



## LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Hoima District

(Vote Code: 509)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	4	67%
No	2	33%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
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.	xxx	Submitted to ministry of finance draft by 7th April 2017 as per yellow receipt and inventory an final on 10/7/2017 as per ministry register. This is beyond 30th June	No
Assessment area: Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).	xxxxx	Budget was attached to the performance contract, but procurement plan was not accompanying. Ministry did not have copy and advised that teams should go PPDA which also referred teams to regional PPDA offices. But complete copy with both budget and procurement plan attached seen at the district signed by the CAO on 30/06/2017. However PDU submitted a procurement plan to PPDA as required.	No
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			
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)	xxxxx	The annual report was submitted to ministry of finance on 28/7/2017 as per copy of yellow receipt	Yes
LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)	xxxxxx	All quarterly budget performance reports were submitted Q1 10/11/2016, Q2 2/2/2017, Q3 10/5/2017 and Q4 28/7/2017 as per copy of yellow receipt.	Yes
Assessment area: Audit			

<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>	<p>Response made and submitted to Internal Auditor General on 24/3/2017 as indicated by the stamp on the report. 12 issued raised were responded to.</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 issued by Auditor General on page 201 No.49 of the Auditor General's report</p>	<p>Yes</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Hoima District

(Vote Code: 509)

Score 54/100 (54%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	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	Evidence that a municipality/district has: • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 2.	0	Committee composed of 10 members in place, appointed by CAO ON 27/01/2017 as per physical planning Act. Minutes in place May 2016, Feb and April 2017. District approved Physical Development Plans of Kyangwali, Kiziranfumbi, Kikuube, Kyarusesa and Butema and submitted to MoLHUD on 15th Sept 2017. No new investments from the physical development plans have approved yet.
	Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.	• All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2.	0	Physical Development Plans for the above RGCs have not been implemented yet.
2	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.	2	Budget conference held on 16/10/2016 and the priorities such as borehole drilling and rehabilitation, water to peri urban areas under water, classroom construction under education and construction of health centres under health are consistent with the AWP.
		• 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	Five year approved Development Plan (2015/15-2019/20) in place. And projects in the current AWP such as construction of classrooms, staff houses and latrines, borehole drilling and rehabilitation, spring wells in sub counties, repair of Buraru road and, rehabilitation of district HQs are all drawn from the 5 year plan.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 1.</li> </ul>	1	Project profiles booklet for 2017/18 seen and profiling is as per format in guidelines 2014. Very few missing implementing agency and recurrent costs on format. Discussed during TPC meeting of 21/12/2016 minute no 487/6/DTPC/HDLG
3	<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual statistical abstract, with gender disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum 1 point.</li> </ul>	1	Abstract discussed in TPC of 31/8/2017, minute no. 529/2/DTPC/HDLG/2017/2018. Copy in place. Gender disaggregated such as: population figures, composition of statutory committees, life expectancy, enrolment, primary level drop outs, special needs children, orphans registered etc.
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"> <li>• Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2</li> </ul>	0	Borehole rehabilitation in Kigorobya and some in Kyangwali not seen in AWP 2016/2017. DWO asserts that this change for boreholes is influenced by hydrological survey report which indicated some borehole sites planned for but hydrological survey indicated no water! This necessitated change. Others by last minute changes due to political influence without council approval as required! There was no evidence approval of the changes.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	0	Many projects especially borehole e.g Bugoma, Kyeramyia, Kasambya and renovation of district HQs were either under way or not started as per 4th QTR /Annual report 2016/17. Totalling to 42 (45%). DWO claims that simply forgot to click the complete burton in OBT.

