is sent instead of 65%. The LG is thus Non Compliant.</p> <p>However, a communication was seen to the town clerk Soroti Municipality and all Sub-County Chiefs dated 30/08/2018 requesting them to furnish details about their staff to the CFO to enable the remittance of the share of the revenue although no evidence of response was provided by the time of the assessment.</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"> <li>Evidence that the total Council expenditures on allowances and emoluments- (including from all sources) is not higher than 20% of the OSR collected in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Total expenditure on council allowances and emoluments during FY 2017/2018 was Shs.68,978,600</p> <p>Total Local Revenue collected during FY 2017/2018 was Shs417,410,150. This forms a Percentage of 16.5%. This falls below the threshold of 20% as provided for in the performance measure hence the LG scores full marks.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The District does not have a substantive senior procurement officer. The position was advertised twice but the district failed to attract qualified candidates. Lucky enough the procurement officer has attained requisite qualification and has been forwarded to the DSC for appointment on promotion in 2018/19.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee.</p> <p>For example Technical evaluation Committee meeting was held 28/August /2017 (Ref; SORO 553/WRKS/2017-2018/00001: Construction of 2 in 1 Teachers house in Ojago P/S</p> <p>Produced report (28 /August / 2018) submitted to contracts committee. The report</p> <p>recommended M/s Frahah AMURIA enterprises for the award of the contract at a bid price of UGX 83,981,279,</p> <p>Technical evaluation Committee meeting was held 28/February /2018 (Ref; SORO 553/WRKS/2017-18/00023: Re-roofing of a 7 classroom block at Otatai P/s Produced report (28 /February / 2018) submitted to contracts committee. The report</p> <p>Recommended M/s No Fear Enterprises be awarded a contract at UGX 29,914,876</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC. For example -Report of the contracts committee seating on 18/April/2018, minute no 488/CC/04/2017-2018 (Item d), as per TEC recommendation, Contracts committee looked at the evaluation report and considered its recommendation of awarding contract to M/s No Fear Enterprises be awarded a contract at UGX 29,914,876.</p> <p>-Report of the contracts committee seating on 19/october/2017, minute no 452/CC/10/2017-2018 (Item a), as per TEC recommendation, Contracts committee looked at the evaluation report and considered its recommendation of awarding contract to M/s Frahah AMURIA enterprises for the award of the contract at a bid price of UGX 83,981,279.</p>	<p>1</p>
---	---	---	----------

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

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.

• a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for

the previous FY: score 2

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

-Drilling and casting of six bore holes (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/18-19/00001) at UGX 144 Million

-Construction of 2 classroom block at Obule-Angorom P/S (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/18-19/00003) at UGX 60 Million.

- Construction of 2 classroom block at Ojom P/S (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/18-19/00004) at UGX 60 Million.

- Low cost sealing of Lira-Kamuda-Aboket Road 0.7km Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/18-19/00005) phase IV at UGX 165 Million.

- Construction of Administration Block Phase IV (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/18-19/00007) at UGX 434,762,390 Million).

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

- Construction of 2 in 1 Teachers house at OJago primary school (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/2017-18/00001) at UGX 83, 981,279

-Re-roofing of a 7 classroom block at Otatai P/s (Ref; SORO 553/WRKS/2017-18/00023) at UGX 29, 914,876.

-- Low cost sealing of Lira-Kamuda-Aboket Road 0.8km (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00010) phase II at UGX 259, 000,472 Million.

-Construction of a 2-classroom block at Tararamiam P/S (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00002) at UGX 49,739, 360.

-Completion of fencing of Gweri HCIII, (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00015) at UGX 30,000, 158.

-Drilling and installation and test pumping of for bore holes (SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00007) at UGX 67,049, 706.

- Construction of a 2-classroom block at Olegei P/S (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00009) at UGX 59,295, 000.

Construction of a 2-classroom block at Olio P/S (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00003) at UGX 55,059, 862.

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/ infrastructure by August 30: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>For FY 2018/2019, By August 30 2018, all bid documents for all investment/infrastructure were prepared above 80%. These include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>--Drilling and casting of six bore holes (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/18-19/00001) at UGX 144 Million</li> <li>-Construction of 2 classroom block at Obule-Angorom P/S (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/18-19/00003) at UGX 60 Million.</li> <li>- Construction of 2 classroom block at Ojom P/S (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/18-19/00004) at UGX 60 Million.</li> <li>- Low cost sealing of Lira-Kamuda-Aboket Road 0.7km Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/18-19/00005) phase IV at UGX 165 Million.</li> <li>- Construction of Administration Block Phase IV (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/18-19/00007) at UGX 434,762,390 Million).</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>For FY 2017/2018, contract register fully updated (2017-2018).</p> <p>Contracts Register FY 2017/2018 is fully updated such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construction of 2 in 1 Teachers house at OJago primary school (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/2017-18/00001) at UGX 83, 981,279</li> <li>-Re-roofing of a 7 classroom block at Otatai P/s (Ref; SORO 553/WRKS/2017-18/00023) at UGX 29, 914,876.</li> <li>-- Low cost sealing of Lira-Kamuda-Aboket Road 0.8km (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00010) phase II at UGX 259, 000,472 Million.</li> <li>-Construction of a 2-classroom block at Takaramiam P/S (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00002) at UGX 49,739, 360.</li> <li>-Completion of fencing of Gweri HCIII, (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00015) at UGX 30,000, 158.</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>For FY 2017/2018, procurement thresholds were well adhered to. Example of sampled projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construction of 2 in 1 Teachers house at Ojago primary school (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/2017-18/00001) at UGX 83, 981,279 (Open domestic bidding in New Vision, Thursday July 13th 2017).</li> <li>-Re-roofing of a 7 classroom block at Otatai P/s (Ref; SORO 553/WRKS/2017-18/00023) at UGX 29, 914,876. (Selective bidding, Invitation letter dated 29/January/2018 to a minimum of three bidders)</li> <li>-- Low cost sealing of Lira-Kamuda-Aboket Road 0.8km (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00010) phase II at UGX 259, 000,472 Million. (Open domestic bidding in Daily Monitor , Friday October 20th 2017)</li> <li>-Construction of a 2-classroom block at Takaramiam P/S (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00002) at UGX 49,739, 360.( Open domestic bidding in New Vision, Thursday July 13th 2017)</li> <li>-Completion of fencing of Gweri HCIII, (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00015) at UGX 30,000, 158. (Selective bidding, Invitation letter dated 29/January/2018 to a minimum of three bidders)</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Projects implemented in the FY 2017/18 were appropriately certified with interim and completion certificates as per technical supervision. For example Completion certificates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Construction of 2 in 1 Teachers house at Ojago primary school (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/2017-18/00001)completion certificate dated 25/06/2018</li> <li>-Re-roofing of a 7 classroom block at Otatai P/s (Ref; SORO 553/WRKS/2017-18/00023) completion certificate dated 25/06/2018</li> <li>- Low cost sealing of Lira-Kamuda-Aboket Road 0.8km (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00010) phase II completion certificate dated 18/06/2018</li> <li>-Construction of a 2-classroom block at Takaramiam P/S (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00002) completion certificate dated 25/06/2018.</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The FY 2018/2019 project site boards for all projects are not yet erected available but even the one that is erected Construction of administration block is not clearly labelled. It misses information on contract value and expected duration.</p>	<p>0</p>
--	--	--	----------

Financial management

<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4</li> </ul>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Month</th> <th>Status</th> <th>Date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>30/06/2018</td> <td>Done</td> <td>30/06/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30/04/2018</td> <td>Done</td> <td>30/04/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31/01/2018</td> <td>Done</td> <td>31/01/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>28/02/2018</td> <td>Done</td> <td>28/02/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31/07/2017</td> <td>Done</td> <td>31/07/2017</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Reconciliations are done online on a daily basis and were checked for accuracy on line although copies were printed of the system to enable our verification.Reconciliations for the months of July 2018 and August 2018 were not availed and thus the score is zero.</p>	Month	Status	Date	30/06/2018	Done	30/06/2018	30/04/2018	Done	30/04/2018	31/01/2018	Done	31/01/2018	28/02/2018	Done	28/02/2018	31/07/2017	Done	31/07/2017	<p>0</p>
Month	Status	Date																			
30/06/2018	Done	30/06/2018																			
30/04/2018	Done	30/04/2018																			
31/01/2018	Done	31/01/2018																			
28/02/2018	Done	28/02/2018																			
31/07/2017	Done	31/07/2017																			



