



LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Butaleja District

(Vote Code: 557)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	3	50%
No	3	50%

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>Butaleja District submitted a Draft Performance Contract for FY 2017/2018 on 30th May 2017 and issued with a receipt (No. 0637) by MoFPED. A Final Performance Contract for FY 2017/2018 was then submitted on 12th July 2017 as indicated by the MoFPED Schedule of Submission.</p> <p>The submission of the Final Performance Contract for FY 2017/2018 was late - 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>The district submitted a Budget and AWP for FY 2017/2018 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>	<p>XXXXX</p>	<p>The Annual Budget Performance Report for FY 2016/2017 was submitted on 10th August 2017 (Receipt No. 4543) issued by MoFPED.</p> <p>This was a late submission - made after the deadline of 31st July 2017.</p>	<p>No</p>
<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>All the four Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for FY 2016/2017 were submitted to MoFPED as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter One submitted on 5th December 2016 (Receipt No. 0149) issued by MoFPED. • Quarter Two submitted on 21st February 2017 (Receipt No. 0373) issued by MoFPED. • Quarter Three submitted on 14th June 2017 (Receipt No. 0794) issued by MoFPED. • Quarter Four submitted on 10th August 2017 (Receipt No. 4543) 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 each quarter.</p>	<p>No</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>xxxxx</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status report to PS/ST was submitted via letter dated 20th March 2017, referenced CR/218. • Since status was submitted before 30th April, then Butaleja District was compliant. • Issues raised by the Auditor General were; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Under collection of local revenue o Unaccounted for advances o Lack of land titles o Issues in the District Health Services o Issues in education o Irregularities in procurement o Understaffing o Lack of IT policy o Lack of documented Risk Management Policies <p>Therefore, compliant.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>xxxxx</p>	<p>Unqualified audit opinion for FY 2016/17 according to the Audit General Report of December 2017. Therefore, compliant.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Butaleja District

(Vote Code: 557)

Score 51/100 (51%)

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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 2. 	0	<p>There is a Physical Planning Committee; which does not sit regularly – the minutes availed were for a meeting held on the 13th April 2017.</p> <p>There is a Registration book, which has a column of 'Date of Submission' but has no column for 'Date of Approval' of the plan.</p> <p>Thus, it could not be established whether the committee considers new investments within time.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2. 	0	<p>There is no physical development plan for Butaleja District. However, there are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban physical development plans for Butaleja Town Council and Busolwe Town Council • Physical development plan for Nabiganda Town Board. <p>Therefore, without a physical development plan for the entire district, the consistency of the plans of all new infrastructure investments with the Physical Development Plans could not be ascertained as some investments are outside the areas that have Physical Development Plans.</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

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

0

The priorities in AWP for FY 2017/2018 were clear. However, the Report of the Budget Conference held on 13th October 2016 scantily spelt out the district priorities.

THEREFORE, it was not easy to establish whether the priorities in AWP in the different sectors were based on the outcomes of budget conference.

- 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

The capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for FY 2017/2018 were derived from the approved Five-Year Development Plan (2015/2016 – 2019/2020). For example, the project under:

- Water in AWP (P. 89) were derived from DDP (P. 184).
- Education in AWP (P. 83 - 84) was derived from DDP (P. 175).
- Health in AWP (Pages 80 & 82) were derived from DDP (P. 181).

- Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 1.

0

The heads of department were guided on how to prepare project profiles (as per Minutes of DTPC held on 22nd March 2017 – Min. 5/3/2017).

There is no evidence that the project profiles developed thereafter were discussed by DTPC.

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. 	0	<p>There is no Annual Statistical Abstract for FY 2016/2017.</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 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"> 100%: score 4 80-99%: score 2 Below 80%: 0 	2	<p>All infrastructure projects implemented by the district in FY 2016/2017 were derived from the Annual Work Plan and Budget approved by the District Council. For example, the projects under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health: on P. 85 - 86 of the Fourth Quarter Report 2016/2017 were derived from AWP (P. 48). Education: on P. 88 - 89 of the Fourth Quarter Report 2016/2017 were derived from AWP (P. 51 - 52). <p>59 investment projects (out of 61) were implemented in FY 2016/2017. This was 96.7%.</p>
5	<p>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</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	0	<p>Not all investment projects were completed. The projects not completed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supply of one Ground Nuts Value Chain equipment to production department. Supply of 2000 tree seedlings (Graveria) to Naweyo Sub-County.

		<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 	0	<p>The total budget for O&M (for all departments) for FY 2016/2017 was UGX 78,295,000, while the actual expenditure was UGX 49,739,000. This was 63.5% of the budget for O&M [Butaleja Quarterly Performance Report for FY 2016/2017 - Cumulative Department Work Plan Performance - Pages 63 - 108]</p>
--	--	---	---	--

Assessment area: Human Resource Management

6	<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four performance reports were seen i.e. Ag Natural resources officer. Ag CBS, Ag CFO, Ag DE
		<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"> DEO is the only substantive head of department <p>Staff approved structure</p> <p>ARC 135/306/01 DATED 7TH June 2017</p>

The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

• Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2

2

- Minute proceedings of the 2nd meeting of Butaleja DSC held on 31st march, 3rd April, 4th 5th , 6th 7th 10th 11th 13th 18th 20th 25th 26th may , 5th may to 30th 2017

- Minute proceedings of the 1st meeting of DSC held on 25th January 2017 and 30th march 2017

- Minute proceedings of the 8th meeting of Butaleja DSC held on 24th , 25th, 28th November 2016

- Minute proceeding for the 4th meeting of the DSC 19th July 2016

- Minute proceeding of the 3rd meeting for Butaleja DSC HELD ON 23rd 24th 27th June 2016

The staff submitted for recruitment were considered.

• Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1

1

- Minute proceedings of the third meeting of Butaleja DSC held on 27th and 28th June 2017
 - Minute proceedings of the 2nd meeting of Butaleja DSC held on 31st march, 3rd April, 4th 5th , 6th 7th 10th 11th 13th 18th 20th 25th 26th may , 5th may to 30th 2017
 - Minute proceedings of the 1st meeting of DSC held on 25th January 2017 and 30th march 2017
 - Minute proceedings for the meeting held of DSC held on 11th October 2016
 - Minute proceeding for the 5th meeting of DSC held on 22nd July 2016
- The staff submitted for confirmation were considered.

• Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1

1

- Minute proceedings of the third meeting of Butaleja DSC held on 27th and 28th June 2017
 - Minute proceedings for the meeting held of DSC held on 11th October 2016
 - Minute proceeding for the 5th meeting of DSC held on 22nd July 2016
 - Minute proceeding of the 3rd meeting for Butaleja DSC held on 23rd 24th 27th June 2016
- The staff submitted for disciplinary action were considered

8	Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months	<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 January and June all accessed the payroll by the second month as per the pay rolls march and august
	Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.	<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	Some staff retired but did not access the pension payroll because of queries from MOPS

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. 	4	<p>Own Source Revenue collection in FY 2015/16 was UGX 105,451,944 which increased to UGX 120,410,820 in FY 2016/17. The increase was UGX 14,968,876 which is equivalent to 14.2%. Therefore, the increase over the two years being more than 10% means a maximum score of 4 points.</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>i. UGX 166,344,835 was the budgeted local revenue in FY 2016/17.</p> <p>ii. UGX 120,410820 was the realized local revenue in FY 2016/17.</p> <p>iii. The decline resulted in a negative variance of UGX 45,934,015, equivalent to - 27.6%. Therefore, zero score.</p>

11	Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<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"> Although the district received Local Revenue in form of Local Service Tax from MoFPED during FY 2016/17, there was no evidence of remittance of 65% to LLGs. This is contrary to the First Schedule of the LGs Act, CAP 243. 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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council expenditure for FY 2016/17 was UGX 21,090,389 20% of local revenue for FY 2016/17 was UGX 50,130,000 So, expenditure being more than 20% of local revenue for FY 2015/16, the score is zero

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

12	The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.	<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 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positions of Senior Procurement officer and Procurement are present (confirmation letter dated 20th July 2016 and minute No 17-2016 (1).
		<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 presented in the works project files of the subsequent project and bids and Contracts committee reports (19 No) are also presented
		<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"> No deviations from the committee members and that the evaluation committee is perfect

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 26th Sept 2017 • Procurement plan for previous FY presented and signed by CAO and Procurement Officer dated 14th Dec 2016 • Procurement plan 2016/17 had plans like construction of a 2 class room block with office and store at Bugombe P/S; Busaba P/S, Masulula P/S, 2 stance pit lined latrine in Namutima P/S, 3 stance pit latrine at Magambo P/S, renovation of LC III office
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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advert newspapers presented for the current year bidding was dated 6th Nov 2017 beyond the 30th Aug. • 8 works projects were advertised but none of the projects has completed bid documents as per this assessment, • Invitation of bids for selective bidding process was advertised on the 1st Nov 2017
		<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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The previous FY contracts register was not presented. Current FY contract register is also not present

• For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2.

2

LG follows the procurement thresholds see below:-

- Construction of a 2 class room block with a store and office at Busaba P/S Buta 557/wrks/16-17/00019 contract value 60,180,708 (open bidding)

- Construction of PPD at Kachonga HC III Buta 557/wrks/16-17/00044 contract value 88, 412, 250 (open bidding)

- Construction of a 2 class room block with a store and office at Masusula P/S Buta 557/wrks/16-17/00020 contract value 60,453,980 (open bidding)

- Borehole siting drilling and installation of 7 Buta557/wrks/16-17/00042 contract value 131,225,540 (open bidding)

- Periodic mechanised rehabilitation of Doho-Namulo road Buta557/wrks/16-17/00042 contract value 119,227,800 (Open bidding)

- Construction of a 2 class room block with a store and office at Bugombe P/S Buta 557/wrks/16-17/00018 contract value 60,176,595 (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 certificates presented in terms of payment certificate records of projects examples are borehole drilling and installation dated 5th June 2017, 30th May 2017, 24th April 2017 Construction of 2 class room blocks with office and store dated 08 May 2017, 12th March 2017, at Busaba dated 16th March 2017, 5th Jan 2017, Bugombe dated 13th March 2017, Butaleja integrated P/S 22nd June 2017 Construction of 2 stance pit latrine dated 7th March 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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence of up to date monthly bank reconciliations. Most bank accounts for the period July to December 2016 were reconciled but neither checked nor approved by the CFO for example, Production and Marketing Department. Therefore not sure of the correctness and validity. IFMS reconciliations from January to December 2017 were also not printed at the time of assessment as evidence of reconciliation. Therefore, zero 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"> • Butaleja District had no overdue bills in the FY 2016/17. • The only figure under accounts payable in final accounts for FY 2016/17 was for pensions. <p>Therefore, score 2.</p>
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"> • Although there was no substantive Senior Internal Auditor but rather an Internal Auditor effective 2015, internal audit reports for FY 2016/17 were produced every quarter as follows; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 1st Quarter – dated 20th October 2016, ii. 2nd Quarter 2016 – dated 23rd February 2017, iii. 3rd Quarter – dated 12th May 2017, iv. 4th Quarter – dated 31st August 2017. • Since internal audit reports were produced and submitted in time, therefore, maximum score of 3 points.