5	<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;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"> <li>Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>Tonya BH rehabilitation Budget 5,567 and spent 3,313, Mbeya Borehole rehabilitation budgeted 5,234 and spent 3,498, Zorobi Borehole budget was 21,000 and spent 11,497 (outside within budget and beyond max.15% plus or minus of original budget). Some not budgeted but implemented and money spent. Figures in Ug Shs 000s</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Rehabilitation of 3 boreholes, rehabilitation of Kaiso pipe water system budget 37,501 but spent 50,769 plus rehabilitation district headquarters 75,000 in 000s were all executed. This gives 85%. Figures in Ug Shs 000s</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"> <li>Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>All the HoDs were appraised as per their performance Contracts on personal files. It should be noted that the new guidelines issued by MoPS on 26th June 2011 changed appraisal for HoDs to signing of performance contracts. In addition, there is evidence of performance reports on file for all the HoDs.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<p>7 out of the 9 HoDs are substantively appointed as evidenced by appointment letters and their performance contracts on personal files. The position of Deputy CAO (Head Management Support Services department) is supposed to be posted by the ministry (MoLG) which has done so. The new department of Trade, Industry and Local Economic Development is still vacant.</p>

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"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Letters of submission for recruitment (Administration, Health, Education, Agriculture) were made on 16/12/2016, 17/01/2017, 24/01/2017, 01/03/2017 are on file. These were considered by the DSC during the 99th session under minute 59/2017 and 100th session under minute 89/2017.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>The DSC received submissions for confirmation in a letter dated 29/7/2016 and considered it during the sitting of 26th – 30th September 2016 under minutes 67/2016, 68/2016 and 71/2016. Other submissions came in 17/2/2017 and 29/03/2017. These were handled during the 97th session under minute 78/2016, 99th session under minute 53/2017 and 100th session under minutes 90/2017 - 91/2017.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>Five (5) discipline cases were submitted to the DSC during 2016/17 FY as per the records book seen. All of them were handled during the 99th session of the DSC sitting on 12th-15th December 2016 under minute 81/2016 and minute 84/2016.</p>
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"> <li>Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>All the officers recruited during the DSC 99th session held from 20th – 28th February 2017, and appointed on 9th March 2017 (2016/17 FY0) were on April payroll with IPPS numbers i.e. had accessed payroll within 2 months from the time of recruitment except 2 officers who reported for duty in June 2017.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>During the FY 2016/17, 16 officers retired as per the retirement list. 2 of 16 officers accessed the payroll within 2 months. <math>2/16 = 12.5\%</math>. Evidence on file indicates that even when approval process is completed in time, MoPS delays to transfer the staff to the district payroll.</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"> <li>• If increase in OSR from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10% : score 4 points</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5 -10% : score 2 point</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5% : score 0 points.</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actual collection of OSR 2015/16 = 1,158,938,058</li> <li>• Actual collection of OSR 2016/17=777,378,359</li> <li>• Decrease in revenue= 381,559,699</li> </ul> <p>Decrease in revenue =33%</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"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budgeted revenue 2016/17 = 820,700,400</li> <li>• Actual collection 2016/17 = 777,378,359</li> <li>• Short fall = 43,322,041 =5%</li> </ul>
11	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>From the Trial Balance: the transfers were made under code</p> <p>263104= 578,034,427</p> <p>From Unconditional Grants of 338,328,300.</p> <p>From local revenue =578,034,427- 338,328,300= 239,706,127</p> <p>As % =239,706,127 / 777,378,359 = 31% which is less than 65%</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>Total collection from OSR= 777,378,359</p> <p>Council emoluments= 199,521,500</p> <p><math>199,521,500/777,378,359 \times 100 = 26\%</math></p>
--	--	---	---	--