<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</li> <li>– no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>Reviewed a sample of payment documents together with the claims register and noted that that payments were done on time. Examples are as listed below:</p> <p>Reviewed invoice No. 2018/021 dated 13/06/2018 from KLR-Uganda Ltd. for sitting, drilling, casting and installation of a hand pump borehole at Anyalai. It was verified on 19/6/2018 and approved for payment on the same date. Payment was done on 26/06/2018</p> <p>Reviewed request for payment for fencing of RCG production well at Adamasiko by Onel Company date 8/06/2018. Verified for payment on 14/06/2018 and approved on 19/06/2018. Payment was done on 26/06/2018.</p> <p>Looked at the request for payment made by Mogen Enterprises made on 14/06/2018 and verified on 19/06/2018 and payment was effected on 26/06/2018</p> <p>Reviewed the request for payment for consultancy services for detailed engineering design of the 8 km Lira Road Kamunda by MBJ Technology dated 12/06/2017 and verified for payment on 22/06/2017. Payment was done on 12/10/2017. This was due to end of year procedures where further payment could not be processed an therefore carried forward to the subsequent period.</p> <p>As seen above all payments were made within the stipulated time and there were no overdue bills.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor: 1 point.</li> <li>• LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The District has an internal auditor by the names of Mr. Okello Michael. A letter of assignment of duty for 6 months dated January 5, 2016 and referenced as CR/D/10787 was seen. The appointment was done by John Nyakahuma, CAO Soroti District. The acting appointment had earlier been done on July 14, 2014 under reference CR/D/10878 by Gidudu Tom (PhD) for CAO, Soroti District. As per District Service Commission under Min No. 42/07/2014 (vii). For effective appointment the file was referred to District Service Commission. The office is therefore not properly constituted since the person serving in office is in acting capacity and yet to be confirmed. He is therefore not substantive,</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"> <li>• LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The 1st Quarter report was prepared and submitted on 6 November 2017 and received in the District Chairperson on the same date. Submitted to the directorate of internal audit on 22 March 2018 and signed by Ag. Head of Internal Audit.</p> <p>2nd Quarter was prepared on 2nd March 2018 and forwarded to the District Chairperson on the same date. Sent to the internal Auditor General on March 2, 2018 and received at the Directorate of internal audit on 22 March 2018. Signed off as above.</p> <p>3rd quarter was prepared and forwarded to District Chairperson on 4 May 2018 and later forwarded to Internal Auditor General on 8 May 2018 but receipted on 07 September 2018. The Ministry of Local Government received on 7 September 2018. Soft copy had earlier been submitted to Alice Nanguku and Akello Tabisa of the Office of Internal General on July 12, 2018.</p> <p>4th Quarter report was prepared on August 16, 2018 and received by the District Chairperson on 16/08/2018. Forwarded to the Directorate of internal Audit on August 17, 2018 but received on 07 September 2018 at the Directorate of Internal Audit and Ministry of Local Government as evidenced by the stamps on the documents. . 4th Quarter report was emailed on September 6, 2018 to the same individuals above</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports: score 2.</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of internal audit findings much as the reports were forwarded to PAC on the respective dates. There was no evidence that they were tabled for discussion. The LG and municipality share the PAC and as a result for the FY 2017/18 focus was put on the municipality findings that were in backlog for quite some time and no attention was given to LG findings.</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"> <li>• Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>The reports were forwarded to PAC on the respective dates but there was no evidence that they were tabled for discussion. The LG and municipality share the PAC and as a result for the FY 2017/18 focus was put on the municipality findings that were in backlog for quite some time and no attention was given to LG findings.</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"> <li>• Evidence that the LG maintains an updated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>A manual assets register is maintained and is in conformity with the format of the accounting manual. There is evidence that forms to compile the assets by heads of departments pending forwarding to Kampala for assistance in uploading into the IFMS system were seen. A copy of the communication to all heads of departments by the CAO dated 9/08/2018 is seen requiring them to provide the details of the assets and other equipment under their custody in the forms attached. Seen also the board of survey report referenced CR/108/01 dated August 2018 that is in conformity with the requirement.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unqualified audit opinion: score 4</li> <li>• Qualified: score 2</li> <li>• Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>From the Auditor General's report for the FY 2017/18 the LG obtained unqualified opinion.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Soroti Local Government council met and discussed service delivery issues. The council met 5 times during the previous FY and discussed service delivery issues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meeting of the 21st -22nd September 2017. Service delivery issues discussed as per minute extract no. 70/09/2017 included; discussion of reports of standing committees on education, issues about recruitment of more health workers, increase of development budget for selected health facilities, recruitment of more staff in the education department and increase in budget allocation for staff houses in the health department.</li> <li>- Meeting of the 29th -30th November 2017. Issues discussed as per minute extract 80/11/ 2017 included the need to establish a district medical board for staff who are mentally ill, need to upgrade HC IIs to HC IIIs in the new sub counties, need to allow the education committee to do more consultations about the education fund, provide more information about the existence of FAL classes and that they were operational and hosted mainly in churches.</li> <li>- Meeting of 19/03/2018. Mainly focussed on the laying of the budget. No service delivery issues were discussed at this particular meeting.</li> <li>- Meeting of the 26th -27th /03 2018. Issues discussed as per minute extract 94/03/2018, urged council members to educate communities about their roles in monitoring projects, need for repairs of the roof blown off by wind at Tukum primary school.</li> <li>- Meeting of the 28th -29th/05/ 2018. Key issues discussed included repairs of the solar panel at Kamuda HC III, need for the district executive to review the activities of NGOs and ban those that are not registered. Need for the MoFPED to send guidelines to the district to utilise the 900M shillings (as IPFs) allocated to the education department for secondary education.</li> </ul>
---	---	--

<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Soroti district presented evidence to confirm that it has a designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints.</p> <p>The CAO assigned additional responsibilities to the Senior Administrative Secretary ( also acting as the Information Officer) as per letter dated 4/06/2018, ref. No. CR/ 168/1; “to receive complaints from the community related to service delivery from all departments, district executive committee and the technical planning committee and ensure appropriate feedback”.</p> <p>The focal point person directs the issues to the appropriate technical person and ensures that the feedback is provided as appropriate in a timely manner.</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"> <li>The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which should be displayed at LG offices and made publically available: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The CAO communicated the grievances handling system and the appointment of a focal point person to the technical heads of departments and lower local governments through a letter dated 4/06/2018 reference number CR/168/1</p> <p>The feedback system to the citizenry includes formal feedback through letters written by the CAO, Heads of departments and/or the focal point person or community meetings are held to provide feedback to the citizenry.</p> <p>For example, a Petition was raised against the location of new administrative units at Oculoi sub county headquarters. Feedback was provided through a community meeting that was convened on the 1/07/2018 Minutes available at the office of the information officer) at Oculoi sub county head quarters. The meeting was chaired by the CAO and was attended by among other people the sub county political and technical leaders.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence to confirm that the LG shares information with the citizens. This was exhibited through published payroll register for the month of August as well as Pensioner Schedule for the month of August 2018, that were displayed at the public notice board at the Administration block</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"> <li>• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Excerpts of the Procurement Plan and the call for bids for planned projects for 2018/19 were displayed on the public notice board at the procurement office. Later in the month, the best Evaluated bids would also be displayed after completion of the selection process.</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"> <li>• Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence presented to the Assessor at the time of the performance assessment exercise to confirm that the LG performance assessment results and implications were published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year or through any other form of communication channel.</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"> <li>• Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence was presented to the assessor to confirm that the HLG communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY.</p> <p>Evidence adduced included: receipt acknowledgement of the DDEG guidelines by the technical and political staff at all sub counties (acknowledgement receipt dated 20th march 2018-duly stamped by the Ag. District Planner), acknowledgement receipt of Budget Call Circular- BBC 2017/18 to Lower Local Governments, Dissemination of the Second Budget Call Circular- 2 BBC to Lower Local Governments for final budget preparation. Issued by the Ag. District Planner on 28th of February 2018, duly stamped by the District Planner (with attachment of the circular).</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence adduced included; a number of correspondences from the Chief Administrative Officer and/or the district planner to lower local governments and heads of departments for example, letter from CAO dated 2/07/18 Re: Mobilisation of Communities to receive feedback on District implemented Projects ( meetings were held at all sub counties), Report of the community dialogue meetings and feedback held on 4th of July 2018 during which technical staff from the district made presentations about the progress of implementation of the planned activities.</p> <p>The RDC's Office pays for airtime for the district to conduct radio talk shows on topical issues affecting the district for example a talk show was held on the 12/07/2018 on Teso Radio. Evidence presented included a presentation brief that included government releases for the year 2017/18, presentation on sector achievements during the year among other topics.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG gender focal person and CDO have provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion into their activities score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>Guidance has been provided by gender focal point person to departments regarding how to mainstream gender. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Report (Ref Date:10, August, 2017) GENDER MAIN STREAMING IN PLANNING PROCESS. Held at PEOPLES GUEST HOUSE SOROTI, Explained National Gender Policy 1997</li> </ul> <p>The training covered (Practical steps in gender main streaming, cross cutting issues)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Minutes of technical planning committee meeting held on 23th/ 04/2018 at the council hall (Min:12/TPC/04/2018 mentoring on gender main streaming in UWEP).</li> <li>-Dissemination of Information on Gender and other policies (dated 22/Nov/2017)</li> <li>-Mobilization of Community groups to benefit from government programmes (Dated 08/August/2017).</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>

The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.

• 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.