• 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 information to council nor LG PAC on implementation of internal audit reports for FY 2016/17.

• One set of minutes for Finance, Planning and Administration Committee during FY 2016/17 was availed for assessment. This was for the meeting held on 20th December 2016 and there was no evidence of any discussion on internal audit reports in the business of the day.

• 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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly internal audit reports were submitted to CAO and LG PAC as follows; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 1st Quarter – dated 20th October 2016, submitted to CAO and LG PAC on 20th October 2016 ii. 2nd Quarter – dated 23rd February 2017, submitted to CAO and LG PAC 28th February 2017 iii. 3rd Quarter – dated 12th May 2017, submitted to CAO and LG PAC on 13th May 2017 iv. 4th Quarter – dated 31st August 2017, submitted to CAO and LG PC 15th August 2017 • However, LG PAC met and reviewed the following reports as follows; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 1st Quarter – 15th August 2016 discussed 2nd Quarter 2015/16 internal audit report. ii. 2nd Quarter – report dated 1st December 2017, discussed Busolwe and Butaleja Town Council reports for FY 2014/15. • Therefore, since internal audit reports for FY 2016/17 were not reviewed by PAC, the score is zero.
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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an assets register but, not in line with LGFAM 2007 format. <p>Therefore, zero score.</p>

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 • 4 Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</p>		<p>Unqualified audit opinion for FY 2016/17 according to Auditor General Report of December 2017. Therefore, score 4.</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>Butaleja District Council met and discussed service delivery related issues, as evidenced below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MIN. 5/June/2017 & Min. 6/June/2017 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 23rd June 2017). • MIN. BDC/31/2016/17, MIN. BDC/32/2016/17, & MIN. BDC/34/2016/17 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 26th May 2017). • MIN. BDC/ /2016/17 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 21st April 2017). • MIN. BDC/2016/17 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 21st December 2016). • MIN. BDC/12/2016/17 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 30th September 2016). • MIN. BDC/05/2016/17 & MIN. BDC/06/2016/17 (Minutes of District Council meeting held 7th July 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. 	2	<p>The Senior Human Resource Officer (Mr. Hyuha George) was designated to coordinate response to feedback (grievances / complaints).as per Ref: CR/156/1 from the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer dated 1st November 2017</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 outside the CAO's office at Butaleja 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>The awarded contracts were displayed on the notice board at CAO's office at the 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 2016/2017.</p> <p>Also, information availed was that the district website (www.butaleja.go.ug) is not functional.</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 	1	<p>The district communicated and explained guidelines, circulars, and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during FY 2016/2017. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A communication (Ref: CR/167/1/1, dated 28th February 2017) from CAO (to HoDs, Senior Managers, head teachers, post-primary schools, Principal Secretaries, and officers of senior rank) regarding 'Submission of Annual Performance Assessment Reports FY 2015/2016 and Performance Agreement Reports FY 2016/2017'
		<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>There were no barazas and community meetings held during FY 2016/2017.</p>
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				

25

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 LG gender focal person has provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities score 2.

2

Guidance is present in the Gender sector including among others the following

- Report on capacity building for women councils and PWD presented dated 23rd June 2016
- Report on mobilising youth groups for repayment of YL funds dated 30th May 2017
- Report on training of youth in entrepreneurship skills dated 4th April 2017
- Minutes of women councils executives dated 3rd March 2017, 30th May 2016
- Report on sensitisation of elderly on their rights dated 30th Nov 2016
- Report on the distribution of local SHE goats to members of Maleme disability group dated 5th July 2017
- Report on community sensitisation on gender roles, responsibilities in development dated 11th July 2017

• 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

- The submitted current FY budget is combined with UWEP, NUSAF, YLP and district programmes
- Current year activities planned are all taken from the subsequent programmes of UWEP, NUSAF, YLP.
- Claims that little money is planned for the district and at most times not realised and the reason why district activities are left out.

26	<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 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental and social impact compliance report for district boreholes presented for April 2017 period • Environmental compliance monitoring for roads and buildings under construction in Naweyo, Himuto sub county and Busabi S/C • Activity report for Bunghaji community wetland management action plan • Screening forms of projects presented and an overall report on all the screening projects in the district is also done for a particular period of time depending on the number of projects screened.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presented works and infrastructure projects all integrated ESMP involving tree planting, and environmental restoration 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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not 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 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Certificate signed were presented:- constructing of strategic bridged in eastern Uganda dated 28th April 2017 • Butesa 4.5km road Butaleja sub county dated 22nd July 2017



LGPA 2017/18

Educational Performance Measures

Butaleja District

(Vote Code: 557)

Score 32/100 (32%)

