



LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Budaka District

(Vote Code: 571)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	2	33%
No	4	67%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: 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>	xxx	<p>Budaka District Local Government submitted a Performance Contract for FY 2017/2018 on 29th May 2017 and issued with a receipt (No. 0636) by the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MoFPED). The district then submitted a Final Performance Contract for FY 2017/2018 on the 14th July 2017 (as indicated on the MoFPED Submission Schedule).</p> <p>The submission of the Final Performance Contract was done after the mandatory deadline of 30th June 2017.</p>	No
Assessment area: 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 (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	xxxxx	<p>Budaka District submitted a Budget that included a Procurement Plan for FY 2017/2018.</p>	Yes
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			
<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	xxxxx	<p>Budaka district submitted the Annual Budget Performance Report for FY 2016/2017 on 4th August 2017 (Receipt No. 4515) issued by MoFPED.</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline of 31st July 2017.</p>	No

<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>Budaka district submitted all the four Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for FY 2016/2017 to MoFPED as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter One submitted on 1st November 2016 (as per MoFPED stamp). • Quarter Two submitted on 1st March 2017 (Receipt No. 0436) issued by MoFPED. • Quarter Three submitted on 30th May 2017 (Receipt No. 0640) issued by MoFPED. • Quarter Four submitted on 4th August 2017 (Receipt No. 4515) issued by MoFPED. <p>All quarterly reports were submitted late. The requirement is that quarterly reports should be submitted by the end of the following month after the end of the each quarter.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Assessment area: Audit</p>			
<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by April 30 (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action (PFMA Act 2015; Local Governments Financial and Accounting Regulations 2007; The Local Governments Act, Cap 243).</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no evidence at MoFPED of receipt of Budaka District status report on implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for FY 2015/16. • At the district level, there was no evidence either of submission of the same report. <p>Therefore, not compliant.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>Unqualified audit opinion for FY 2016/17 according to Auditor General Report of December 2017. Therefore, compliant.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Budaka District

(Vote Code: 571)

Score 63/100 (63%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality; and (ii) all Town Councils 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 municipality/district has: • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 2.</p>	0	<p>There is a functional Physical Planning Committee which has been holding regular meetings as evidenced by the minutes of the meetings held.</p> <p>There is a registration book, which has a column for 'Date of Submission', but lacks a column for 'Date of Approval' of plan.</p> <p>Therefore, it was not possible to ascertain whether the committee considers new investments on time.</p>
		<p>• All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2.</p>	0	<p>There is no physical development plan for the entire district. However, there is / are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An urban physical development plan for Budaka Town Council • Local physical development plans for the Town Boards of Iki-Iki, Kaderuna, and Kamonkoli. <p>However, since some developments are outside these planned areas, the consistence could not be established.</p>
2	<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>• Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.</p>	2	<p>The priorities in the AWP for FY 2017/2018 are based on the outcomes of the Budget Conference held on the 4th November 2016. Refer to 'Report on Budget Consultative Meeting / Budget Conference for FY 2017/2018 – (Pages 5 - 6)'; and Budaka 'Local Government Performance Contract FY 2017/2018 (Pages 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21, 23, and 25)'.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If different, justification has to be provided and evidence that it was approved by Council. Score 2. 	2	<p>The capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the FY 2017/2018 were derived from the approved Five-Year District Development Plan (DDP). For example under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water, the investments in AWP for FY 2017/2018 (Pages 77 - 78) and the DDP (Appendix – Page 172) • Education, the investments in AWP for FY 2017/2018 (Pages 65 - 67) and the DDP (Appendix – Page 170).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 1. 	1	<p>Project profiles were developed as part of the DDP for FY 2015/2016 – 2019/2020 (refer to Pages 204 - 229); as such they were discussed by DTPC before the plan was presented to the District Council.</p>
3	<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual statistical abstract, with gender disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum 1 point. 	1	<p>The district compiled an Annual Statistical Abstract (2016/2017), with gender disaggregated data and presented to DTPC to support budget allocation and decision-making – as per DTPC Minutes dated 27th October 2016 (Min. 4/DTPC/10/2016).</p>
4	<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2 	2	<p>The infrastructure projects implemented during FY 2016/2017 (as indicated in the Quarter Four OBT Progress Report for FY 2016/2017 – Cumulative Department Work Plan Performance - Pages 82, 100, 114 – 115, 120 – 122, 126) were derived from the Annual Work Plan and Budget Estimates for FY 2016/2017.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	4	.All the investment projects implemented (at district-level) in FY 2016/2017 were completed as per work plan by end of FY 2016/2017.
5	The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects and assets during the previous FY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	2	Twenty-eight (28) investment projects implemented during FY 2016/22017. All these projects were completed within approved budget of UGX 624,861,659. The overall expenditure was UGX 605,237,696, which was 96.9% of the approved budget.
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	2	<p>The total budget for O&M (for all departments) for FY 2016/2017 was UGX 427,058,000, while the actual expenditure was UGX 601,362,000.</p> <p>This was 140.8% of the budget for O&M Quarter Four OBT Progress Report for FY 2016/2017 (Cumulative Department Work Plan Performance - Pages 77 - 154).</p>

Assessment area: Human Resource Management

6	LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only two performance reports were provided. The rest were not appraised.
	Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district has only three heads of department that are substantive. • Structure ref. ARC 135/306/01

7	<p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budaka DSC minutes of the meeting held on 18th – 19th April 2017 • Budaka DSC minutes of the meeting held on 6th December 2016 • Budaka DSC minutes of the meeting held on 14th November 2016 • Budaka DSC minutes of the meeting held on 14th October 2016 <p>The staff that were submitted for recruitment were considered</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budaka DSC minutes of the meeting held on 16th may 2017. <p>The staff submitted for confirmation were considered.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no disciplinary case submitted.
8	<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The staff recruited in July were able to access the pay roll by August
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2 	0	<p>Some of the retired staff were not able to access the retirement payroll because of irregular appointment and delays from the ministry of public service</p>
Assessment area: Revenue Mobilization				