In FY 2018/19 Gender focal point person and CDO have planned activities (work plan) Vote:553 Soroti District). These include

- Gender Main streaming
- children and youth services,
- community based services and
- support to disabled and elderly, representation on Women councils.
- probation and welfare support
- operation of community based services Department.
- UWEP Projects supported in 7 sub counties

In FY 2017/18 over 90% of the planned activities on gender activities/vulnerability/social inclusion well implemented e.g 100% achievement was registered as was planned (Annual report dated 10, August, 2017) Departments were helped on how to use data for planning, mentoring of departments on gender main streaming, facilitating youth council meetings, supporting people with disabilities, dissemination of gender aggregated data, conducting radio talk shows,



<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Environmental screening and EIA are carried out for activities and projects are planned and budgeted for in respective BOQs for specific projects in each department depending on the department e.g Education (Voucher number No: NAT/NOV/18/012 indicates money drawn from the budget as planned for conducting environmental Impact Assessment for construction of schools, pit latrines, renovations), Health(Voucher number No: NAT/MAY/18/010 indicates money drawn from the budget as planned for conducting environmental Impact Assessment for construction health Centres. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construction of 2 in 1 Teachers house at Ojago primary school (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/2017-18/00001) Environmental and social screening form dated 25/01/ 2018)</li> <li>-Re-roofing of a 7 classroom block at Otatai P/s (Ref; SORO 553/WRKS/2017-18/00023) Environmental and social screening form dated 25/01/ 2018)</li> <li>- Low cost sealing of Lira-Kamuda-Aboket Road 0.8km (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00010) phase II (Environmental and social screening form dated 25/01/ 2018)</li> <li>-Construction of a 2-classroom block at Takaramiam P/S (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00002) Environmental and social screening form dated 25/01/ 2018)</li> <li>-Completion of fencing of Gweri HCIII, (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00015) Environmental and social screening form dated 25/01/ 2018)</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Environmental and social management and health and safety plans are integrated and appended on the bid documents are contracts agreements for example: for example bid documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Drilling and casting of six bore holes (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/18-19/00001)</li> <li>-Construction of 2 classroom block at Obule-Angorom P/S (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/18-19/00003).</li> <li>- Construction of 2 classroom block at Ojom P/S (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/18-19/00004</li> <li>- Low cost sealing of Lira-Kamuda-Aboket Road 0.7km Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/18-19/00005) phase IV.</li> <li>- Construction of Administration Block Phase IV (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/18-19/00007)</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1</li> </ul>	<p>All projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construction of Administration Block Phase III at Plot 6-8 LM2/1958</li> <li>--Renovation of Education office at PLOT 6-8, LM12/1958.TIRIR HEALTH IV, Plot 36, STO/136</li> </ul> <p>Renovation of doctors house</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Completion of fencing of Gweri HCIII, (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00015) is done on government land for Soroti District Gweri HCIII Land title Plot 36, STO/135</li> <li>-Asuret Sub County Plot 176, Block 6.</li> <li>-Drilling of bore holes was done on Private land and agreements were made and were available and MOUs. The agreements are witnessed witnessed by chairpersons and community members. For example Ojam Village agreement for bore hole dated 11/06/2018 was done, Ohelle Village (Bore drilling Agreement dated 2/06/2018), Awidiang Village (Bore drilling Agreement dated 2/06/2018), Kelim C Village (construction of water/sanitation facility Agreement dated 06/05/2018), Anyalai C Village (construction of water/sanitation facility Agreement dated 05/05/2018),</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>All completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Renovation of Education office (Environmental and social certification form dated June 20th , 2018)</li> <li>Low cost sealing of Lira-Kamuda-Aboket Road 0.8km (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00010) phase II(Environmental and social certification form dated June 25th , 2018)</li> <li>-Sitting Drilling , installation and test pumping of deep bores(Environmental and social certification form dated June 20th , 2018)</li> </ul> <p>Mitigation Certification Forms completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO and they stamped.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance (new one): Score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance. Clearance is done after inspection of contracts committee and based on the report of this committee.</p> <p>e.g</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Completion of fencing of Gweri HCIII, (Ref: SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00015) dated 23/04/2018.</li> <li>- Sitting Drilling , installation and test pumping of deep bores(Environmental and social certification form dated June 20th , 2018)</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that environmental officer and CDO monthly report, includes a) completed checklists, b) deviations observed with pictures, c) corrective actions taken. Score: 1</li> </ul>	<p>Reports were prepared though by only environmental officer. No reports were prepared by both environmental officer and CDO together. No evidence in terms of monthly reports prepared by both officers (Environmental and CDO) were found at the time of assessment at Soroti District.</p>	<p>0</p>

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>The LG education de- partment has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>The LG Education department of Soroti District budgeted for a Head Teacher and the minimum of seven classroom teachers as per Performance Contract FY 2018/2019 (Vote 522) dated 30/7/2018 indicates budgeting for head teachers and teachers. Also a list of 79 primary schools, a list of 864 teachers including Head teachers, enrollment list by school show at least the seven teachers (ref List of teachers as performance contract 2018/19)</p>	4
<p>The LG education de- partment has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>As per teachers list, deployment of the Head Teacher and the minimum of seven teachers is done. Also ascertained with H/R payroll and as per the sampled schools below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Agora P/S has a head teacher and 14 teachers.</li> <li>-Omodoi P/S has 13 teachers including the head teacher .</li> <li>-Awoja Bridge P/S has 10 teachers including the head teacher.</li> <li>-Awoja P/S has 18 teachers including the head teacher.</li> </ul>	4

<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100%: score 6</li> <li>o If 80 - 99%: score 3</li> <li>o If below 80%: score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>According to Soroti District approved structure as per DEO's proposed work plan to the H/R dated 9/5/18 structure for primary teachers is filled with a wage bill provision. The wage bill provision is for 864 teachers.</p> <p>Teachers proposed by office of the DEO was 1,188, the wage bill provision is 864, placements filled is 824 as a result of retirements, death and transfers of service which is 95%</p> <p>Meanwhile the district has advertised and short listed for the short fall.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6</li> </ul>	<p>Soroti District approved structure (Approved establishment of the district, as per CAO communication dated 8/8/18 ref: CR/D/152/1 had a provision of 2 slots of school inspectors and these positions were substantively filled (Performance contracts, 2017/18 and 2018/19 Soroti District, Vote 553: Education department)</p>	<p>6</p>
<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary Teachers: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The DEO has accordingly submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the FY 2018/2019 on.9/5/18 Education Department proposed Primary Teachers positions to be filled to the tune of 1,188 of them</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Inspectors: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The DEO has accordingly submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the FY 2018/2019 on.9/5/18 Education Department proposed Positions of school inspectors to be filled are 2</p>	<p>2</p>
--	---	---	----------

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"> <li>• 100% school inspectors: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>The District has two inspectors of the schools, all the two have been appraised for the period 2017/18 as indicated below:</p> <p>Emoru Anango appraised on 10/7/2018 File No: CR/D/11603</p> <p>Ilenyot Jeniffer appraised on 8/7/2018 File No: CR/D/10570</p>	<p>3</p>
---	--	--	----------

<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary school head teachers o 90 - 100%: score 3</li> <li>o 70% and 89%: score 2</li> <li>o Below 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The District has 79 schools. As part of the assessment 10 of the 79 head teachers appraisal files randomly sampled were reviewed. Findings from the review revealed that 7 of the 10 head teachers of the sampled 10 files were appraised. Below are the details of 5 of the 10 head teacher's files reviewed.</p> <p>Olupot John Bosco Abeko PS Officer appraised by the SAS Tubur Sub-County on 05/1/2018. File No: CR/D/22129</p> <p>Ogari Emmanuel Adacar-Asuret PS Officer appraised by the SAS Asuret Sub-County on 04/12/2017. File No: CR/D/22061</p> <p>Nyachwo Veronica Arapai PS Officer appraised by the SAS Arapai Sub-County on 19/11/2017. File No: CR/D/22129</p> <p>Alum Sarah Katine PS Officer appraised by the SAS Katine Sub-County on 06/2/2018. File No: CR/D/21595</p> <p>Okiror David Obule PS Officer appraised by the SAS Asuret Sub-County on 10/12/2017. File No: CR/D/22159</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>All guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the FY 2017/2018 were communicated to schools. For example on 30/5/18 there was general meeting with head teachers and communication was given regarding school performance, gender and environment in various minutes enforcing closure of illegal schools was communicated to all head teachers, circulars are displayed on the notice board, a letter to all H/Ts on gender issues dated 10/5/18.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>A number of meetings were held with head teachers of primary schools on different dates to elaborate and sensitize on the matters regarding education improvement as guided by the MOES</p> <p>for example on 12/10/17, 30/5/18/</p> <p>In each meeting minutes were recorded and attendance taken.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all registered primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100% - score 12</li> <li>o 90 to 99% - score 10</li> <li>o 80 to 89% - score 8</li> <li>o 70 to 79% - score 6</li> <li>o 60 to 69% - score 3</li> <li>o 50 to 59 % score 1</li> <li>o Below 50% score 0.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>In FY 2017/18, inspections were done and reports were produced.</p> <p>All the schools were inspected accordingly. Out of 79 primary schools at least each school was inspected once per term at least 72 schools (90%) were visited as per report dated 14/12/17,29/8/18,E-inspection report dated 9/8/18 and sampled schools.</p> <p>Awoja P/S was visited at least three times on 24/7/18, 26/7/18 and 28/6/18;</p> <p>Awoja Bridge Primary school was inspected at least three times 13/2/18, 7/6/18, 28/6/18; Amodoi P/S was inspected at least four times 26/4/18, 3/7/18, 24/7/18, 20/7/18;</p> <p>Agora P/S was inspected at least five times 10/7/17, 14/7/17, 22/8/17, 29/11/17 and 6/3/18.</p>	<p>10</p>