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"> <li>Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Position available, The Officer joined LG in 2008 as an Officer, Probation Appointment 7th May 2008 vide Min DSC min 072/2008(i), Confirmation in Appointment 1st July 2011 DSC Min 71/2011 as a procurement Officer. Appointment on Promotion 4th April 2017 DSC minute 78/2017 - Position is substantive</p> <p>Procurement Officer Replacement on going as per the New Vision Advert of 1st January 2018</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>The TEC is adhoc constituted by various department.</p> <p>TEC report on procurement of services dated 26th June 2016 to the Head PDU on revenue collection Services at Kibugubya Market dully signed by 4 members</p> <p>TEC Report 13th March 2017 Construction of Kapaapi Town Mini piped water system TEC members' appointment letters seen from CAO on 2nd March 2017</p> <p>TEC Report 25th November 2017 dully signed and submitted to Head PDU. Appointment letters 15th November 2017</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>Contracts Committee Minutes 5th December 2016 upheld the TEC Evaluation recommendations minute 45/12/16 Approval of TEC reports: Works, Supplies and Services</p> <p>e.g. Reference No. Hoim509/Wrks/016/-017/00002- Awarded to Kona Co Ltd amount =145,094,908 UGX and Hoim509/Wrks/016-017/00004 Survey Sighting and Drilling of Boreholes Awarded to Icon Projects Ltd Amount 259,054,840 UGX</p>
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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	0	<p>Procurement Plan for the Current FY produced by 12th October 2017 the Previous FY 2016/17 on 3rd October 2016. Submitted to PPDA received by PPDA on 23rd October 2017 signed by the CAO CC: PS MoFPED.</p> <p>Tested the Procurement Plan of previous FY 2016/17 for adherence to Procurement Plan. Projects above Threshold were examined as Construction projects of a 3 (three) classroom block at Nyawiga Primary School</p> <p>Advertisement Notice Submitted on for notice on 17th October 2016 published by New Vision on 20th October 2016.</p> <p>Examination of the Plan</p> <p>Bid Invitation PP: 6/10/206 Vs Actual 20th October 2016</p> <p>Bid Opening PP: 27/10/2016 Vs Actual 9th November 2016</p> <p>TEC Report PP:10/11/2016 Vs Actual 25th November 2016</p> <p>Award 25/11/2016 PP Vs Actual 5th December 2016</p> <p>Contract Signing PP 25th November 2016 Vs Actual : 20th December 2016</p>

14

The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

- For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30: score 2

0

All BOQs were prepared by September 2017 with no specific date on the Bid documents. It's True that All investment/infrastructure have been Awarded by 10th December 2017 for FY 2017/18  
Date of Display is 19th December 2017  
Date of removal 4th of January 2018  
Thus evidence inadequate as per assessment criteria

- For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2

2

The Contract Register: Title: Hoima DLG Contractors Register 2016/17. Activity files are available for all 116 contractors for various projects and supplies and revenue sources

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

2

National Selective Bidding threshold above 50 Million  
• Reference No. Hoim509/Wrks/016-017/00002-Construction of 3 Classroom Block at Nawayiga Ps. Awarded to Kona Co Ltd amount =145,094,908 UGX  
• Hoim509/Wrks/016-017/00004 Survey Sighting and Drilling of Boreholes Awarded Icon Projects Ltd Amount 259,054,840 UGX  
• Hoim509/Erks/016-017/00006 Construction of Kapaapi Town mini Piped Water Systems 234,796,695 UGX. Advertisement Notice 20th October 2016 No2. 7th February 2017

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"> <li>Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Completion Certificates Obtainable from finance prepared by Water Engineer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Certificate of completion Dated 27/03/2017 Survey Sighting and Drilling of 13 Boreholes Various, Contractor ICON Project LTD, Amount 241,216,780 UGX, Completion dated 27/03/2017, Liability Period 6 Month.</li> <li>Completion Certificate dated 17/06/2017; Project Construction of Kapaapi Miini Piped water System, Contract No: HOIM509/Wrk/016-017/00006, Contractor: ZIM Construction Company LTD, Amount: 234,208,052 UGX, Completion date: 17/06/2017 Liability Period: 6 Month</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>No signage's issued on Award of Contracts, thus the labelling procedure not followed</p>
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"> <li>Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bank reconciliations are prepared on monthly basis as verified from the Bank Reconciliations files. The last one prepared on 17/1/2018</li> </ul>
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"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Payment claim register not in place and could not verify how soon suppliers are paid.</li> </ul>

18

The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.

- Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor and produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 3.

0

- No substantially appointed Senior Internal Auditor but reports are being produced

- 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.

2

Status of implementation report as tabled as proof by Internal Auditor.

- From PAC attendance lists, sat on many occasions to review the reports on 27&28/9/17, 18&19/12/17, 10/7/2017, and on 12/1/2018 to review reports for Quarter 4 2016/17.

- DEO responded to accountability queries, letter dated 16/3/2017 & received by Internal Auditor on 16/3/2017 in which accountability of 13,394,000 was cleared.