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 a wage provision of 7,935,042,000/=.</p> <p>The budget covers 1264 teachers at all levels in the 101 Government schools</p> <p>Each of these Government Schools has a minimum of 8 teachers and 94 of these schools have a substantive Head Teacher.</p> <p>Three Head teachers, 11 Education Assistants and 4 Senior Education Assistants are due to be recruited in 2017/2018 on replacement. However, even after recruitment, the LG will have a deficit of 4 schools without 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>According to the OBT 2017/2018 and the staff list as at 31st May, 2017, each of the 101 Government Schools has at least 8 teachers and 94 out of the 101 schools has a substantive Head Teacher</p> <p>Even after the pending recruitment of 3 Head Teachers, the LG will have a deficit of 4 schools without a substantive Head Teacher in 2017/2018</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 for teachers within the wage bill is 1264 teachers. The number of teachers on the payroll is 1264. This translates into 100% of positions of primary teachers filled 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 Butaleja District LG, Butaleja Town Council and Busolwe Town Council” dated 7/6/2017 has 2 positions of school inspector. These are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senior Inspector of Schools (1) filled Inspector of Schools (1) filled <p>The District also has an inspector of schools in charge of Special Needs who is referred to as Officer in Charge of Special Needs.</p> <p>All 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 Department sent the recruitment requirements of the Education Sector to the CAO in a letter dated 29th January 2018. It detailed the gaps in the Education Department as follows; 3 Head Teachers, 11 Education Assistants and 4 Senior Education Assistants.</p> <p>The CAO approved the recruitments of the Head Teachers and Teachers on replacement.</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>All positions of School Inspectors 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>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inspectors of schools were appraised i.e. <p>CR/D/1061</p> <p>CR/D/10167</p> <p>CR/D/10182</p>
		<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"> • 30 out of 101 primary school head teachers performance reports were availed i.e. 29%

Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection

6	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to</p>			<p>There is no documented evidence that the Department has in place a systematic way of communicating guidelines, policies and circulars from the national level to school</p> <p>The circulars received by the district in 2016/2017 and</p>
---	--	--	--	---

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

presented at the time of assessment were;

- Provisional Lists of Students to benefit from District Quota Admission Scheme dated 20th June 2016 from MOES
- Standing Instruction No.4 of 2016; Scheme of service for the Accounts Cadre dated 7th October, 2016 from MOPS
- Data Collection for the National Education Indicators Survey 2016/2017 dated 14th October 2016 from MOES
- UNFPA Supported Baseline Evaluation in Schools dated 17th November 2016
- Timetable for PLE dated November 2016 from UNEB
- Convicted Public Officers on Government Payroll dated 9th December 2016 from MOPS
- Uganda National Primary Schools Performing Arts Festival Syllabus for 2017 dated 17/2/2017 from MOES
- School Feeding Programme in Education Institutions dated 15th May, 2017 from MOES
- Authentication and matching of the validated biometrics data of public officers against the national identification registered data base dated 17th May 2017 from Ministry of Public Service (MOPS)
- Evaluation Report for Construction of School Facilities at 5 Primary Schools (Bubinga P/S, Hiriga P/S, Hisega C/U Community School, Bugisa P/S and Nahalando SDA P/S) in Butaleja District under the Global Partnership for Education Support to Uganda Teach and School Effectiveness Project (UTSEP) dated 20th June 2017 from

0

				<p>MOES</p> <p>Two of the three schools visited (i.e. Busolwe Township P/S and Nakwasi P/S) did not present any circular while Butaleja Integrated P/S produced the following circulars received through the district;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulations on the Conduct and Supervision of PLE 2017 • Timetable for PLE dated November 2017 from UNEB • Registration Guidelines of Candidates for PLE 2017 dated 1st March 2017 from UNEB
		<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>Head Teachers meetings were held on; 15/7/2016, 31/8/2016, 24/8/2017 and 23/11/2017.</p> <p>The Minutes drawn from these meetings did not deliberately explain any of the issues in the circulars and guidelines presented by the district</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: 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. 	0	<p>The sampled schools presented evidence that they were inspected. However, at the time of assessment, the LG did not present any inspection reports.</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>	<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 	0	<p>There were no minutes to show that the Department had held meetings to discuss school inspection reports</p>
<p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 	0	<p>The LG presented two acknowledgement notices from DES as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter 2 report was received by DES on 25/11/2016; • Quarter 4 report was received by DES on 23/9/2016 <p>Quarter 1 and Quarter 3 acknowledgement notices from DES were not presented at the time of assessment</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4 	4	<p>The LG produced evidence of follow-up on the recommendations of school inspection as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On 14/7/2017, three teachers wrote apology letters to the inspector of schools because they were away from school without permission when inspection was carried out • Also, a Head Teacher wrote to the Inspector a commitment to ensure that teachers have schemes of work and lesson plans. This was in response to inspection recommendations in this regard

The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES

Maximum 10 for this performance measure

- Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5

0

The data of schools in the LG Education Department is consistent with OBT but inconsistency with EMIS Data

The data in the Department and OBT presents 101 Government Schools in the LG while EMIS data presents 93 Government schools in the LG

Also EMIS data presents 29 Private Schools in the LG while the data in the Department presents 57 Private Schools

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 minimal discrepancies;

For instance, Bingo P/S has 1088 pupils as per the EMIS data while the District Data and OBT presents 1216 and 1217 pupils respectively for the same school

Bubaali P/S has 527 pupils as per the EMIS data while the District Data and OBT presents 520 and 523 pupils respectively for the same school

Bubbalya P/S has 715 pupils as per the EMIS data while the District Data and OBT presents 730 and 738 pupils respectively for the same school

Bubinge P/S has 540 pupils as per the EMIS data while the District Data and OBT presents 613 and 614 pupils respectively for the same school

Bubuhe P/S has 660 pupils as per the EMIS data while the District Data and OBT presents 723 and 429 pupils respectively for the same school

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10

The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council

Maximum 4 for this performance measure

• 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

2

During FY 2016/2017, the Health / Education Committee met and discussed service delivery issues as follows:

- Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 15th May 2017 (under MIN. HE/2016/2017).
- Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 19th December 2016 (under MIN. HE/2016/2017).
- Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 22nd September 2016 (under MIN. HE/04/2016/17).