9	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If increase in OSR from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10% : score 4 points • If the increase is from 5 - 10% : score 2 point • If the increase is less than 5% : score 0 points. 	0	<p>Own Source Revenue collection in FY 2015/16 was UGX 159,249,663 which declined to UGX 149,645,976 in FY 2016/17. The decrease was UGX 9,603,325 which is equivalent to 6%. This therefore being a decline in revenue collection over the two years, the score is zero.</p>
10	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10% : then 2 points. If more than +/- 10% : zero points. 	0	<p>Own Source Revenue was budgeted at UGX 180,000,000 in the FY 2016/17 and the actual collection was UGX 149,645,976. This translates into negative variance of UGX 30,354,024 equivalent to -16.9%. The variance is more than -10% therefore, zero score.</p>
11	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local revenue (Local Service Tax) for FY 2016/17 was remitted to only 2 LLGs (Budaka Town Council and Budaka Sub-county) out of 12 LLGs. No remittance of 65% to the other 10 LLGs. • This is contrary to Section 85 (4) of the Local Governments Act, CAP 243, and Regulation 39(2) of LGFARs 2007 which require 65% of local revenue collected by the higher LG to be remitted to LLGs. • Therefore, zero score.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council expenditure for FY 2016/17 totalled to UGX 29,400,000 • 20% of local revenue for FY 2015/16 was UGX 31,849,860 • Therefore, council expenditure for FY 2016/17 being less than 20% of local revenue for FY 2015/16, the LG gets 2 point score.
--	--	---	---	--

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

12	<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Position of Senior Procurement officer present while Procurement Officer is missing.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEC minutes are present in the subsequent project and Contracts committee reports for the works project are also present (22 No).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes are present and there are no deviations. The Evaluation committee follows the requirements.

13	<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AWP 2017/18 presented and projects planned are seen in the Procurement plan 2017/18 • Procurement plan for current FY presented and signed by CAO, Procurement Officer and dated on 30th Oct 2017 • Procurement plan for previous FY presented and signed by CAO and Procurement Officer dated 30th May 2016 • Procurement plan 2016/17 had plans like construction of 4 stance pit latrine in Naboa P/S, construction of Kitchen at Kamokoli P/S, Kitchen at St. Peters Nalubembe P/S, 2 stance pit latrine at Lerya P/S and 2 stance lined pit at Kamokoli P/S, 5 stance pit latrine at Lighole P/S
14	<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advert newspapers presented for the current year bidding was dated 1st June 2017 and 4 infrastructure projects were advertised. All were open bidding including construction of 15 boreholes, construction of office block at Budaka sub county, construction of staff house, kitchen and pit latrine at Naboa parents P/S, and construction of office block at Kakule sub county
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Contracts register is fully updated plus the current FY projects that are on-going are also included in the current contracts register

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	2	<p>LG follows the procurement thresholds see below:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renovation of staff house at Lyama HC III Buda 571/wrks/16-17/00007 contract value 9,445,821 (selective bidding) Construction of placenta pit at Mugiti HC III Buda 571/wrks/16-17/00014 contract value 4,229,000 (selective bidding) Fencing of Katira Health centre Buda 571/wrks/16-17/00019 contract value 15,474,298 (selective bidding) Construction of 10 complete bore holes Buda 571/wrks/16-17/00001 contract value 160,010,020 (open bidding) Construction of Nasanga sub county office block Buda 571/wrks/16-17/00003 contract value 58784689 (open bidding)
15	<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interim and completion certificates presented including fencing of Katiri HCIII dated 22th June 2016, fencing of Kamokoli HCIII dated 22nd June 2016, renovation of doctors house at HC IV dated 9th March 2017, construction of I HC III dated 20th Feb 2017,
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No site boards available for this current year.

Assessment area: Financial management

16	<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is evidence of monthly bank reconciliations. The reconciliations were up to date (December 2017) at the time of assessment (February 2018). Therefore, 4 point score.
17	<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budaka District had no overdue bills for the FY 2016/17. While the Final Accounts of FY 2016/17 indicates a figure of UGX 546,346,995 as outstanding commitments, it refers to Youth Livelihood Program funds which will be returned to Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development after recovery from youth groups. Since this is not an overdue bill, therefore, a 2 point score.
18	<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor and produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 3. 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was a substantive Senior Internal Auditor in the FY 2016/17 who produced internal audit reports as follows; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4th Quarter – dated 15th August 2017, 3rd Quarter – dated 15th May 2017, 2nd Quarter – dated 15th January 2017, 1st Quarter – dated 15th November 2016. Since there was a Substantive Senior Internal Auditor who produced all the four quarterly internal audit reports, therefore, a maximum score of 3.

• 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: score 2.

0

- There was no evidence of status on implementation of internal audit reports to council.
- Review of minutes for Finance, Planning and Administration Committee meetings of 29th September 2016, 21st March 2017, and 11th May 2017 revealed that follow up on audit queries was never discussed.
- Therefore, zero score.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was evidence that internal audit reports were submitted to CAO and LG PAC as follows; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 4th Quarter – 16th August 2017 o 3rd Quarter – 7th June 2017 o 2nd Quarter – 10th February 2017 o 1st Quarter – 29th November 2016 • After receipt of internal audit reports, LG PAC reviewed the reports as follows; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 1st Quarter – dated 17th October 2016, o 2nd Quarter – dated 15th February 2017, o 3rd Quarter – dated 28th April 2017, o 4th Quarter – dated 13th June 2017. • Internal audit reports were reviewed during the following meetings; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 5th – 7th October 2016, o 28th – 30th November, 2016 o 10th – 12th April 2017 o 3rd – 5th May 2017 <p>Therefore, score 1.</p>
19	<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no evidence of maintenance of an up dated assets register. While motor vehicles and heavy plant plus other assets are properly recorded in the register, land and buildings are not included yet, Budaka District owns land in many locations including where the district headquarters sits. Therefore, zero score.