- Letter dated 2/5/2015 by Head Teacher Bugambe SS for recovery made from one Teacher who absconded from duty but continued to be paid 1,150,000 on receipts No. 00378937 & 00378854

- 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

1

Schedule of distribution lists of submissions/ dates to PAC, CAO, CFO, Clerk to Council, LC V Chairperson verified:

Q1 on 28/10/2016

Q2 on 31/1/2017

Q3 on 28/4/2017

Q4 on 28/7/2017

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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some assets are partially recorded and not all required information is recorded in the register eg Motorcycle Honda CG 125 LG 01099-10 acquired in 2008 does not have the value.</li> <li>Mitsubishi L200 donated by the president also does not have the value, engine No, Chassis No. date of acquisition</li> <li>Road equipment from URF and not recorded in the assets register, eg Water tanker UG 2131-w</li> </ul>
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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>unqualified audit opinion: score 4</li> <li>Qualified: score 2</li> <li>Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unqualified audit opinion as in the Auditor General's report No.49 page 201</li> </ul>
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>Council sat 5/8/2016, 27/10/2016, 22/12/2016/ 28/02/2017, 30/3/2017 and 29/5/2017 and discussed among others review and approval of committees (PAC, DSC and Land Committees), BFPs, Reports, Laying of budget, revenue enhance plans, capacity building plans and procurement plans among others.</p>
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"> <li>Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2.</li> </ul>	0	<p>Mr. Perez Kyomuhangi (entomologist) appointed as public relation officer as per CAOs letter dated 14/07/2016. However no evidence of functionality in form of receiving and dispensing complaints / grievances.</p>

23	The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)	Evidence that the LG has published: • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2	2	Payroll July 2017 and Pension payroll of Nov/2016 displayed. However this should increase to include more periods.
	Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1	1	Best evaluated bidder for procurement 2017/2018 dated 10/12/2017. However this should increase to include information and even other periods.
		• 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	N/A
24	The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens	• 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	Distribution list and delivery acknowledgement of budget execution circular FY 2016/2017 to sub counties seen
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	• 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.	1	Baraza conducted in May 2017 in Buseruka Sub county as per comprehensive report presented. And radio programmes purportedly conducted on Liberty FM, Spice and Radio Hoima on various themes. But no evidence presented for the radio programmes.
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

Mainstreaming activity guidance through radio: Report dated 10th July 2017  
Sensitization on Gender and Development and Roles and responsibilities: Report Dated 13/12/2016  
Gender Specific Needs for Planning: Report dated: 13th September 2016  
Support LLG on Gender, Culture in 11 Sub counties Report dated 20th July 2017.  
Community Mobilisation and Sensitisation on Gender Q4 2016/17 Targeting Local Leaders. Quarterly Report Q4 2016/17 dated 4th July 2017  
Bi-Annual Report (Q1&Q2) 2016/17 Minutes TPC Dated 16th March 2017 Minute 505/9/DTPC-HDLG/2016/17 Approval of Projects and women empowerment  
TPC minutes dated 23rd February 2017 Minute 500/8/DTPC-HDLG/2016/17 Situational Analysis and Project Beneficiaries

• 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

Planned activities are found in the Hoima District Annual Work plan 2017/18, Page 179 and Page 182, Budget allocation per work plan Total 15,200,000 UGX out of 1,053,550,000 UGX  
Only 67.2% of the previous year Budget were implemented on Gender Activities

<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>	<p>• 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>	<p>2</p>	<p>HOIMA District Investment Plan and Project Profiles 2015/16-2019/2020. All have EIA &amp; Mitigation plans. Screening forms (ESSF) are used but found to be inadequate as its designed for Industries rather than Localised Community project see Section 3,4, 8. The tool is designed for assessing category A. See revised tools by OPM</p>
	<p>• Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Reference No. Hoim509/Wrks/016/-017/00002-Construction of 3 Classroom Block at Nawayiga Primary School. BOQ date 7/11/2016 Bid document page 14 Hoim509/Wrk/016-017/00013 Construction of 3-5stance Latrine at Kasiita Primary School page 9 The quotation doesn't match the recommendations from Environment. Need to harmonize with heads of most projects</p>
	<p>• 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>	<p>0</p>	<p>There are no titles the process is ongoing to have all project own titles. There are no funds to facilitate these processes.</p>
	<p>• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form are available: Rehabilitation of Community Access Road in Kyagwali S/c-Mburara-Nyabunende-Kololo 8.8km by Litho Enterprise LTD Borehole Drilling in Nyakabonge by ICON Project Ltd</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Educational Performance Measures