It was noted that the numbering in the minutes is confusing

• Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2

0

No single report and/or recommendations of the Health / Education Committee were presented to ascertain whether issues that required approval of council were presented.

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 has lists of members of each of the 101 SMCs in the district. Some of the schools have submitted Minutes of their respective SMCs. The Minutes indicate that the SMCs hold discussions on budget and other resource issues.</p> <p>However, the sampled schools revealed that some of the schools are either not holding the mandatory 3 meetings a year (i.e. once a term) or they are not submitting their Minutes to the DEO. In addition, none of the sampled schools had attached the Head Teachers report to the Minutes.</p> <p>Malangha P. S. had only one set of minutes for 2017 dated 7/3/2017, Bugosa P. S. had one set of minutes for 2017 dated 12/6/2017, Kachekere P. S. had one set of minutes for 2017 dated 16/6/2017 while Masanghe P. S. had three sets of minutes for 2017 dated 3/8/2017, 8/6/2017 and 1/3/2017. Bunghali P. S. had one set of minutes for 2017 dated 22/3/2017</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>	3	<p>At the time of assessment, the LG had publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants on the notice board in the Education Department</p> <p>At the sampled schools, the non-wage recurrent grants were posted in the Head Teachers office</p>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				

13	<p>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</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: score 4 	0	<p>The Education Department made late submission of procurement requests to PDU as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of 2 Classroom block with office and store at Bugosa P/S, Mulagi P/S, Kapisa P/S, Bung haji P/S and Bubuhe P/S at 61,000,000/= each. Submission of the requests to PDU was made on 11th October, 2017 Construction of 2 Stance Lined Latrine at Bunawale P/S, Bukedi College Kachonga and Wangale P/S, Dube Rock P/S, Busaba Islamic P/S, Lwamboga P/S at 7,000,000/= each. Submission of the requests to PDU was made on 11th October, 2017 Construction of a 3 Stance Pit Latrine at Magambo Memorial P/S at 10,500,000/=. Submission of the request to PDU was made on 11th October, 2017 Supply of 18, 3 Seater desks at Busaba P/S, Bugombe P/S, Masulula P/S, Nampologoma P/S and Bugosa P/S at 2,700,000/= each. Submission of the requests to PDU was made on 11th October, 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"> There are no delays in certification and recommendation of suppliers/ contractors in education sector as confirmed in the 2 major contracts executed in FY 2016/17 as indicated below; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Name of Contractor – Hacoin Prime Properties Ltd Nature of Contract – Construction of 2 classroom

• Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points

3

- b. Award date – 14th June 2017
- c. Contract date – 16th June 2017
- d. Payment request – 20th June 2017
- e. Recommendation – 22nd June 2017
- f. Certificate date – 22nd June 2017
- g. Payment approval – 22nd June 2017
- h. Payment date – 27th June 2017
- ii. Name of Contractor – Masaka Agricultural Dealers (U) Limited
- a. Nature of Contract – Construction of a 2 classroom blocks an office and store at Busaba Project School in Busaba Sub-county
- b. Award date – 18th November 2016
- c. Contract date – 18th November 2016
- d. Payment request – 9th March June 2017
- e. Engineer's Certificate – 22nd March 2017
- f. Payment approval – 22nd March 2017
- g. Payment date – 23rd May 2017
- Although payment delayed in both cases (i) and (ii) above due to lack of supplier numbers which is a key requirement in IFMS payment system, certification and recommendation for payment had been made in time.
- Therefore, score 3

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 received by the department from DPU during each quarter; and after inputting the appropriate information the files would be submitted to the District Planner for integration into the Master OBT for Butaleja District.</p> <p>The dates of submission could not be established.</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 o If sector has no audit query score 4 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points o If all queries are not responded to score 0 	0	<p>i. 1st Quarter internal audit report for FY 2016/17 raised a query about failure to pay operational permit of UGX 2,332,850 by Merchant Property Holding. GENERAL RECEIPT NO 0340067 DATED 19TH DECEMBER 2017 WAS SUBMITTED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY AS RECOMMENDED BY INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT.</p> <p>ii. 4th Quarter internal audit report raised a query about parents' contributions in many primary schools which were not included in school budgets nor accounted for. The schools include; Bugangu, Malangha, Mazimasa, Bufujja, Lubanga, Doho, Kapisa, Kangalaba and Namutima Primary Schools. NO EVIDENCE ON FOLLOWUPOF THE AUDIT QUERRY.</p> <p>iii. Therefore, zero score.</p>
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				