20	<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: • unqualified audit opinion: score 4 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</p>	4	<p>Unqualified audit opinion for FY 2016/17 according to Auditor General Report of December 2017. Therefore, 4 maximum points.</p>
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				
21	<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2</p>	2	<p>The District Council met and discussed service delivery related issues as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MIN. 49/5/COU/BDLG/2017 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 26th May 2017). • MIN. 43/4/BDLG/COU/17 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 13th April 2017). • Min. 33/3/BDLG/COU/17 & Min. 36/3/BDLG/COU/17 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 30th March 2017). • Min. 22/12/BDLG/COU/2016 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 20th December 2016). • Min. 15/10/BDLG/COU/2016 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 18th October 2016). • Min. 06/08/BDLG/COU/2016 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 25th August 2016).

22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2. 	0	<p>There is no officer designated to coordinate response to feedback (grievance / complaints).</p>
23	<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2 	2	<p>The district Payroll and Pensioner Schedule were displayed on the notice board at the 'Old' Administration Block at Budaka District Headquarters.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1 	1	<p>Information on the awarded contracts was displayed on the notice board at the 'Old' Administration Block at Budaka District Headquarters.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications, are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1. 	0	<p>Not Applicable. The Central Government did not conduct the Annual Performance Assessment for LGs in 2016/17.</p> <p>However, the district has a functional website (www.budaka.go.ug) supported by NIITA (U); which is utilised to publish key information about the district.</p>
24	<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1 	0	<p>No evidence was provided to confirm communication and explanation of guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to Lower Local Governments during FY 2016/2017.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG during previous FY has 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. 	0	<p>Community meetings and barazas were said to have been conducted during FY 2016/2017. However, no documentary evidence was presented.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

25	<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG gender focal person has provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities score 2. 	2	<p>Guidance is present in the Gender sector including among others the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive committee and women council minutes presented 23rd Jan 2018, 09 Jan 2018, 01 Aug 2017, 22 May 2017, • Disability council meeting held 24th Oct 2016, 06 June 2017, 7th April 2016 • Quarterly YLP reports April to June period 2017 • Report on mobilisation of women to participate in development initiatives 14 July 2017 • Report on s lower local governments on gender mainstreaming 11th Jan 2017
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that gender focal point has planned activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and that more than 90% of previous year's budget for gender activities has been implemented: score 2. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitted current FY budget is combined with UWEP, NUSAF, YLP and district programmes • No activities are presented for the previous year. • For activities that advocate for women roles the total amount of money allocated for those activities in all the UWEP and YLP was 334,932,000 and the total for all activities is 823,461,017. Making a percentage of 41% below the required 90%.

<p>26</p> <p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 2 	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental report for a borrow pit areas 9th Feb 2017, • Restoration report for the borrow pit 20th July 2017 • Report on the implementation of Environmental mitigation and social measures for the communities • Review of EIS for the proposed metro cement factory in Nyanza village dated 6th feb 2017 • Screening forms for projects presented
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	<p>1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presented works and infrastructure projects all integrated ESMP involving tree planting, growing grass, present in the BOQs of bids.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1 	<p>0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No documentations are presented.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2 	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental certification of projects presented including projects as construction of 5 stance pit latrine, Fencing of Iki Iki HC , construction of staff house,



LGPA 2017/18

Educational Performance Measures

Budaka District

(Vote Code: 571)

Score 26/100 (26%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				
1	<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 	0	<p>According to the LG Performance Contract 2017/2018, the district has budgeted 5,423,286,000/= to cater for 901 teachers. At the time of assessment, 899 teachers were on the payroll and 7 that were recruited in September 2017 are due to access the payroll in March 2018.</p> <p>Within the current wage provision, each of the 59 Government School has a minimum of 8 teachers and 44 schools have a substantive Head Teacher. 15 schools do not have a substantive Head Teacher.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4 	0	<p>The staff list in the Department indicates that each of the 59 schools has a minimum of 8 teachers. 44 of the schools have a Substantive Head Teacher which leaves a deficit of 15 schools without a substantive Head Teacher</p>

2	<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision o If 100% score 6 o If 80 - 99% score 3 o If below 80% score 0 	6	<p>The ceiling of teachers within the wage bill is 901 teachers.</p> <p>Currently, the LG has 899 teachers on the payroll. The 7 teachers who were recruited in September are due to access the payroll in March 2018</p> <p>This translates into 100% of positions filled by primary teachers within the wage bill provision</p>
3	<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	6	<p>The approved structure of the LG titled “ Approved Staff Establishment for Budaka District and Budaka Town Council dated 20/7/2017” has 2 positions of school inspectors as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senior Inspector of Schools (1) • Inspector of Schools (1) <p>Both positions are filled</p>

4	<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 Primary Teachers: score 2</p>	2	<p>The HRM received the recruitment requirements of the Department and these have been entered in the recruitment plan of the LG that appears in the OBT 2017/2018</p> <p>According to HRM, the Local Government has express permission to recruit on replacement. Accordingly, this FY, the LG recruited 6 teachers (Education Assistant II level) and 1 Deputy Head Teacher</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of School Inspectors: score 2</p>	2	<p>The LG has 2 positions for inspector of schools; Senior Inspector of Schools (1) and Inspector of Schools (1). Both positions are filled</p>
5	<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 appraised school inspectors during the previous FY • 100% school inspectors: score 3</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No performance appraisal reports were provided
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised head teachers during the previous FY. • 90% - 100%: score 3 • 70% - 89%: score 2 • Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No performance appraisal reports were provided
Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection				
6	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines,</p>			<p>Although the LG insisted that they were communicating all guidelines, policies and circulars to schools, there</p>

policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools

Maximum 3 for this performance measure

• 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

0

was no documented evidence in this regard.