Hoima District

(Vote Code: 509)

Score 69/100 (69%)

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"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All schools meet the minimum required 7 teachers or a teacher per class and above basing on the staff list in the performance contract annex.</li> <li>Basing on the approved teachers structure for p/s is 1655 teachers over 135 schools, the average is 12 teachers budgeted for each school.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Every school out of 135 schools in the LG has a head teacher, by appointment or assignment as evidenced above: 12 teachers per school..</li> <li>LG meets the thresh hold.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>According to performance contract pg 21, budgeted for 1255 teachers but the current wage bill allow 1189, accounting to 94%.</li> </ul>

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"> <li>Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6</li> </ul>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two inspectors are substantively recruited according to the approved staff structure for 2017/18 as at 4th July 2017, signed by PS/ST.</li> </ul>
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruitment plan in the performance contract annex 2017/18 shows 180 teachers proposed for filling this FY.</li> </ul>
		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The recruitment plan 2017/18 does not include inspector of schools. The structure is full.</li> </ul>
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	<p>The District has 2 school inspectors (District Inspector of Schools and Inspector of schools). Both have their appraisals for 2016/17 completed and on their files i.e. 100%.</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	<p>3 of the 5 sampled head teachers had their appraisals (performance agreements) completed and endorsed by their supervisors (Sub-County Chief and DEO) i.e. 3/5= 60% (below 70%).</p>

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 schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>Circulars include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guideline to implement the three star approach for water sanitation and hygiene in schools; dated November 2017; signed by MIN. MOES:</li> <li>• Esterblishment Notice No.1 of 2015. LEAVE WITHOUT PAY (LWP), dated on 4th March 2015.signed by PS. MOES.</li> <li>• Esterblishment notice No. 4 of 2009. Application of Sanctions in cases of Abscentism in the public service, among others.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level, including on school feeding: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Head teachers meeting reviewing FY 2016/17, Minute no. 2/23/8/17; Support supervision tools disseminated;</li> <li>• School feeding policy and DES policy guide lines were communicated, dated on 23/08/2017. Attendance 123 teachers signed.</li> <li>• Focus on school inspection FY 2017/18; dated 19/7/2017; signed by DES. Disseminated on 26/7/2018</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4th Quarter release, a total of 81 P/ schools inspected</li> <li>• 3rd Quarter release, 89 schools inspected</li> <li>• 1st Quarter release 76 schools inspected</li> <li>• Overall TOTAL is 225 private and 135 government P/schools.</li> <li>• Therefore inspection coverage is <math>(81+89+76)/3=82/(135+225)*100=23\%</math> which is far below!</li> </ul>

<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"> <li>• Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department meeting; Minute no.3/1/2017: Discussed about the poor sanitation at Kasenyi Lyato p/s. This FY 2017/18 Pit Latrine is included in the action plan to be constructed .</li> <li>.</li> </ul>
<p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1st quarter submitted on 28/10/2016</li> <li>• 2nd quarter submitted on 20/2/2017</li> <li>• 3rd quarter submitted on 5/5/2017</li> <li>• 4th quarter submitted on 24/8/2017</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviewed inspection report Minute no.3/1/2017, about poor hygiene and sanitation at Kasenyi Lyato. In 2017/18, Kasenyi lyato pit latrine construction is included in AWP as a follow up on inspection reports.</li> </ul>

9	The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	5	List of schools with EMIS number are 135 and the performance contract also give the same census figure.
	Maximum 10 for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>According to the performance contract pg 21, the list of government aided primary schools FY 2017/18 shows 135 with a total enrolment of 65,260 pupils as budgeted. But the report indicates 65,636 pupils, which is not in consistent with EMIS.</li> </ul>