<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>The education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations.</p> <p>For example Minutes of inspection reports</p> <p>10/5/18 and 28/6/18 meetings on Inspection. Recommendations, corrective measures including guidance and counseling are measures used as corrective actions.</p> <p>Corrective letters issued as per letter to Acero Sicely of Telamot primary school given warning letter dated 2/3/18, Letter dated 21/6/18 to Ongorok Charles for sexual harassment to a fellow staff, invited him to appear before the rewards and sanctions committee.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Soroti Education department submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports through e- inspection as used by the tablet, dated 9/8/18 as acknowledged by the DES, for the period April to July 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed- up: score 4.</li> </ul>	<p>Inspection recommendations are followed-up. For example:</p> <p>-Meeting with head teachers dated 30/5/18 reminded of actions to be taken on circulars as issued by MOES, 9/8/18 the e-inspection report recommended more intensive support supervision by head teachers. e- inspection feed back as printed on 20/12/18 record management, compliance to statutory requirements, health and sanitation and other observations for the attention of schools and the DEO.</p>	4
<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Data submitted was accurate and consistent</p> <p>For example performance contract FY 2018/2019 dated 29/5/18 provides the list of schools which are consistent with PBS report as reviewed by the assessor.</p>	5
<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>Enrolment data submitted for all schools in place with 63,377 pupils and was consistent with PBS data.</p>	5
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The LG committee re- sponsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The sector committee on education met on the dates indicated below and among other issues discussed service delivery issues which were eventually tabled to the district council meetings for approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meeting of the 29/11/2017- discussed the issue of the need for the district to establish a medical board for staff that suffer from mental illness. Council resolved that a medical board be established for staff as per government standing orders.</li> <li>- Meeting of the 27/02/2018- Among other issues discussed the inability of the district to recruit 318 teachers due to lack of sufficient wage bill, recommended to council for the approval of School Management Committees for 79 primary schools.</li> <li>- Meeting of the 28-29/05/2018- Meeting reviewed the work plans and budgets for the sector for submission to council for approval. Council approved the education sector work plans during the same sitting.</li> <li>- Meeting of the 28th -29th May 2018- discussed issues of IPFs for secondary education and made recommendations to council. Council resolved that the funds should be appropriated in the first quarter of 2018/19. Council also approved the sector work plans and budgets</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>• Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Issues discussed by the Education committee as indicated in the foregoing indicator (above) were tabled to council sitting of 28th-29th of May 2018 for resolution. For example, council resolved that IPFs for secondary education be appropriated in the first quarter of 2017/18. Council sitting of the 29th November 2017 resolved that a medical board be established for district staff to consider approving treatment for mental illnesses and the council meeting of the 28th 29th of May 2018, approved sector budgets including education.</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"> <li>• 100% schools: score 5</li> <li>• 80 to 99% schools: score 3</li> <li>• Below 80 % schools: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>All the 79 primary schools in Soroti District have functional SMCs; the office of the DEO has a record of submitted minutes of SMC meetings as submitted by the schools. These SMCs meet regularly and keep minutes. For example as sampled ,</p> <p>-Agora P/S was inspected at least more than once by Associate Assessor on 10/7/17, 14/7/17 by the inspector and DEO, 22/8/17 by Associate Assessor, 29/11/17 by the DIS and on the 6/3/18 by Associate Assessor.</p> <p>-Omodoi P/S was inspected on 3/7/18, 26/4/18, 24/7/18, 20/7/18 by the Center Coordinating Tutor, Inspector, and Associate Assessors respectively and variously.</p> <p>-Awoja Bridge P/S inspected on 13/2/18, 7/6/18, and 28/6/18 by the Associate Assessors, and Health Inspector respectively and variously.</p> <p>-Awoja P/S was inspected at least three times. On 24/7/18, 26/7/18 and 28/6/18 by Inspector and MOES and Associate Assessors respectively and variously.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non- wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>All schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants were posted on public notice boards. for example the main education notice board The District has put up for publicity of all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grant on the public notice boards evidence is there at DEO s office.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			

<p>The LG Education department has submitted input into the LG procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements,</p> <p>to the Procurement Unit that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>Education Department Submissions of the procurement in put were done and they covered all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget. However, the submissions were done late on 20/6/18 beyond the required submission time of April 30th.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3.</li> </ul>	<p>There is evidence that timely recommendation and initiation of payments was done by the sector. For instance:</p> <p>A request was made on 07/06/208 for a payment for construction of a 5- Stance lined pit latrine at Awaliwal Primary School. Was verified by the District Engineer on 08/06/2018 and recommended for payment on 9/06/2018. Payment was done on the 26/06/2018.</p> <p>Reviewed the request for payment for the supply of 3-seater desks for upper primary (144) that was dated 01/02/2018 but received by the LG on 7/03/2018.recommended for payment by DEO on 7/03/2018 and approved for payment on 9/05/2018 and paid on 26/06/2018.</p> <p>Reviewed the request for payment for construction of a 2 classroom block in Ogwolo P/S by Elgonia Two Builders (U) Ltd. that was prepared on 06/02/2018 but certified for payment on 28/02/2018 by DEO and the District engineer and payment was done on 16/4/2018</p> <p>Reviewed request for payment by Ayo &amp; Sons for construction of a 2 classroom block in Omulala P/S issued on 22/05/2018, verified for payment on 18/06/2018 and DEO recommended for payment on 20/06/2018. Payment was done on 26/06/2018</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15th of July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence ( in form of submission dates by the sectors) presented to the assessor to confirm that the education sector submitted annual reports for previous FY ( including all quarterly reports ) in time ( by mid July) to the Planning Unit. However, all the 4 Quarterly reports were available ( with 4 report recently submitted to MoFPED for approval on the 5th of September 2018) for review in the district Planning Unit.</p> <p>Reasons mentioned by the Ag. Planner included the limited skills by the various departmental staff in the use of the newly introduced PBS system for reporting. In addition, the local government was required to prepare and submit a number of mandatory reports to the relevant ministries within the same time ( end of the FY) thus creating workload to the district staff.</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"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If sector has no audit query score 4</li> <li>o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2</li> <li>o If all queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>On March 13, 2018 Mr. Joseph Balisanyuka - CAO, Soroti wrote to the District inspector of schools under reference CR/252/2 to account for funds identified as unaccounted for for Q1 and Q2 for FY 2017/18. 2 items were identified and required action from the District inspector of schools.</p> <p>On the same date and under the same reference the Inspector of schools was asked by the CAO to account for unaccounted for funds meant for construction of latrines in orimai and Omulaba P/S amounting to shs. 27,460,464 and shs.1,647,628 respectively for Q1 and Q2 FY 2017/18</p> <p>There is evidence that the issues raised were subsequently retired by the internal auditor on action of the auditee</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			

<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills, etc.: Score 2</li> </ul>	<p>At the time of assessment, there was evidence that education department has disseminated guidelines on gender, environment charging the head teachers on all these issues including how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills. Quote letter dated 10/5/18.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The education department and gender focal person issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools.</p> <p>For example activity reports 10/8/18 and 22/11/17</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The School Management Committees meet the guidelines on gender composition. All schools sampled have two or more female members on their SMC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Awoja Bridge P/S has three female members.</li> <li>-Omodoi P/S has three female members.</li> <li>-Agora P/S has four female members.</li> <li>-Awoja P/S has three female members.</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>

<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 1:</li> </ul>	<p>The Education department in collaboration with Environment department have issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education) ref; Letters to head teachers dated 8/5/18 and 10/5/18 by the DEO, also report of compliance by environment officer dated 20/7/18.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all school infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Screening forms signed by Environmental Officer and the CDO were available for all school infrastructure projects.</p> <p>Site visits reports as endorsed by EO and CDO as per 28/1/18 on renovation of seven classroom block; reports dated 25/1/18 on construction of two classroom blocks; reports dated 25/1/18 on construction of classroom blocks at Takaramiam P/S, construction of two class room blocks at Orio P/S, rehabilitation of DEO's office block, and the construction of a 5 stance pit latrines at Achuna and Amorot P/S Tubur District.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1</li> </ul>	<p>The Environmental Officer and Community Development Officer visited the sites to check whether the mitigation plans are complied with reports as above dated 25/1/18 and 28/1/18 for various sites.</p>	<p>1</p>



Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human resource planning and management			
<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health care workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health care with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than 80% filled: score 8</li> <li>• 60 – 80% - score 4</li> <li>• Less than 60% filled: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The Soroti DLG HD had substantively recruited PHC workers to the tune of 96.3% only (i.e. according to MoH Transmittal letter to MoPS dated 11th/10/2006 Ref: ADM.45/153/02 approved and adopted structure for Soroti):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Soroti DLG HD's Staffing Norm for is 242 but only 139 PHC workers were reported to be filled at the time of the assessment. The assessment saw CAO transmittal letter (dated 2nd/8/2018) submitted to the Chief of Party/USAID RHITES-E Mbale (Ref: CR/56/2). This offered evidence of attempts to fill 94 vacancies through conducting of interviews. This means that the attempts made overall suggest that 233 are covered (139+94). The puts the figure at 96.3% (62.8% filled + 33.5% attempted).</li> <li>2. While the DLG had IPFs with a PHC wage bill provision amounting to UGX 1,822, 243, 272 for the FY 2018/19, by the time the assessment was completed in Soroti DLG, the assessment team had not accessed the PBS records to confirm that the IPFs had to do with HWs (10 for the HD personnel and 139 as other PHC workers). The records in the PBS were required to indicate whether plans concerned existing and planned wage obligations.</li> <li>3. There were some mismatches the information on staffing, especially inconsistencies between the HD and HF level records. For example, the Tiriri HC IV reported having only 31 filled positions while the HD put the figure at 35 filled for the HC IV. It was clear that the HD's records were not up to date and this includes the ones offered to the assessment team (see table).</li> </ol> <p>ID Type of HF No. of HFs Norm Filled Vacant</p> <p>1 HC IV 1 47 35 12</p> <p>2 HC III 6 114 80 34</p> <p>3 HC II 9 81 24 57</p> <p>Total 16 242 139 103</p>	8

<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan for primary health care workers to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/re- quest to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of primary health care workers: score 6</p>	<p>Soroti DLG HD submitted a staff recruitment plan/request to HRM but the submission was not comprehensive enough to cover all PHC workers in all HFs in the DLG:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The official (signed and stamped) DHO's submission letter (dated 27th/8/2018) to CAO and HR on recruitment only cited 3 out of 104 PHC HWs. Another official (signed and stamped) letter by CAO (dated 2nd/8/2018) submitted to the Chief of Party/USAID RHITES-E Mbale (Ref: CR/56/2) seeking support to support recruitment through conducting of interviews offered evidence of attempts made to fill 94 vacancies.</li> <li>2. This above suggests that the attempts made overall suggest that filling 97 vacancies out of the 103 would still create a shortfall of 6 PHC HWs. Even so this seen as inadequate because the DHO records on vacant positions were incomplete. As seen above, there were some mismatches the information on staffing, especially inconsistencies between the HD and HF level records. For example, the Tiriri HC IV reported having only 31 filled positions while the HD put the figure at 35 filled for the HC IV.</li> </ol>	<p>0</p>
<p>The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital In-charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100%: score 8</li> <li>o 70 – 99%: score 4</li> <li>o Below 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>The District has 15 health units of which one is a HC IV, while 6 are HC III and 9 HC IIs.</p> <p>From review sampled 10 health in-charge appraisal files it was found out that all of them had been appraised. Details of four of the 10 sampled in-charges are indicated below:</p> <p>Asege Agnes Aukot HC II appraised on 23rd/08/2018. File Ref No: CR/D/11232</p> <p>Okello Stephen Awaliwal HC II appraised on 1st/08/2018. File Ref No: CR/D/11557</p> <p>Asio Betty Arapai HC II appraised on 17/07/2018. File Ref No: CR/D/11532</p> <p>Ijongat Harriet Tasur HC III appraised on 20th /07/2018. File Ref No: CR/D/11255</p>	<p>8</p>

<p>The Local Government Health department has deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY, and if not provided justification for deviations: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>There were some discrepancies between the HD's and HF's records with respect to the staffing levels in the HFs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The staff deployment was not in accordance with the positions as seen in HD's official records. As seen in the HD's staffing lists, Katine HC II had only 3 staff according to HD records yet the HF's records showed 4 fully filled portfolios.</li> <li>At the time of the assessment, the PBS records were inaccessible to be able to confirm that the overall deployment of PHC workers was fully in line with the staffing lists in use together with the budget for FY 2018/19.</li> </ol>	<p>0</p>
<p>Monitoring and Supervision</p>			

The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities

Maximum 6 for this performance measure

- 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

There was mixed evidence from the sampled HFs that the DHO/HD was effective when it came to communicating all the circulars, guidelines and policies issued by the national level for the FY 2017/18 (see table). There was only evidence that the sampled HFs had access to some assorted circulars, guidelines and policies from the national level (i.e. did not receive all or 100% of those issued). Indeed, there were both apparent and reported challenges in the mode of communication and documentation between and within the HD and HFs:

1. As signals for commitment towards “effective communication” and investment into efforts towards supporting CME, more systematic records of those received and those distributed would be necessary. Even going by their own records alone, there was no documented evidence that the DHO had communicated all the circulars, guidelines and policies received from the center (i.e. in the spirit of ensuring “effective communication” and promoting CME).
2. While it was often difficult for HFs to establish when exactly they had received what circular, guideline and policy, on the whole the sampled HFs possessed an average of 9 circulars, guidelines and policies issued in the FY 2017/18 (i.e. 8 found with Arapai HC II; 4 with Katine HC II/PNFP; 16 with Soroti HC III; and 8 found with Tiriri HC IV) would be attributed directly to “the effective communication” on the part of the HD.
3. The only concrete evidence came in form of DHO transmittal letters seen as HFs in form of circulars. A sample of those seen were dated 11th/1/2018 on Switch form 10 dose to 5 dose Vial Injectables Polio Vaccines (IPV) Effective June 2018; The circulars were in line with the HD’s CME efforts. Also, HF’s records indicated that the list of those received excluded “Guidelines for LG Planning for the Health Sector, 2017; Sector Grant and Budget Guidelines FY2018/19; and Policy Strategies for Improving Health Service Delivery 2016-2021”.

ID No. Issued to HFs (FY 2017/18) Average

1 Arapai HC II 8

9

2 Katine Mission HC II 4

3 Soroti HC III 16

4 Tiriri HC IV 8

The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities

Maximum 6 for this performance measure

- 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

There was some scanty evidence at the HD level and in the sampled HFs that the DHO's effectively explained the guidelines and policies issued by the national level through stakeholder engagement (e.g. meetings with HFs in charges among others to disseminate the circulars, guidelines and policies). The circulars were in line with the HD's CME efforts:

1. The DHO records indicated some dissemination activities of circulars, guidelines and policies (.e.g. the 18th/6/2018 Report on Training of S/C HWs on the Introduction of Rota Virus Vaccine into Routine Immunization and Dissemination of Rota Virus Guidelines. The assessment team also saw Minutes of the Performance Review (pages 2 and 3) Meeting by the DHT and HF I/Cs of Soroti District (at District Council Hall on the 20th/4/2018) is evidence that the technical team took off time to explain and engage stakeholders.
2. However, evidence for facilitating the dissemination through cascaded explanations of the circulars, guidelines and policies left a lot to be desired the lower one went below the ladder the health sector. The only concrete evidence came in form of DHO transmittal letters seen as HFs in form of circulars. A sample of those seen were dated 11th/1/2018 on Switch form 10 dose to 5 dose Vial Injectables Polio Vaccines (IPV) Effective June 2018;

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

Maximum 6 points for this performance measure

Evidence that DHT/MHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: score 3

The DHT supervised 100% of the sampled HC IVs (i.e. Tiriri HC IV) but coverage of PNFPs (e.g. Katine Mission HC II) was limited, evidence especially available for quarters 1 and 4. For example, the HSD covered 0 out of 2 PNFPs in quarter 2 of FY 2017/18. This means that there was only evidence of supervising PNFPs for quarters 1 and 4 (not 2 and 3 and this on account of lack of funds) . From the other records for FY 2017/18 (e.g. DHO, DHT and HSD/HC IVs), it was clear that discussion of support supervision results/reports was partial (50%). The DHO attributed this to partial funding that only enabled the HD to work in quarters 2 and 3 only (i.e. between 16th-20th/10/2017 for Q2 as well as 9th-19th/3/2008).

#### ID HF's OFFICIAL VISITS (FY 2017/18) TOTAL

##### DHO DHT HSD

1 Katine HC II/PNFP 0 6 13 19

2 Tiriri HC IV 3 31 14 48

For the FY 2017/18, the support supervision visits for Tiriri HC IV are captured both in the logbook and in the visitors' book. For the latter, the DHT and DHO visits made were 31 and 3 respectively. The HD supervised 100% of the sampled PNFPs (Katine Mission HC II) as evidenced from the number of DHT support supervision visits in the MoH Supervision Log Book at the HF level. At the sampled PNFP it was confirmed that they too benefited from and received advice from the DHT through support supervision. For the FY 2017/18 the visits are captured between serial numbers 83602 and 83603. In the logbook 0 visits were made by the DHO, 6 by the DHT and 13 by the HSD).

The MoH Supervision Log Books indicated that the DHT supervised Tiriri HC IV at least once in a quarter as captured in the 4 mandatory support supervision quarterly reports. In the MoH logbook, the visits are evident between series 392025 and 392042 (i.e. from 13th/7/2017 to 18th-20th/6/2018). For the FY 2017/18, the HMIS quarterly log (see table) capture visits as seen in the log.

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

Maximum 6 points for this performance measure

Evidence that DHT/MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:

- 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

Support supervision for FY 2017/18 covered 55% of HC IIIs and HC IIs (far less than the 60% threshold – see table). Therefore, there was limited evidence that the DHT ensured that the HSD supervised the HC IIIs and IIs fully. The HD attributed the failure to cover all HC IIIs and IIs to lack of funding.