Also the schools that were sampled had some circulars not listed by the district while none of the circulars listed by the district were found in the sampled schools.

The circulars that were presented by the LG at the time of assessment were;

- District/ Municipality and Core PTC Commitments dated 3rd November 2016 from Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES);

- Ministers briefing with District Education Officers, Municipality Education Officers and District/ Municipal Inspectors of Schools dated 14th November, 2016 from MOES;

- Information on Physical Education and Sports Teachers in Secondary Schools in Uganda dated 25th November 2016 from MOES;

- Introducing Twaweza East Africa 2017/2018 Undertakings in Uganda dated 5th June 2017 from MOES;

- Appointments to Board of Governor, Katira Parents Secondary School dated 28th June 2017 from MOES;

- Teacher Support Supervision in Schools dated 30th June 2017 from MOES

In the schools that were sampled the circulars that

were found were;

Namirembe Day and Boarding Mixed P/S:

- The East African Community Arts and Culture Festival (JAMAFEST) dated 26/4/2017 from Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development

Namengo Girls P/S

- Invitation to attend Early Grade Reading Teacher Training as a participant dated 7/11/2016 from MOES;

- Circular letter of No.1 of 2017; Mass Registration of Learners in all Primary, Secondary Schools and Post Primary Institutions in Uganda starting 29th May, 2017 dated 25th April 2017 from MOES; (also received by Namengo Boys P/S)

- Registration Guidelines for PLE 2017 dated 1st March 2017 from UNEB;

Namengo Boys P/S

- Release of 2016 PLE Results dated 12th January 2017 from UNEB

Suni P/S

- Regulations on the conduct and supervision of PLE 2016 from UNEB

St. Peters P/S Nalubembe

Could not trace any circulars

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level, including on school feeding: score 2 	0	<p>There were no minutes from the Head Teachers meeting so it could not be ascertained whether these meetings were used to explain and sensitise Head Teachers on the guidelines, policies and circulars issued by the national level</p>
7	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all private and public primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all private and public primary schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59% score 1 o Below 50% score 0. 	3	<p>School inspections were undertaken in 2016/2017 and reports were compiled.</p> <p>The 1st Quarter report indicates that 59 Government Schools were inspected</p> <p>The 2nd Quarter report indicates that 22 Government Schools and 57 Private Schools were inspected</p> <p>The 3rd Quarter report indicates that 59 Government Schools and 11 Private Schools were inspected</p> <p>The 4th Quarter report indicates that 59 Government Schools were inspected</p> <p>This translates to 66% (drawn from 59 Government Schools and 43 Private Schools)</p> <p>NB* The District has more Private Schools but some have been declared not viable and are due to be closed</p>

8	<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4 	<p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>There were no minutes to show that the Department had held meetings to discuss school inspection reports</p> <p>There was no evidence produced to show that the LG had made submissions of the inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES)</p> <p>There is no documented evidence of follow up on inspection recommendations</p>
9	<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5 	<p>0</p>	<p>The list of schools in the Education Department is consistent with OBT 2017/2018 as far as the Government schools are concerned but inconsistent with EMIS</p> <p>The List in the Department and OBT presents 59 Government Schools in Budaka DLG, while EMIS presents 58 Government Schools in the LG</p> <p>Furthermore, the List in the Department presents 43 Private Schools while EMIS data indicates that the district has only 22 Private Schools</p>

Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5

0

The enrolment data in the three data sources has some discrepancies;

For instance, Sekulo P/S has 652 pupils as per the EMIS data while the District Data and OBT presents 472 and 475 pupils respectively for the same school

Sapiri P/S has 1438 pupils as per the EMIS data while the District Data and OBT presents 1333 and 1345 pupils respectively for the same school

Nanzala P/S has 1138 pupils as per the EMIS data while the District Data and OBT presents 1018 and 948 pupils respectively for the same school

Nansanga P/S has 1301 pupils as per the EMIS data while the District Data and OBT presents 1324 and 1073 pupils respectively for the same school

Nangeye P/S has 523 pupils as per the EMIS data while the District Data and OBT presents 574 and 574 pupils respectively for the same school

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<p>10</p>	<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc...during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>2</p>	<p>The Education and Health Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2016/2017 as evidenced below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of the Education and Health Committee meeting held on 9th May 2017 (under MIN. 29/HEA/5/17). • Minutes of the Health and Education Committee meeting held on 15th March 2017 (under MIN. 19/3/HEA/17 & MIN. 20/3/HEA/17). • Minutes of the Health and Education Committee meeting held on 5th December 2016 (under MIN. 10/12/HEA/16). • Minutes of the Health and Education Committee meeting held on 27th September 2016 (under MIN. 3/HEA/9/2016).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2 	<p>2</p>	<p>The Education and Health Committee met and made recommendations for presentation to the District Council as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Education and Health Committee Report Presented to Council on 30th March 2017’. • ‘Education and Health Committee Report Presented to Council on 20th December 2016’.