17	<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc...: Score 2 	0	<p>There was 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</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2 	0	<p>There was no evidence of issue and explanation of guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools.</p>
		<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 an 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>Each of the sampled schools i.e. Busolwe Township P/S and Nakwasi P/S and Butaleja Integrated P/S had 2 women and 4 men on the Foundation Bodies of their respective SMCs</p> <p>This is in line with the guideline on gender composition for 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 was 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

Butaleja District

(Vote Code: 557)

Score 53/100 (53%)

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"> • Three evidences were presented to this assessment covering; a request for recruitment with critical positions for recruitment in financial the year 2016/17, a list of newly recruited Health staff by cadre in the FY 2016/17 as well as the posting or deployment list to different respective health facilities during that time. 59 cadres were recruited and deployed in the year 2016/17 • Up to the present time, the normal structure of Butaleja District health services contains 529 health workers and the District has employed 351 of the workers. Consequently 66.5% of positions of Health workers have been filled now 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>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The office presented a recruitment plan dated 23th march 2017. Containing 12 cadres of health workers to be recruited.

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"> • BUSOLWE HOSPITAL in charge was appraised. CR/C/2010
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 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DHO office presented 59 deployment letters of all health workers recruited in 2016/17 and each deployment letter indicates the health facility a health worker was posted.

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 	0	<p>No evidence presented regarding communication of guidelines</p>
		<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"> • The DHO said that no meeting was held to in-charges of health facility and among others to explain the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level:

6	<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3</p>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DHO presented 2 copies of a report for integrated support supervision that was conducted in September 2016 and a report produced on 3rd October 2016 and another report of Jan-March 2017. The support supervision covered 24 health facilities which included Busolwe Hospital and Nabiganda the HSD. This assessment visited both facilities and confirmed.
		<p>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</p>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DHO presented one copy of a report for integrated support supervision that was conducted in September 2016 and a report produced on 3rd October 2016. This support supervision covered 24 health facilities which included Busolwe Hospital the HSD. Both PNFPs and Public facilities were supervised. The details of supervision were outlined, positive and negative findings. Recommendation were made and responsible persons were assigned to take actions within specified means of framework; immediate or during next supervisions, No other regular quarterly reports (quarter 3 and 4) were presented to this assessment to fully understand that support supervision activities were fully executed throughout the year.
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: • 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</p>	0	<p>Busolwe Hospital and Nabiganda are the HSD but both facilities did not supervise the lower facilities. .Busolwe Hospital did not receive funds for doing activities of HSD and no supervision was done to lower facilities. Nabiganda HCIV is a new HSD being set up and it is not yet fully functioning as a HSD</p>

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	No evidence submitted for justification and consideration.																											
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 	0	No evidence submitted as well.																											
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: o List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Biostatistician presented DHIS2 information and extracts of HMIS data. A sample of data on deliveries was obtained for 2 quarters from DHIS 2, 2016/17. Q1 2467, Q2 2368, This information was cross checked with the information in the OBT reports for the same quarters and the following information that was picked on deliveries was found matching in both reports. Therefore, Q1 and Q2 reports were found to be accurate and consistent in both OBT reports and HMIS DHIS2 <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Type</td> <td>OBT</td> <td>HMIS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NGO</td> <td>139</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>HCII-III</td> <td>1698</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hospital</td> <td>630</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Total OBT 2467 = Total HMIS 2467</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q2 <table border="0"> <tr> <td>NGO</td> <td>167</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>HCII-III</td> <td>1640</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hospital</td> <td>561</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Total OBT 2368 = Total HMIS 2368</td> </tr> </table>	Type	OBT	HMIS	NGO	139		HCII-III	1698		Hospital	630		Total OBT 2467 = Total HMIS 2467			NGO	167		HCII-III	1640		Hospital	561		Total OBT 2368 = Total HMIS 2368		
Type	OBT	HMIS																													
NGO	139																														
HCII-III	1698																														
Hospital	630																														
Total OBT 2467 = Total HMIS 2467																															
NGO	167																														
HCII-III	1640																														
Hospital	561																														
Total OBT 2368 = Total HMIS 2368																															

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>	<p>• 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</p>	2	<p>During FY 2016/2017, the Health / Education Committee met and discussed service delivery issues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 15th May 2017 (under MIN. HE/2016/2017). • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 19th December 2016 (under MIN. HE/2016/2017). • Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 22nd September 2016 (under MIN. HE/04/2016/17). <p>It was noted that the numbering in the minutes is confusing</p>
		<p>• Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</p>	0	<p>No single report and/or recommendations of the Health / Education Committee were presented to ascertain whether issues that required approval of council were presented.</p>
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): • If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5 • If 80-99% : score 3 • If 70-79%: : score 1 • If less than 70%: score 0</p>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This assessment visited Busolwe Hospital and Nabiganda HCIV. This assessment found that the Hospital management committee and the HCIV-HUMC were fully functioning. The committee for the Hospital met on 28th April 2017, 30th March 2016 and in particular the committee sat on 20th September 2017 and discussed the budget performance of the FY 2016/17 and to approve the budget for financial year 2017/18. A budget of 256,625,400 was approved.
12	<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• 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</p>	0	<p>There was No publicized health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants on all notice boards by the time of this assessment.</p>