ID Date Support Supervision Visits

6 HC IIIs 9 HC IIs

Q1 13th/11/2017 3 out of 6 4 out of 9

Q2 31st/1/2018 1 out of 6 7 out of 9

Q3 30th/4/2018 2 out of 6 6 out of 9

Q4 31st /7/2018 4 out of 6 6 out of 9

The above was confirmed in the sampled HFs (i.e. for Arapai HC II, Katine Mission HC III(PNFP) and Soroti HC III - see table):. While the DHT ensured that the HSD supervised lower level HFs, the discussion of Support Supervision Reports only focused on the Q2 and Q3 findings, hence covering fewer HFs as against the total number of HFs. Again the cited operational gap reportedly had to do with the limited funding to the HD to support total support supervision of all HFs for all quarters. For example, the HSD covered 0 out of 2 PNFPs in quarter 2 of FY 2017/18.

ID HFs OFFICIALVISITS (FY 2017/18) TOTAL

DHO DHT HSD

1 Arapai HC II 0 9 12 21

2 Katine Mission HC III 0 6 13 19

3 Soroti HC III 0 21 11 32

<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>There was limited evidence that all 4 quarterly reports for FY 2017/18 were discussed and used to make recommendations in each quarter:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While all 4 quarterly reports were available, evidence of them being discussed and used to some recommendations in the monthly DHT was limited for each quarter (see table). The DHT minutes for FY 2017/18 were incomplete. For FY 2017/18, the DHT only met 7 out of 12 mandatory times (i.e. to discuss support supervision and monitoring reports), hence was unable to discuss all reports fully and pave the way for follow up and corrective actions. NB: The DHT held the meetings on the 4th/9/2017, 13th/5/2018, 20th/4/2018, 14th/3/2018, 3th/1/2018, 24th/5/2018 and 20th/6/2018.</li> <li>Again, while the DHT ensured partially that the HSD supervised lower level HFs, the discussion of Support Supervision Reports only focused on the Q2 and Q3 findings, hence covering fewer HFs as against the total number of HFs in the district. Again the reported operational gap had to do with the limited funding to the HD to support total and integrated support supervision for all HFs for all quarters.</li> </ol> <p>Quarters Submission Date DHT Minutes Discussing the Reports</p> <p>Q1 13th/11/2017 None provided/reviewed/seen</p> <p>Q2 31st/1/2018 None provided/reviewed/seen</p> <p>Q3 30th/4/2018 None provided/reviewed/seen</p> <p>Q4 31st /7/2018 None provided/reviewed/seen</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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</li> </ul>	<p>In the course of support supervision visits, all sampled HFs (100%) benefited from DHT advice and recommendations. The HD and DHT had some evidence of advice and corrective actions as follow up on the results of support supervision (see table):</p> <p>Quarters Recommendation Follow up</p> <p>Q1 HF-based mentorship/coaching on nutrition On-site HF support with indicators revised in the HMIS (16th-20th October 2017) with support from UNICEF</p> <p>Q2 Training on nutrition On-site HF counselling and support</p> <p>Q3 Training in Rota Virus Introduction Ditto</p>	<p>6</p>



measure

#### Q4 Training on Family planning 11th-15th June 2018 training initiatives

Self-reported evidence of use of recommendations was more predominant than documented evidence of the same:

1. The recommendations in quarterly reports came in form of advice rendered as pointers to corrective actions, mainly those that were needed to deal with emerging challenges. Based on the details in the health sector AWP and HMIS, it was clear that the recommendations made were partial, hence follow up incomplete. For example, Q1 Report (pg. 19) cites In-service training for staff (i.e. "...there is need to lobby for support to enable organizing in-service courses for staff in the many health interventions..."). Follow up came by way of support to promoting EPI Standards.
2. For the sampled HC IV and lower HFs respectively, the DHO made 4 and 5 visits altogether in FY 2017/18. For the sampled HC IV and lower HFs, the DHT made 13 and 34 visits altogether respectively in the FY 2018/19. As seen in the MoH Supervision Log Books, Visitors Books, selected HUMC minutes seen in the sampled HFs, the visits were opportunities for HF in-charges to solicit advice. However, they often offered limited proof that the advice was being followed up.
- 3.

#### FY 2017/18 Recommendations

#### ID HF Findings & Advice Follow up

1 Arapai HC II Seen (393013-393017) use EPI Charts Chart developed and filled e.g. 1st/7/2018

2 Katine Mission HC II Seen (83602-83603) e.g. conduct CME, identify room for data tools, plot and update immunisation charts. No evidence of follow up for all the 3 pieces of advice

3 Soroti HC III Seen (392620-392625) e.g. open child register and conduct performance review Seen filled HMIS Form 073 and Minutes for 23rd/6/2018

4 Tiriri HC IV Seen ( 392025-392042) ensure completeness of HMIS 105 HMIS 105 Box File compiling relevant reports (e.g. 20th/7/2017) pg.8 with filled Qty and Days on Stock on hand