11	<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) • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80% schools: score 0</p>	0	<p>The Education Department in the district has a file of all SMCs in the 59 Government aided Schools. Meanwhile, the department did not present any report and Minutes from the 59 schools.</p>
12	<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</p>	0	<p>By the time of assessment, the LG had not posted all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants although the 1st Quarter release of the grant for 2017/2018 has been received by the district.</p> <p>The sampled schools had posted the wage grants received in the office of the Head Teacher</p>

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

13

The LG Education department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget

Maximum 4 for this performance measure

• Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4

0

The Education Department made late submissions of requests to PDU as follows;

- Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Naboa P/S at 16,000,000/=. The submission of the request was made on 2nd October 2017;
- Construction of a 5 stance lined pit latrine at Kakule P/S, Kerekerene P/S, Bulangira P/S, Kadenge P/S, Nabiketo P/S and Bupuchai P/S at 16,000,000/= per school. The submission of the request was made on 12/10/2017;
- Construction of a Staff House, Kitchen and Latrine at Kakule P/S at 100,000,000/=. The submission of the request was made on 25/5/2017;
- Construction of a 2 Classroom block at Kadimukoli P/S at 47,000,000/=. The submission of the request was made on 12/10/2017
- Supply of 36, 3 Seater desks at Kadimukoli P/S at 5,400,000/=. The submission of the request was made on 12/10/2017

14	<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence of implementation of major contracts in education sector. There were no vouchers to track certification and recommendation of contracts as it was claimed that all contract vouchers were taken by Parliamentary PAC about audit follow up and investigation. Therefore, zero score.
----	---	---	---	--

Assessment area: Financial management and reporting

15	<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	0	<p>OBT Baby files were provided to the department by the DPU during every quarter. These would be returned to the DPU after inputting the required quarterly information to enable integration into the Master OBT, submitted to MoFPED.</p> <p>There were no records kept to show dates of submission to DPU.</p>
----	--	--	---	--

16	<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If the sector has no audit query score 4 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points o If all queries are not responded to score 0 	<p>2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal audit report for 3rd Quarter 2016/17 raised queries in education sector. The following are the findings and how they were resolved; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Kalayi Robert – UGX 900,000 for monitoring Q1 projects. The query was lack of accountability reports – PAYMENT SHEETS AND MONITORING REPORT DATED 3RD OCTOBER 2016 WERE SUBMITTED AS ACCOUNTABILITY. o Bandobya Investments Ltd – UGX 694,375 for retention. The query lack of receipts – RECEIPT NO. 016 DATED 18TH NOVEMBER 2016 SUBMITTED AS ACCOUNTABILITY o Waako Richard – UGX 806,000 for travel to Kampala. Queries were; no receipt for fuel, no acknowledgement – ATTENDANCE SHEET AND RECEIPT DATED 28TH NOVEMBER 2016 WERE SUBMITTED AS ACCOUNTABILITY. • Since the sector has provided information on the status of implementation of audit findings, therefore, score 2.
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards			

17

LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines

Maximum 5 points for this performance measure

- Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc...: Score 2

0

There is no evidence of dissemination of guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills

- 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

0

There is no evidence of issue and explanation of guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	1	<p>The requirement of the gender composition of the SMC as per the 2nd Schedule of the Education Act 2008 is at least 2 women on the Foundation Body which has a total of 6 people.</p> <p>The LG has compiled a file which indicates that each of the SMC's in the 59 Government Schools has at least 2 women on the Foundation Body of their respective SMCs.</p> <p>In the sampled schools, the status of the gender composition of the SMC is as follows;</p> <p>Namirembe Day and Boarding Mixed P/S and Namengo Girls P/S have 3 men and 3 women each on the Foundation Body of their respective SMCs while Namengo Boys P/S, Suni P/S and St. Peters P/S Nalubembe have 2 women and 4 men each on the Foundation Body of their respective SMCs.</p> <p>This is in line with the guideline for gender composition of SMCs</p>
18	<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 3: 	0	<p>There is no evidence of issue of guidelines on environmental management to the schools by the Education Department in collaboration with the Environment Department</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Health Performance Measures

Budaka District

(Vote Code: 571)

Score 41/100 (41%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human resource planning and management				
1	<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY • More than 80% filled: score 6 points, • 60 – 80% - score 3 • Less than 60% filled: score 0</p>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DHO office presented a list of Health workers composed of 145 Health medical staff and 132 non- medical. The 145 Health workers were approved as a structure of District medical workers and of these 107 were filled leaving a gap of 38 vacant posts for health workers not yet recruited. Therefore, the district has to date achieved 73.8% of recruitment of health workers using a wage bill provision from PHC wage.
2	<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 4</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No recruitment plan submitted this financial. However, the Ag. DHO presented a list of 12 cadres of health workers under going a process of recruitment including a position of substantive DHO.
3	<p>The LG Health department has ensured that performance appraisal for health facility in charge is conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the health facility in-charge have been appraised during the previous FY: o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0</p>	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Budaka health centre iv in charge was appraised file no CR/BD/10539

4	<p>The Local Government Health department has equitably deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers equitably, in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY: score 4 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence presented to this assessment regarding deployment of health workers.
---	--	--	---	--

Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision

5	<p>The DHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DHO made at least two late communications to all In-charges in FY 2016/17, one regarding circulars received from Ministry of health dated 30th June 2017 and particularly the communication was on Viral load rejection criteria, and another communication was again made on 14th June 2017 regarding guidelines on use of UNEP cold chain in storage and maintaining cold chain Oxytocin.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No meeting held according to the Ag. DHO and therefore no evidence presented

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

Maximum 6 points for this performance measure

Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3

0

- Four quarterly (Q) Supprt supervision reports (1 to 4); dated Q1 July-Sept 2016; 26th Sept 2016, Q2 Oct-Dec; 01 Dec 2016, Q3 Jan-March; 30/03 / 2017 and Q4 April-June; 29/06/2017 all titled integrated technical support supervision and the supervision activities were recorded as having been conducted by the DHT for FY 2016/17. These documents were presented as evidence. The areas of supervision included supervision of functionality of health facilities, Data Management, sanitation and hygiene in facilities, financial management of PHC, staffing and equipment. However, all the reports presented do not indicate that supervision visits were made to Budaka HCIV. This assessment visited Budaka Health facility and it was confirmed by the in-charge that indeed no supervision was made by the DHO office to the HSD,

Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY: • If 100% supervised: score 3 points • 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

0

- The DHO's office claims that 17 Health facilities were supervised which include 14 government and 3 NGOs. This claim was evidenced by the Four quarterly (Q) reports (1 to 4) dated Q1 July-Sept 2016; 26th Sept 2016, Q2 Oct-Dec; 01 Dec 2016, Q3 Jan-March; 30/03 / 2017 and Q4 April-June; 29/06/2017 all titled integrated technical support supervision and the DHO office asserted that the supervision reports are for activities made to lower lever units although the reports generalizing visits to facilities and do not mention specific visits made to each facility by name. It was difficult to convince this assessment that indeed the reports reflect that visits supervision visits were made to 17 facilities without mentioning any facility by name.