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc...during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	Education, Health and Sanitation Committee met 15/7/2016, 20/10/2016, 14/12/2016, 23/02/2017 and 24/5/2017 and discussed reports and action areas, capital development projects, monitoring reports, BFP 2017/2018 and AWP 2017/18.
	Maximum 4 for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Approval of application for a university college of Gulu University in Hoima during meeting of 5/8/2016</p> <p>Also procurement of motorcycles for inspectorate.</p>



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>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At Ruguse P/S Min.14/2017; Approved the annual budget 2017/18.</li> <li>• All SMCs discuss resource issues related to planning and budgeting, fundraisings, at least once a year</li> <li>• 3 Meetings are mandatory, however to some few; do not meet the minimum of one meeting per term. Many meetings concentrate in 3rd term.</li> </ul>
12	<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>In the DEOs office and outside notice boards, and all the five schools sampled these grants are displayed in the general public 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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement requests to PDU for; Three classroom block at Nyawaiga P/S; Received on 15/8/2017</li> <li>• Procurement requests to PDU for; Three Seater Desk (54) for Nyawaiga P/S; Received on 15/8/2017</li> <li>• Procurement requests to PDU for; Construction of staff houses for Kigomba Public P/S; Received on 30/6/2017</li> </ul>

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"> <li>Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	3	<p>1) Construction of 3 Classroom block at Nyawanga P.7 School worth 145,094,908 by Kona Co. Ltd</p> <p>Date of contract: 20/12/2016</p> <p>Date of Certificate No. 1: 24/1/2017</p> <p>Date of payment: 30/1/2017</p> <p>Voucher No: PV-ED00140.</p> <p>Date of certificate No.3: 23/3/2017</p> <p>Date of payment: 27/3/2017</p> <p>Voucher No.PV-ED00501</p> <p>2) Construction of Teacher's House at Kigomba Public P.7. School worth 83,775,894 by M/S Karki Builders &amp; Engineering Ltd.</p> <p>Date of contract: 23/2/2017</p> <p>Date of Certificate No. 1: 10/5/2017</p> <p>Date of payment: 8/6/2017</p> <p>Voucher No: PV-ED00140.</p>
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"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>Q1 31/10/2016, Q2 15/1/2017, Q3 5/5/2017 and Q4 24/07/2017 as submission dates to ministry, but submissions by online by OBT to planning unit for consolidation were by mid July as confessed by the planner.</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"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year 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</li> </ul>	<p>Although reports are provided as below, not all issues have been addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DEO addressed the query raised in unaccounted UPE funds of 13,394,000 on 16/3/2017'</li> <li>• Letter dated 2/5/2017, Recovery of 1,150,000 out of 1,251,728 were also made by Head Teacher of Bugambe SS for payment to a teacher who had abandoned his work. Receipts Nos.00378937&amp; 00378854'</li> </ul> <p>Quarter 4 report shows that all the secondary schools had not accounted for Capitation grant and in quarter 3 only 1 school out of 15 had accounted for USE &amp; UPOLEP, 311,294,000</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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sarah Basasibwa and Nelson K.of Ruguse P/S, and Nsonzi Juliet of Butema BCS were trained at Bulera CCT as a senior Women/ men teacher</li> <li>• The Education Act 2008 emphasises adherence on formation of SMCs that 2/6 founding body should be women. Who will in turn influence gender issue</li> <li>• Gender guidelines are communicated to head teachers during head teachers meetings at beginning of term.</li> </ul>
----	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guideline on WASH; implementing the three star approaches for Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene in schools Nov 2017.</li> <li>• Every school must have ramps for easy access to PWDs; at least one stance on toilets with ramps. It is a requirement for contractors.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On every SMC's founding body members, 2 out of 6 must be women, and in a sample of school taken, at least a minimum of two females on management committee as stipulated in the education act 2008. (e.g Kitondola has 5, Ruguse has 4, Katereiga has 4 etc)</li> <li>• Every school must have senior woman/men teacher to handle peculiar issues of gender</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 3:</li> </ul>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district environment department designed a tool for monitoring schools.</li> <li>• On September 11th , 2017; Guidelines on Environmental Management for schools in Hoima District disseminated in Head teachers meeting.</li> <li>• Whenever specifying procurement works, contractors must plant grass, and plant a tree when opening/ commissioning.</li> </ul>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Health Performance Measures