<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o List of health facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>There was accurate and consistent data and reports on the 20 HFs receiving PHC funding as per MoH formats:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The HD publicized a list of 21 HFs receiving PHC funding for the FY 2017/18.</li> <li>2. Based on the MoH Excel spreadsheet, the 21 HFs cited by the HD are covered among the broader listing of all HFs (e.g. Soroti Prisons and Soroti Prisons as well as other PNFPs such as Islamic NGO HC III and Princess Diana HC IV). Their reporting rate was inadequate (below the required 100% e.g. Teso Safe Motherhood HC II and Marie Stopes Soroti HC III did not submit consistently).</li> <li>3. Access to the PBS was limited as at the time of assessment, hence the assessor did not confirm whether the 21 HFs were among those in view.</li> </ol>	<p>10</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			
<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence was presented to the assessor to confirm that the council committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports. A review of minutes of the meetings of the sector committee responsible for health revealed as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meeting of the 29/11/2017- discussed among other issues the need to establish a medical board for the district to handle cases of staff that might require treatment for mental sickness.</li> <li>- Meeting of the 27/02/2018- discussed issues including regulating staff going on study leave, upgrading 5 health ( as per min. Extract 31/02/2018), need to expedite the process of payment of contractors for renovated health facilities at Ocokical HC II.</li> <li>- Meeting of the 10-11/05/2018- mainly dealt with reviewing of the budgets and work plans and for submission to council for approval.</li> </ul> <p>There was no evidence to confirm that performance assessment results for the previous year were discussed by the council committee responsible for health (results were released in mid may and by the time of the review the district had not yet received copies / excerpts from the national assessment results.</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"> <li>Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence presented included a review of minutes of the council committee meetings held on various dates as cited in the above indicator as well as a review of the minutes of council meetings that sat on the following dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 21st -22nd Sept. 2017- resolved issues pertaining to recruitment of more health workers, increased development budget for health facilities among other issues</li> <li>- 29-30/11 2017- resolved issues of establishment of a medical board for staff and upgrading of HCIIIs to HC IIIIs in newly created sub counties</li> <li>- 28-29/05/18- resolved issues to do with repairs of solar panels at Kamuda HC III, and approval of the AWP and budget for FY 2017/18.</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 6 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 6</li> <li>If 80-99 %: score 4</li> <li>If 70-79: %: score 2</li> <li>If less than 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>According to the sampled HFs only 75% of the HUMCs were functional and the average level of functionality at 87.5% (i.e. with minutes for the FY 2017/18). NB: Only Tiriri HC IV had minutes for 4 quarters (see table). A division of the sum of the said 2 figures by 2 is above 60% (i.e. <math>75.0+87.5=162.5\div 2=81.3\%</math>). Therefore, the HD met the gender composition requirement because the average of the sample hovers above the 60% composite rate (hence meets the requirement) - see table.</p> <p>HFs' HUMCs No. of Meetings in FY 2017/18</p> <p>Functionality</p> <p>Arapai HC II 4 100%</p> <p>Katine Mission HC II 2 50%</p> <p>Soroti HC III 4 100%</p> <p>Tiriri HC IV 4 100%</p> <p>% of HFs with 100% Functional HUMCs (75%) 87.5%</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence from the DHO's Notice Board that Soroti DLG published all the 17 HFs receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants. The publication captured relevant information about the HF such as the account number, annual budgets and total for FY 2017/18. Also 75% of the sampled HFs had posted similar information (i.e. Tiriri HC IV, Asumuk HC III and Wera HC III). However, there was no posting of the same information on the DLG budget website and on the PNFP notice board (i.e. the St. Michael Health Care Foundation).</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"> <li>Evidence that the sector has submitted input to procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DHO belatedly submitted the HD input to the DLG procurement plan (i.e. 6th/7/2018, hence not before 30th April 2018). The late submission was attributed to complications of transferring from the OBT to PBS systems as well as loss of revenue from UGX 500m to 48m that called for many adjustments to be made, thus the loss of time.</li> <li>The HD's submissions were complete – i.e. (i) List in submission covered all the 12 investment items seen in the approved (Ref: CR/213/15 of 29th/8/2018) health sector AWP for the FY 2018/19. The submitted inputs and requests were complete in the sense of providing BOQs, Drawings, Scope of Works, Technical Specifications and ToRs.</li> </ol>	<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"> <li>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>The DHO submitted Procurement Form PP1 on the 9th/7/2018, hence submitted in time (i.e. by the end of the Q1 for FY 2017/18).</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"> <li>Evidence that the DHO/ MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4.</li> </ul>	<p>Although payment vouchers are not numbered, they were reviewed and we ascertained the following:</p> <p>i. A construction contract Soro553/Wrks/16-17/00044 carried out by Elgonia Two Builders (U) Ltd. for the construction of a staff house in Ocokican H/C II had a request for payment prepared on 06/02/2018, was recommended by the District Officer on 16/03/2018 and verified by the District Engineer on 22/02/2018. Payment was processed on 20/3/2018 as evidenced by the CFO stamp. The payment voucher had a payment date of 04/05/2018.</p> <p>ii. Reviewed payment request under contract Soroti553/Works/17-/18/00031, for rehabilitation of Doctors' house in Tirir HCIV that was prepared on 7/06/2018 by Inofit Investment Limited, recommended for payment by DMO on 14/06/2018 and verified for payment on the same date and was paid on 26/06/2018</p> <p>The DHO recommended and made timely initiation of payments to the service providers.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			
<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	<p>There was no evidence presented to the Assessor by the Ag. Planner of Soroti District at the time of the assessment to confirm that the health sector Q4 report was submitted to the Planning Unit by mid-July. While the Ag. District Planner stated that the health department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) by mid-July for consolidation, there was no evidence adduced in form of physical hard copies of the reports or evidence of the online submission (planner had no access to PBS information) dates by the health department to the Planning Unit. Information at the MoFPED as per report submission status/ schedule generated on the 28th of August 2018, however, indicated that the consolidated Quarter 1, Quarter 2 and Quarter 3 were submitted on 22/02/18, 21/03/18 and 30/05/18 respectively, while there was no evidence that Q4 had been submitted to MoFPED by the time the report submission status/schedule generated on the 28/08/18 by MoFPED.</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"> <li>• If sector has no audit query: Score 4</li> <li>• If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: Score 2 points</li> <li>• If all queries are not responded to Score 0</li> </ul>	<p>Reviewed the action taken on the recommendations done by the internal audit and CAO's communication to the sector and noted that the observations were later retired by the internal auditor after accountability was duly provided.</p> <p>On March 13, 2018 Mr. Joseph Balisanyuka - CAO, Soroti wrote to the Health inspector under reference CR/252/2 to account for funds identified as unaccounted for for Q1 and Q2 for FY 2017/18. 2 items were identified and required action from the health inspector</p> <p>On March 13, 2018 Mr. Joseph Balisanyuka - CAO, Soroti wrote to the District Health Officer under reference CR/252/2 to account for funds identified as unaccounted for in Q1 and Q2 for FY 2017/18. 1 item was identified amounting to shs. 39,977,800 and required action from the District health Officer</p> <p>Due to the fact that the sector had audit queries, the sector and the LG for that matter scored a 2 instead of a 4</p>	<p>2</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"> <li>Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30 % women: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The DLG/HD did not go above the composite-rate threshold (of 50%) to be able to meet the requirement and to enable it to score 2. This is because only half (i.e. 2 out of 4) of the sampled HFs offered evidence of compliance with the (30%) gender-composition requirement (see table). NB: The composite rate is derived from a division by 2 of the sum of the percentage of HFs meeting the gender composition requirement and the overall average they are able to muster collectively. Respectively, the actual figures involved when it came to Soroti DLG/HD led to the following computation: <math>50.0\% + 31.7\% = 81.7\% \div 2 = 40.9\%</math>. Therefore, the fact that the 40.9% composite rate hovered way below the 50% threshold, the DLG/HD did not meet the gender composition requirement, thus scored a zero (0).</p> <p>Name of HF HUMC Members Female Members %/Female</p> <p>Arapai HC II 5 2 40.0</p> <p>Katine Mission HC II 6 1 16.7</p> <p>Soroti HC III 7 3 42.9</p> <p>Tiriri HC IV 11 3 27.2</p> <p>NB: To get above board and to score 2, the DLG/HD needed at least one other compliant sampled HF (i.e. to make them 3 out of 4 altogether); to be able to go above the 50% composite-rate threshold (i.e. to earn 53.4% based on the following calculation: <math>75.0\% \text{ compliant HFs} + 31.7\% \text{ overall average} = 106.7\% \div 2 = 53.4\% \text{ composite rate}</math>).</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>Only 50% of the sampled HFs offered evidence of having received communications for promoting of gender-sensitive sanitation, including having access to the issued guidelines on the separation of facilities for female and male. The assessor reviewed 2 relevant circulars. To this effect:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Soroti HC III received DHO circular dated 22nd/8/2018 on labeling of sanitary facilities (targeting all HFs)</li> <li>Arapai HC II received DHO circular dated 22nd/8/2018 on labeling of sanitary facilities</li> </ol>	<p>2</p>

<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions:</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p>	<p>The EO had 4 signed and stamped Environment Screening Form covering health infrastructure for FY 2017/18. The HD implemented 4 health infrastructure projects in the FY 2017/18 and 4 health infrastructure project environment screening forms covering the following but all dated 25th/1/2018:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fencing Arabaka HC II,</li> <li>Fencing Gweri HC III,</li> <li>Renovation of Asuret HC III Staff House, and</li> <li>Rehabilitation of Atirir Old Doctors and Staff Houses).</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>
<p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to checked whether the mitigation plans are complied with:</li> </ul> <p>Score 2</p>	<p>The EO and CDO The EO had 2 signed and stamped Site-Visit Reports (titled as seen below but meant to check whether mitigation measures for the identified risks were complied with):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report on Environment Compliance Monitoring of Soroti District Development Projects for FY 2017/18 dated 31st/2018.</li> <li>Report on Environment Compliance Monitoring Inspection for Quarter 4 (dated 20th/7/2018).</li> </ol>	<p>2</p>



The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management

Maximum 4 points

- Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal<sup>2</sup>: score 4.

The Soroti DLG HFs had access to guidelines on waste segregation in form of a chart for waste sorting. Even so, there was always limited evidence offered on the source of the guidelines in use by the HFs, let alone their being issued by the DLG's HD. On closer scrutiny, though, from the other evidence garnered through the assessment, it was clear that there were mixed signals when it came to documenting the issuing and use of guidance on medical waste. For example:

1. For example, 4 out of the 4 sampled HFs offered evidence that they had access to medical waste management guidelines in form of charts. However, 0 out of the 4 sampled HFs offered evidence that they had access to formal communications in form of medical waste management circulars, either from the DHO, MoH or both.
2. The HD's records offered evidence in form of a signed and stamped submission letter (dated 30th /8/2018) from the DHO to all In-charges of HC IVs, IIIs and IIs on Guidelines on Health Care Waste Management.
3. Some sampled HFs possessed document referred to as Making Medical Injections Safer (MMIS) Project for HWs Guide 2009

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Planning, budgeting and execution			
<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the district Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below average coverage: score 10</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 7</li> <li>o If 60-79: Score 4</li> <li>o If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Soroti district has a safe water average coverage of 79.01%, with the sub-counties of Kamuda (75.03%), Arapai (73.56%) and Gweri (66.07%) below average district coverage.</p> <p>In the current FY budget, the district has targeted the construction of 5 deep boreholes in the sub-counties of Asuret, Kamuda, Gweri and Arapai. It is evident that the district allocated 80% of budget allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage that was below the district average.</p>	7
<p>The district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Score 15</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 10</li> <li>o If 60-79: Score 5</li> <li>o If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>In the previous FY 2016/17, the district had a safe water coverage of 75.62% with the sub-counties of Gweri (62.34%), Katine (74.63%), and Arapai (72.07%) below the district average. In the budget of the previous FY the targeted water supply sub-counties were Asuret, Kamuda, Tubur and Gweri. Originally, the plan had anticipated the construction of Adamasiko piped water scheme however the plan was changed to the construction of 2 boreholes in Katine since the finances received were below the budgeted finances for the scheme as reported in the minutes of 24th/01/2018, reference; Min 07/TPC/01/2018.. In Arapai, DDEG grant to construct one borehole.</p> <p>Therefore, the LG did implement 100% of the budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties below district average coverage.</p>	15

Monitoring and Supervision

<p>The district Water department carries out monthly monitoring of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the district Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15</li> <li>• 80% - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10</li> <li>• 70 - 79%: score 7</li> <li>• 60% - 69% monitored: score 5</li> <li>• 50% - 59%: score 3</li> <li>• Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored: score 0</li> </ul>	<p>In the previous FY, 9 water supply facilities and 1 sanitation facility were implemented. According to the records, it was evident that the DWO did monitor and supervise the construction of the facilities thus accounting for 100%. For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The drilling and construction supervision report of 3 boreholes ie Chelle in Kamuda sub-county, Awidyang and Ojama in Katine sub-county dated; 18th/6/2018.</li> <li>- The drilling and construction supervision report of 6 boreholes i.e Ongunai and Abua in Kamuda sub-county, Ariet and Agule in Gweri sub-county, Owolo in Asuret sub-county and Anyalai'C' in Tubur su-county dated: 3rd/5/2018.</li> <li>- The siting supervision report of 3 boreholes ie Chelle, Awidyang and Ojama date: 15th/6/2018</li> <li>- Siting supervision report of 6 boreholes i.e Ongunai, Ariet, Owolo, Agule, Abua, Anyalai'C'.</li> </ul>	<p>15</p>
<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the district has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: Score 5</li> <li>• List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>Soroti District Local Government submitted accurate/consistent data for FY 2018/19. In the Management Information System (MIS) reports at the Ministry of Water and Environment (MoWE) 6 Deep Boreholes were reported to be rehabilitated and 6 drilled in the Financial Year. This is consistent with the 6 to be rehabilitated and 6 drilled as reported in PBS</p>	<p>5</p>