7	<p>The Health Sub-district(s) have effectively provided support supervision to lower level health units</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities have been supervised by HSD and reports produced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% supervised score 6 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 4 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 2 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budaka HCIV is a HSD and this assessment visited the facility, and talked to the in charge who presented all documents pertaining supervisions by HSD to lower facilities, there was evidence of supervision reports that the HSD actually supervised lower level facilities include Namusita, Kameruka, Karekerene among others mentioned in the quarterly visits dated 12th June 2017, and 15th April 2017. However, the in-charge admitted to this assessment that not all facilities were supervised because of limited resources
8	<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No evidence presented on discussion of supervision report or other reports per se,
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intrinsically since no discussions and recommendation were made from reports. The DHO office could not produce evidence of follow up of any kind of supervision.

9	<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for health facility lists as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DHO Biostatistician presented documentation of OBT reporting and HMIS submitted reports that are entered in DHIS 2. This assessment reviewed how Health facilities submit the monthly reports and the Biostat entering data into the District health information system DHIS2 (online system the District uses to manage data). The system generates overall totals for performance indicators. The OBT information is extracted from the DHIS2 and provides outputs for govt and NGOs facilities for particular performance indicators. In this assessment, It was noted that Nansaga HCIII and Mogite do not get PHC but report on HMIS and 1this is additional reporting which is not a problem. It was also noted that 100% of facilities in OBT are those that get PHC and actually report on HMIS. The OBT reports and HMIS reports were found to be accurate and consistent.
---	--	---	----	---

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council 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 	2	<p>The Education and Health Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2016/2017 as evidenced below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the Education and Health Committee meeting held on 9th May 2017 (under MIN. 29/HEA/5/17). Minutes of the Health and Education Committee meeting held on 15th March 2017 (under MIN. 19/3/HEA/17 & MIN. 20/3/HEA/17). Minutes of the Health and Education Committee meeting held on 5th December 2016 (under MIN. 10/12/HEA/16). Minutes of the Health and Education Committee meeting held on 27th September 2016 (under MIN. 3/HEA/9/2016).
----	---	---	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	2	<p>The Education and Health Committee met and made recommendations for presentation to the District Council as below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Education and Health Committee Report Presented to Council on 30th March 2017’. • ‘Education and Health Committee Report Presented to Council on 20th December 2016’.
11	<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 5 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5 • If 80-99% : score 3 • If 70-79%: : score 1 • If less than 70%: score 0 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budaka HCIV was visited and the Facility has a functioning committee which meets regularly. The committee met on 6th oct 2016, 1st Dec 2016, 29th Mar 2017, 5th April 2017 and 17th Nov 2017. However none of the meetings reflect any discussions of budget and resource allocations
12	<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence and no information of PHC funds found displayed on all noticeboards at the District.
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				

13	<p>The LG Health department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests 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 	0	No evidence of a plan presented at the time of assessmnt
		<p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	0	A 30th October 2017 all requisition for construction of pit latrines in Kerekerene HCIII but this was done in quarter 3 of current FY
14	<p>The LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time: • 100% - score 8 • 70-99% – score 4 • Below 70% - score 0 	0	<p>The As. DHO presented minutes of a meeting that was held on 14th Dec 2016 to support lower level facilities to develop procurement plans for NMS drugs and supplies. There was no attendance list of names of participants to justify that the DHT also participated in the facilitation process and to know who actually attended the meeting.</p>

15	<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 2 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points</p>	2	<p>There are no delays in certification and recommendation of suppliers/ contractors in the health sector as confirmed in 2 contracts executed in FY 2016/17 as indicated below;</p> <p>i. Name of Contractor – BBC Buyera Building Contractors Ltd</p> <p>a. Nature of Contract – Fencing of Katira HC III in Katira S/C</p> <p>b. Award date – 14th June 2017</p> <p>c. Contract date – 16th June 2017</p> <p>d. Payment request – 20th June 2017</p> <p>e. Recommendation – 22nd June 2017</p> <p>f. Certificate date – 22nd June 2017</p> <p>g. Payment approval – 22nd June 2017</p> <p>h. Payment date – 27th June 2017</p> <p>ii. Name of Contractor – Semlink International Limited</p> <p>a. Nature of Contract – Fencing Kamonkoli HC III</p> <p>b. Award date – 14th June 2017</p> <p>c. Contract date – 16th June 2017</p> <p>d. Payment request – 22nd June 2017</p> <p>e. Certificate date – 22nd June 2017</p> <p>f. Payment approval – 2nd June 2017</p> <p>g. Payment date – 26th June 2017</p> <p>Therefore, score 2.</p>
----	--	---	---	---