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	<p>DHO presented a procurement plan that was submitted to PDU on 15th august 2017. So, this was done over 3months late from April 30</p>
		<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	<p>No request or any document presented to this assessment as an evidence.</p>
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% - score 8 70-99% – score 4 Below 70% - score 0 	8	<p>DHO presented a basic kit list of drugs and supplies which is called the procurement plan and dated 12th December 2016 The plan was developed and reviewed together with all in-charges, the NMS officers and supported by the District medicines management officer/assistant inventory management officer as a lead facilitator and endorsed by the DHO. The procurement Kit developed was also endorsed by all in-charges of health facilities</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 health sector as confirmed in 2 contracts executed in FY 2016/17 as indicated below;</p> <p>i. Name of Contractor – Native Investments Ltd</p> <p>a. Nature of Contract – Construction of 2 in 1 staff house at Nabiganda HC III</p> <p>b. Award date – 18th November 2016</p> <p>c. Contract date – 5th January 2017</p> <p>d. Payment request – 29th May 2017</p> <p>e. Certificate date – 5th June 2017</p> <p>f. Payment approval – 8th June 2017</p> <p>g. Payment date – 27th June 2017</p> <p>ii. Name of Contractor – Bangoma Investment Limited</p> <p>a. Nature of Contract – Construction of OPD at Kachonga HC III</p> <p>b. Award date – 18th November 2016</p> <p>c. Contract date – 19th December 2016</p> <p>d. Payment request – 15th March 2017</p> <p>e. Engineer’s Certificate – 21st March 2017</p> <p>f. Payment approval – 21st March 2017</p> <p>g. Payment date – 17th May 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 received by the department from DPU during each quarter; and after inputting the appropriate information the files would be submitted to the District Planner for integration into the Master OBT for Butaleja District.</p> <p>The dates of submission could not be established.</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 • If sector has no audit query score 4 • If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points • If all queries are not responded to score 0</p>	0	<p>The following queries were raised by quarterly internal audit in the health sector during FY 2016/17;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Quarter – Mr Isogoli Henry was advanced with UGX 1,110,000 for facilitating VHT meetings during the quarter. However, the funds remained unaccounted for at the time of audit. DURING ASSESSMENT, THE SITUATION HAD NOT CHANGED. • 2nd Quarter – Mr Were Abubaker (the Accountant to Busolwe Hospital) collected cash totalling to UGX 4,449,000 at the health facility but only banked UGX 1,470,000. The balance of UGX 2,979,000 remained unaccounted for. AT THE TIME OF ASSESSMENT, THERE WAS NO EVIDENCE OF ACCOUNTABILITY • Since there is no status of implementation of the queries, the score is zero.
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>Busolwe Hospital. Has 11 members of the board where 3 members are women and 8 are men. Nabiganda HCIV has 5 members where one is a woman.</p>
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 that the DHO issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities</p> <p>No evidence that the DHO issued guidelines on issued guidelines on medical waste management in health facilities</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Butaleja District

(Vote Code: 557)

Score 34/100 (34%)

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>	<p>• 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</p>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According quarter II progress report for FY 2017/2018 dated 19/1/2018 Butaleja DLG has safe water of 60.82% • There is evidence that the LG Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the annual work plan budget for the current FY2017/2018 (03/7/2017) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 07 sub counties with safe water below district average were targeted as seen here under; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Butaleja sub county with 45.11% safe water coverage was targeted with 01 new deep bore hole in Nabusuli village - Busabe sub county with 46.88% safe water coverage was targeted with 02 new deep boreholes in Bumwami village and Busaabe primary school. - Kachonga sub county with 58.65% safe water coverage was targeted with 01 deep borehole in Gaba village - Himutu sub county with

			<p>59.90% safe water coverage was targeted with 01 new deep borehole in Naluma village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mazimasa sub county with 43.45% safe water coverage was targeted with 02 new deep bore holes in Nakabi village and Dube Rock primary school. - Naweyo sub county with 59.41% was targeted with 01 new deep bore hole in the village of Busangisa - Nawanjoju sub county with 59.48% safe water coverage was targeted with 01 new deep borehole in Bulugu village. This demonstrates that the water department of Butaleja DLG has planned to increase safe water access to sub counties below district average.
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> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AWP and Budget for the previous financial year 2016/2017 show that Butaleja DLG had safe water coverage average of 57.97%. <p>There is evidence that the LG Water department had implemented budgeted water projects in the 05 targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY in 4th quarter progress report dated 14/7/2017 as seen here under;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Busabe Sub County with 44.86% safe water coverage was allocated 05 new deep boreholes namely Mwiha-DWD52702, Bugose, Budobe DWD52705, and Ludodo.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	15	<p>Each at an investment cost of 21,000,000/=</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Butaleja sub county with 46.92% safe water coverage was allocated 02 new deep boreholes as Namadere DWD66219 and Busibira DWD66209 Kachonga sub county with 55.89% safe water coverage was allocated 02 new deep boreholes of Chadongho DWD66213 and Namara B DWD66206. Himutu sub county with 56.96% was allocated 01 new deep borehole of Buhababwe DWD66215 Mazimisa sub county with 42.12% safe water coverage was allocated 02 new deep boreholes of Wapala DWD66211 and Muhimbbania DWD 66212. <p>This demonstrates that Butalejs DLG implemented water projects in sub counties whose safe water coverage was below district average in the previous financial year 2016/2017.</p>
--	--	---	----	--

Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision

3	<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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence that the LG Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually since supervision and monitoring plans were obtained and reviewed. Secondly, all the supervision and monitoring reports for some of the WSS projects weren't authentic since they were not stamped and dated by the DWO
---	--	---	---	--