<p>The district Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/ data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>Constructed water facilities include; Owolo in Asuret Sub-county, Ongunai in Kamuda sub-county, Gweri in Gweri sub-county, Anyalai C in Tubur sub-county, Abua in Kamuda sub-county and Ariet in Gweri sub-county. The rehabilitated water facilities were in the sub-counties of soroti (2), Asuret (1), Kamuda (1), Gweri (1) and Arapai (1).</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Procurement and contract management</p>			
<p>The district Water department has submitted input for district's procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted input for the district procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	<p>The District Water Office submitted inputs for procurement requisition for the construction of 6 deep boreholes and rehabilitation of a spring well was done on 7/8/2018.</p> <p>The procurement plan was submitted on 7th/8/2018 and entailed; Siting, drilling and installation of deep boreholes in Asuret (Okweny), Kamuda (Oworo), Gweri (Okolonga), Arapai (Asuret- Olegei &amp; Aten) sub-counties; Siting, drilling and installation of deep borehole of Arusi-Tukum, Rehabilitation of small protected spring; borehole rehabilitation by HPMS, Borehole drilling construction (retention for 2017/18), construction of a line VIP latrine in Aparisa etc.</p> <p>Although the procurement plan and requisition were submitted, they were submitted past the deadline of 30th April.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the contract manager prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>From the Project files, there was no evidence in form of contract management plan, no evidence in form of minutes for site meetings between contract manager and the contractor. The argument was that the implemented projects could at times take less than a month to be implemented.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The district has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2</li> </ul>	<p>From a sample of four (4) water and 2 sanitation facilities that were visited i.e. Ongonia, Abua, Owolo and Ariet deep borehole facilities; 5-stance VIP latrine at Amoroto primary school in Gweri sub-county and Soroti district local government pit-latrine. All these were constructed 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"> <li>If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The contractors did hand over the completed WSS facilities which was evidenced by the report on commissioning of district projects (boreholes) in the sub-counties of Kamuda, Katine, Tubur and Asuret dated 4th/9/2018.</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"> <li>If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>The district local government appropriately certified all WSS projects that were completed by issuing a completion certificated For example;</p> <p>-Certificate of completion; project: Siting, drilling, installation, apron, construction &amp; test pumping of 11 boreholes; location: Arapai, Gweri, Kamuda &amp; Soroti sub-counties; contractor: KLR(U)Ltd; Contract No: Soro553/WRKS/15-16/00006; Contract sum: UGX. 191,419,305; Dated: 9th August, 2018.</p> <p>-Certification of completion; project: 5 stance lined pit latrine in Awaliwal P/S; Location: Gweri sub-county; contractor: M/s Cavali Enterprises; contractor No: Soro553/WRKS/16-17/00024; Contract sum: UGX: 15,891,650; Dated: 07th June, 2018.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district Water depart- ment has certified and initiated payment for works and supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	<p>The water officer timely made recommendations for payment of contractors and suppliers.</p> <p>Reviewed invoice No. 2018/021 dated 13/06/2018 from KLR- Uganda Ltd. for sitting, drilling, casting and installation of a hand pump borehole at Anyalai. It was verified on 19/6/2018 and approved for payment on the same date. Payment was done on 26/06/2018</p> <p>Reviewed invoice No. 2018/021 dated 13/06/2018 from KLR- Uganda Ltd. for sitting, drilling, casting and installation of a hand pump borehole at Anyalai. It was verified on 19/6/2018 and approved for payment on the same date. Payment was done on 26/06/2018</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Financial management and reporting</p>			

<p>The district Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Plan- ning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5</li> </ul>	<p>While information from the MoFPED ( ref. Reports submission status/ schedule generated on the 28th of August 2018) indicates that Soroti District had submitted three consolidated quarterly reports by the time the schedule was produced on the 28th of August 2018 ( Quarter 4 report was submitted late) , the Ag. Planner for Soroti district did not present evidence to the assessor to confirm that the quarterly reports for the water sector were submitted to the Planner by mid July for consolidation.</p> <p>Reasons given by the Planner included inability to access the PBS system at the time of the assessment (system was locked and Planner could not be able to retrieve the submission dates), to retrieve the submission dates, absence of records at the water office (in form of hard copies of the water sector or emails communication) that could be checked to ascertain and confirm the submission dates.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>The District Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If sector has no audit query score 5</li> <li>If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3</li> <li>If queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>On March 13, 2018 Mr. Joseph Balisanyuka - CAO, Soroti wrote to the District Water Officer under reference CR/252/2 to account for funds identified as unaccounted for in Q1 and Q2 for FY 2017/18. 4 items were identified and required action from the District Water Officer.</p> <p>Reviewed the responses submitted by Mr. Ocung Denis, District Water Officer dated 30/06/2018 indicating action taken on recommendations of the internal audit team. 10 items were identified and were all responded to and corrective action taken.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

<p>The district committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>The council committee responsible for water met on 27/02/2018 (ref. File for council committee meetings at the office of the Clerk to Council) and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) during the previous FY 27/02/2018.</p> <p>While PAC reports were presented to the DEC for review during the meeting of the 08/08/ 2018, PAC reports were not included on the Order Paper for the council meetings that were convened in the FY 2017/18. It was reported by the Clerk to Council that PAC reports will be tabled in the first Council meeting in the first quarter of the FY 2018/19.</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"> <li>Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>Evidenced presented to the assessor to confirm that the water sector committee presented issues that require approval to Council included:</p> <p>A set of council meeting minutes of 21st- 22nd September 2017, Meeting of the 29th -30th November 2017, Meeting of 26th -27th March 2018, Meeting of the 28th -29th of May 2018 (ref. Minutes of Council Meetings File at the office of Clerk to Council), that discussed and resolved various sector issues including the drilling of more bore holes, repairs and maintenance of bore holes, increased supervision to sites of boreholes and need to reactivate the water user committees among other water related issues. The water sector budget was also approved at the council sitting of the 28th – 29th May 2018.</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"> <li>The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>From the District Notice boards, there was display of AWP, Budget and Water Grant releases and expenditures as per the PPDA Act.</p>	<p>2</p>



<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>According to the sampled water sources, construction was as per design(s). For example, the boreholes in Ongonai &amp; Abua Village in Kamuda sub-county, Owola Village in Asuret sub-county Borehole and Ariet Village Borehole were as per stipulated design. They were well protected, had water discharge pit and right pump handle.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The district Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>Observation from the notice board proved that there was information on tenders and contract awards including name/contract and contract sum displayed on the District Notice boards, For example; .example;</p> <p>Drilling and installation and test pumping of boreholes (SORO 553/WRKS/17-18/00007) at UGX 67,049,706, Contractor; KLR (U) Ltd.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If communities apply for water/ public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>From the DWO, community applications for water/public sanitation were found; for example; in the letter from Asuret sub-county, the community requested for assistance in the matter of water in their village, which was signed by the chairman, Mr. Ademu Sam.</p> <p>Request for drilling a borehole at Ojanya village dated 19th/ 02/2018. Request for clean drinking water for school dated; 17th/07/2017; Aboket primary school.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water and Sanitation Committees that are functioning evidenced by either: i) collection of O&amp;M funds, ii) carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, iii) facility fenced/protected, or iv) they have an M&amp;E plan for the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul> <p>Note: One of parameters above is sufficient for the score.</p>	<p>From the sampled water supply facilities in the villages of Owolo, Abua and Ongunai all were well fenced/ protected using strong tree cuttings and communities were contributing a fee of 1000 shs per month for O &amp; M.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>			
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>There was evidence of environmental screening and certification of water development projects for FY 2017/18 as shown in the report dated 13th/ July/2018. From the files, forms on the environment and social screening was found; for example; forms on the Siting, drilling and test pumping of 4 boreholes as well as one on siting, drilling and installation of six boreholes dated 25th/01/2018</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>Follow up for operation and maintenance behaviour change and environmental issues on already existing boreholes was done as evidenced by the report dated 5th July, 2018</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>From the sampled contracts, it was evident that the clause on environmental protection was incorporated. It stipulates that trees and puspulm grass should be planted.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>The district Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If at least 50% WSCs are women and at least one occupying a key position (chairperson, secretary or Treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>From the DWO software progress reports Our ref: CR/210/1 of the previous FY date; 10th/July/2018, it was established that the WSCs were made up 9 members each with both men and women. The committees are made up of at least 50% women and they at least take up a key position for example; In Ongunai water user committee, the vice chairperson (Akello Dokas) and treasurer (Otida Silvia) are women; Abua Water user committee, the Chairperson (Ayuta Charlotte) and Vice chairperson (Arayo Christine) are women.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/</p> <p>RGCs provided by the Water Department.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>Public sanitation facilities had adequate access and separate stances for men, women and rumps for PWDs. For example the 5-stance Public latrine at Amoroto Primary School in Gweri Sub-county had separate stances for both girls and boys and a ramp for People with Disabilities.</p>	<p>3</p>