Assessment area: Financial management and reporting

16	<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	0	<p>OBT Baby files were provided to the department by the DPU during every quarter. These would be returned to the DPU after inputting the required quarterly information to enable integration into the Master OBT, submitted to MoFPED.</p> <p>There were no records kept to show dates.</p>
17	<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If sector has no audit query score 4 If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points If all queries are not responded to score 0 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal audit report for 3rd Quarter 2016/17 raised queries on the following; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Lyada Samuel – UGX 3,313,000 for attending to cholera patients in the isolation camp – no payment schedules for the beneficiaries o Gonja Contractors – UGX 1,197,228 for retention o Owori Investments – UGX 1,300,000 for fuel for DHO – no fuel consumption sheets. There was no evidence of status report on implementation by health sector. Therefore, zero score <p>Therefore, zero score.</p>
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				
18	<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2 Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2 	2	<p>Budaka HCIV visited on 10th Feb 2018 during the assessment and records presented by the incharge contain 9 members of HUMC of which 2 are women and 7 men</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One circular on sanitation management specifically on infection control sanitation and hygiene was presented as evidence. The circular was sent to all in charges dated 11th August 2016

19	<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that the LGs has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal : score 2 points.	0	<p>No evidence presented to justify that the LG issued guidelines on medical waste management</p>
----	---	---	---	---



LGPA 2017/18

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Budaka District

(Vote Code: 571)

Score 30/100 (30%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: score 10 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the district water office it has been established that safe water coverage status for Budaka DLG stands at 66.1% According to annual work plan and budget of the current financial 2017/2018 the under mentioned sub counties have safe water coverage below district average are; Budaka town council 42.8% and Kaderuna sub county 47.7% In the current work plan and budget 2017/2018 page 9 Kaderuna Sub County was targeted to increase safe water access. Nakabale viilage was allocated 01 deep borehole in Nakabale parish under DWSCG. Construction was reported as complete and registered as DWD60610 at an investment cost of 16,251,550/= <p>This evidence demonstrates that Budaka DLG targeted to increase safe water access to sub counties below district safe water average.</p>
2	<p>The LG 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>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the previous FY 2016/2017 the under mentioned sub counties had safe water access below district average were; Budaka s/c-58%, Kaderuna s/c- 59%, Naboa s/c- 57%, Nansanga s/c-61% and Kamonkoli s/c- 64% There is evidence to

Maximum 15 points for this performance measure

• Evidence that the LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY: score 15

0

show that Budaka DLG implemented water projects in sub counties below district average. The 4th quarter annual progress report for water and sanitation activities FY 2016/2017 reliably shows that.

- In Kaderuna s/c had 01 borehole rehabilitation as Nansanga borehole DWD37295 at an investment cost of 3,840,000/=

- In Budaka s/c, Sipiri HC 111 borehole was rehabilitated at investment cost of 3,840,000/=. Kiisa spring well was also rehabilitated.

- In Naboa s/c there was construction of new deep boreholes namely Naboa primary school borehole and Nakatende 11 borehole at investment cost of 17,500,000/= each.

Also 3 boreholes were rehabilitated in Lupada p/s, Nameja-kabalabala and Nangeye 11 each at a cost of 3,840,000/=

- In Kamonkoli s/c 02 new boreholes of Kapulukuchu DWD56131 and Jami A DWD56125 were constructed.

Also Zadki and Namisango spring wells were rehabilitated at a cost of 3,840,000/= each.

- In Nansanga s/c there was hardly any water facility implemented as either new or rehabilitation of old ones. This clearly indicates that not all sub counties below district safe water coverage were targeted hence the justification of the score.

Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision

<p>3</p>	<p>The LG Water department carries out monthly monitoring and supervision of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually. • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15 • 80 - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10 • 70 - 79%: score 7 • 60 - 69% monitored: score 5 • 50 - 59%: score 3 • Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored -score 0</p>	<p>5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was hardly supervision/ monitoring plan obtained at DWO. • However, the 4th quarter annual report for water and sanitation FY 2016/2017 has supervision/ monitoring reports which were relied upon to establish if all WSS facilities had been monitored at least once annually both software and hardware activities as seen here under; <p>Under hardware activities monitoring reports observed were; supervision report of 10 new deep boreholes namely; Katira, Kavule, Kapulukuchu, Jami A, Buganza, Buloki, Bwibwere A, Naboia p/s, Nakatende 11and Suni B</p> <p>(progress re[port on the construction of 10 boreholes FY2016/2017 by Galaxy Agro Tech (u) ltd dated 4/11/2016)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitoring report on rehabilitation of 6 deep boreholes under DWSCG by Budaka district pump mechanics consultancy association dated 3/3/2017. Facilities were Naboia p/s, Kabalaabala, Nangeye, Kakule p/s, Kopia and Nansansa. - Monitoring report of 03 boreholes dated 26/6/2017 namely Sapiri HC III, Kaderuna HC III and Bukoli, - Supervision report on construction of 03 new spring wells under DDEG dated 7/3/2017. Namely Mpigirika, Zadoki, and Kamugenzi
----------	--	---	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supervision report of 04 new spring wells under DDEG by Mbojja Enterprises ltd dated 31/1/2017 Namely Kiisa, Kakwangha, Namusango and Mugwere. - No monitoring report on construction of Nampangala public VIP RGC <p>A number of software monitoring reports were obtained at the DWO as seen here under;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 37 post construction support report on water and sanitation committees dated 5/5/2017 - Other activities implemented with no supervision/monitoring reports are; Establishing 10 WUCs, Training 10 WUCS. <p>Since some projects both hardware and software activities weren't monitored the score of 60% - 69% was given and the justified.</p>
4	<p>The LG Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: o List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence that Budaka DLG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY 2017/2018 since no list of water facilities which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT was obtained at DWO to crosscheck with what was obtained at MoWE.
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				