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY 2017/2018 since there was no authentic list of water facilities obtained in a hard copy form that is consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT.
---	--	---	---	---

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 water sector had submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30) obtained at DWO as such review of submissions to DPU was not crosschecked with submissions from 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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No contract management records on WSS infrastructure showing BOQ/specification and site meeting minutes was obtained at DWO showing agreed actions between the DWO and the contractor/consultant. As such a sample of 5 WSS projects was not taken to validate findings from files. • Besides the DWO hardly had a contract management plan to follow for monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects in the district.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No architectural designs of water and sanitation facilities was obtained at DWO
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No 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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No completion reports and files with certified certificates of all WSS projects was obtained at DWO of Butaleja DLG
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 of suppliers/ contractors in water sector as confirmed in 2 contracts executed in FY 2016/17 as indicated below;</p> <p>i. Name of Contractor – Icon Projects Ltd</p>

• Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points

3

- a. Nature of Contract – Drilling and installation of 8 boreholes
- b. Payment request – 4th June 2017
- c. Certificate date – 6th June 2017
- d. Payment approval – 7th June 2017
- e. Payment date – 23rd June 2017
- ii. Name of Contractor – East African Boreholes Limited
- a. Nature of Contract – Construction of a 2 classroom blocks an office and store at Busaba Project School in Busaba Sub-county
- b. Payment request – 1st May 2017
- c. Engineer’s Certificate – 30th May 2017
- d. Payment approval – 7th March 2017
- e. Payment date – 13th June 2017
- Although payment delayed in (ii) above due to lack of supplier numbers which is a key requirement in IFMS payment system, certification and recommendation for payment had been made in time.
- Therefore, score 3

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 received by the department from DPU during each quarter; and after inputting the appropriate information the files would be submitted to the District Planner for integration into the Master OBT for Butaleja District.</p> <p>The dates of submission could not be established.</p>
9	<p>LG Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If sector has no audit query score 5 If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 If queries are not responded to score 0 	0	<p>The following queries were raised by quarterly internal audit in the water sector during FY 2016/17;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st Quarter 2016/17 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Wasige Richard was advanced UGX 604,000 for preparing BoQ for water drilling in Butaleja District. However, UGX 336,000 remained accounted for. Mr Wasige Richard was also advanced UGX 465,000 for field visits and 1st Quarter Water and Sanitation committee meetings. However, no program to justify the amount advanced and, no evidence that the payee received the money. NO EVIDENCE TO ADDRESS THE AUDIT QUERY. 2nd Quarter <ul style="list-style-type: none"> UGX 8,790,000 was paid to the contractor for rehabilitation of 8 boreholes but, 5 of them had not been rehabilitated something that was confessed by the user communities. NO EVIDENCE TO ADDRESS THE AUDIT QUERY. <p>Therefore, zero score</p>

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<p>10</p>	<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 	<p>3</p>	<p>The Works and Technical Services Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2016/2017 as evidenced below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 23rd May 2017 (under MIN. WKS/2016/17). Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 19th April 2017 (under MIN. WKS/2016/17). Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 19th December 2016 (under MIN. WKS/2016/17). Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 23rd September 2016 (under MIN. WTS/04/2016/17). <p>It was noted that the numbering in the minutes is confusing</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	<p>0</p>	<p>No single report / recommendations of the Works and Technical Services Committee were presented to ascertain whether issues that required approval of council were presented.</p>

11

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

Maximum 6 points for this performance measure

• 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

- No information of the AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures was displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act
- Besides, the local government website was not functional.

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

0

- While there an attempt of labelling WSS projects indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding, a sample 05 projects visits weren't properly inscribed as per the assessment manual. For example;
 - V- Doho ALT
DWD 29423
DWSCG FY 08/09
By E-Plus
Date 24/4/2009
 - V- Wapala
P-Doho
S- Mazimisa
DWD66211
FY2016/2017
 - V-Lubembe
P- Lubembe
S- Mazimisa
Cty- Bunyole
D- Butaleja

			<p>Funder: NUSAFII</p> <p>Date 22/6/2014</p> <p>- V- Namadete</p> <p>P- Busibira</p> <p>DWD 66219</p> <p>FY 2016/2017</p> <p>Date:03/06/2017</p> <p>- V-Buhobe</p> <p>P-Butaleja</p> <p>DWD66218</p> <p>FY 2016/2017</p> <p>Date:2/6/2017</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	<p>0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) was displayed on the District notice boards/ website as per PPDA act critical requirements
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 	<p>0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No community applications file for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY 2017/2018 was obtained at DWO

		<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 meetings minutes were obtained and filed by DWO showing 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 2017/2018 • No sector MIS reports were obtained to show the above information on functionality of WSCS evidenced by collection of O &M funds.
--	--	--	---	---

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) was conducted for all WSS projects and reports were in place at ENR office
		<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 at both ENR and DWO

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"> • 4th quarter progress report of the previous FY 2016/2017 obtains functionality of water source points but hardly obtains information of gender equity in WSCs composition with at least 50% women as per the sector critical requirements.
15	<p>Gender- and special-needs sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/RGCs.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sample of 05 Public sanitation facilities obtained shows that they have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs. (Gender- and special-needs sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/RGCs) as seen here under; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Doho primary school - Namehere primary school - Lubembe primary school - Doho HC II - Doho Rice Scheme public VIP