5	<p>The LG Water department has submitted procurement 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>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence that the DWO has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30). In fact, there were hardly any documents of procurement obtained at water department
6	<p>The DWO has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the DWO prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2 If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	0 2 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DWO has not prepared a contract management plan to guide monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects in Budaka DLG Besides, there was no contract management records that shows BODs/ specifications and site meeting minutes as such a sample of 5 WSS projects wasn't taken to validate the findings from the files/ records. Architectural designs were obtained for deep boreholes, spring wells and VIPs at the DWO Handed over reports of all completed WSS facilities was obtained at DWO

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 			<p>There are no delays in certification and recommendation for payment of suppliers/contractors in the water sector as confirmed in 2 contracts executed in FY 2016/17 belows;</p> <p>i. Name of Contractor – Budaka District Pump Mechanics Consultancy Association</p> <p>a. Nature of Contract – Rehabilitation of 3 boreholes in Budaka, Kachomo and Katira Sub-counties.</p> <p>b. Payment request – 26th June 2017</p> <p>c. Date of recommendation – 22nd June 2017</p> <p>d. Engineer’s Certificate – 27th June 2017</p> <p>e. Payment approval – 26th June 2017</p> <p>f. Payment date – 29th June 2017</p> <p>ii. Name of Contractor – Budaka District Pump Mechanics Consultancy Association</p> <p>a. Nature of Contract – Rehabilitation of 6 boreholes in Naboia, Kakule, and Kaderuna Sub-counties.</p> <p>b. Contract date – 23rd January 2017</p> <p>c. Payment requisition – 28th February 2017</p> <p>d. Recommendation – 3rd March 2017</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	3	

				<p>e. Certificate date – 6th March 2017</p> <p>f. Payment approval – 6th March 2017</p> <p>g. Payment date – 10th March 2017</p> <p>iii. Name of Contractor – Pine Peak Super Investment Limited</p> <p>a. Nature of Contract – Construction of 5 stance pit latrine at Nampangala Trading Centre</p> <p>b. Contract date – 9th January 2017</p> <p>c. Payment request – 28th February 2017</p> <p>d. Recommendation – 3rd March 2017</p> <p>e. Certificate date – 3rd March 2017</p> <p>f. Payment approval – 7th March 2017</p> <p>g. Payment date – 20th March 2017</p> <p>Therefore, 3 point score.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Assessment area: Financial management and reporting

8	<p>The LG Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	0	<p>OBT Baby files were provided to the department by the DPU during every quarter. These would be returned to the DPU after inputting the required quarterly information to enable integration into the Master OBT, submitted to MoFPED.</p> <p>There were no records kept to show dates of submission to DPU.</p>
---	--	---	---	--

<p>9</p>	<p>LG Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 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> <p>o If the sector has no audit query score 5</p> <p>o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3</p> <p>If queries are not responded to score 0</p>	<p>0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal audit report for 3rd Quarter 2016/17 raised the following queries; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Nantongo Jemimah – UGX 3,500,000 for community mobilization and sensitization on water hygiene – funds not accounted for. o Gewuma William – UGX 2,560,000 for water quality testing – no accountability o Owor Investments Ltd – UGX 945,000 for fuel for supervision of water activities – funds not accounted for. • There was no evidence of status report on implementation by health sector. Therefore, zero score <p>Therefore, zero score.</p>
<p>Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>			

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3 	3	<p>The Works and Technical Services Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2016/2017 as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the Works and Technical Services Committee meeting held on 8th May 2017 (under MIN. 25/5/WKS/17). Minutes of the Works and Technical Services Committee meeting held on 17th March 2017 (under MIN. 18/3/WKS/17 & 19/3/WKS/17). Minutes of the Works and Technical Services Committee meeting held on 6th December 2016 (under MIN. 11/12/WKS/2016). Minutes of the Works and Technical Services Committee meeting held on 26th September 2016 (under MIN. 04/09/WKS/2016).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	3	<p>The Works and Technical Services Committee met and made recommendations for presentation to the District Council as below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Works and Technical Services Committee Report Presented to Council on 30th March 2017'

11

The LG Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency

• 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

0

• The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have not been displayed on the district notice boards/ website as per the PPDA Act

Maximum 6 points for this performance measure

• All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2

0

• Not all WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding as per the sample obtained here under;

- Nampangala community VIP

Funder:DWSCG

Contractor: Pine Peak Super Investment FY 2016/2017

Client: BDLG

- Nampangala village borehole

Nampangala parish

Budaka s/c

Funder: DWSCG

DWDNO 60694

Date 81/2018

- Nabiketo village borehole

Project NUSAF

Chali parish

Budaka s/c

District Pallisa

Date: 25/4/2005

- Nabiketo VIP public facility for the RGC not

				<p>inscribed at all</p> <p>- Bolosho village borehole</p> <p>Chali parish</p> <p>Budaka s/c</p> <p>DWD41641</p> <p>Date 9/12/2013</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards or website as a critical requirement under PPDA act
12	<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No community application files were obtained at DWO to show that communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O&M funds and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, for the current FY: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No community meeting minutes obtained at DWO No sector MIS information on management of o and m funds for preventive maintenance and minor repair for the current FY at the DWO

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

13	<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence of environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place at the ENR
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY 2016/2017
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection or mitigation plans
14	<p>The LG Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If at least 50% WSCs are women as per the sector critical requirements: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The soft ware progress reports obtained for the previous FY 2016/2017 doesn't show WSCs composition women as per the sector critical requirements No list of WSC with composition of at least 50% WSCs as women as per the sector critical requirements was obtained at DWO

<p>15</p>	<p>Gender- and special-needs sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/RGCs.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>• If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3</p>	<p>0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From 5 public sanitation facilities sampled, Gender- and special-needs in public places/RGCs were as seen here under; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Budaka DLG public sanitation has adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs - Nampangala RGC community VIP Has a separate stance for PWDs with a adequate access but No separate stances for men and women - Sapiri HC III has adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs - Sapri primary school has adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs
-----------	--	---	---