Hoima District

(Vote Code: 509)

Score 79/100 (79%)

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	<p>The district has 98 posts to fill under PHC wage but advertisement has not been made. The DHO wrote to CAO. The PHC wage for 2017/18 FY is 3,122,436,000</p> <p>The LG performance contract for 2017/18 FY has 98 vacancies for the health workers in the structure.</p> <p>Only 62% of the posts in the structure for health is filled with PHC health workers</p>
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	<p>The LG performance contract has 98 vacancies in the health sector included in the recruitment plan.</p> <p>Pages 19-21 of the LG performance contract covers the health sector challenges including vacancies for staff. The recruitment plan is attached as annex to the LG performance contract.</p>
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	<p>The District has 2 HCIVs (Kikuube and Kigoroobya). The in charges for both facilities have their performance appraisals completed (endorsed by their supervisors i.e. DHO and CAO) and on personal files. i.e. 100% appraisal done.</p>

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"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	4	<p>The DHT met prior to the distribution of staff to all the Public and public not for profit health facilities. The meeting is dated 15th Sept 2016. All health facilities including all HCIIIs have qualified staff in place as shown in the staff deployment list</p>
---	--	--	---	--

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"> <li>• Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<p>Guidelines seen at DHOs office include infection control, Vitamin A supplementation, New guidelines for ART, EMTCT, Uganda clinical guidelines, TB guidelines.</p> <p>There is no minute of the DHT meeting to show communication of the guidelines</p> <p>The guidelines were distributed to the health facilities although there is no record of distribution.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	0	<p>No minutes of the meeting ; in charges did not sign for the guidelines</p>
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	<p>2 HCIV in the district were supervised, no district hospital in the district; DHT minutes available for 15th Jan 2017; 6th April 2017; 15th Oct 2017</p>

		<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>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All lower level facilities supervised with support from Partners IDI, World Vision international, Facility supervision log books are in place</li> <li>28th March 2017; 18th May 2017; 17th Aug 2016; 25th Aug 2016; 29th sept 2016</li> </ul>
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>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All lower health facilities supervised; the HSD has support supervision reports e.g. reports dated 7th Dec 2017 30th Nov 2017; 28th Nov 2017 at Kigoroby HCIV</li> </ul> <p>The health facilities visited have support supervision log books that show evidence of support supervision visits</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"> <li>Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>Support supervision reports are discussed during DHT and HSD meetings. The DHO has district performance plans for each health facility in charge that is reviewed every quarter.</p> <p>DHT meeting minutes of 11th July 2016 indicate this</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</li> </ul>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The recommendations in the Support supervision log books are followed up in the subsequent visits and also during meetings of health facility in charges e.g. minutes of the meeting on 11th July 2016. some of the actions followed up include the PHC funds that were reduced; non allocation of PHC development; referral services and operations of the ambulance in Kigoroby HCl; poor working environment with limited waiting space for patients, and stock outs f basic supplies</li> </ul>



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"> <li>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The list of 63 facilities (government and Public not for profit) are consistent with HMIS and OBT</li> </ul>
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"> <li>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</li> <li>Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Education, Health and Sanitation Committee met 15/7/2016, 20/10/2016, 14/12/2016, 23/02/2017 and 24/5/2017 and discussed reports and action areas, capital development projects, monitoring reports, BFP 2017/2018 and AWP 2017/18.</p> <p>Presented proposal to procure an ambulance 22/12/2016, also presented BFP 2017/2018 for approval.</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):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5</li> <li>If 80-99% : score 3</li> <li>If 70-79%: : score 1</li> <li>If less than 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	5	<p>All the health facilities have HUMC that are functional with minutes of meetings available at the health facility e.g Dwooli HC HUMC minutes of 30th July 2016;15th Sept 2016; and 30th June 2017</p>
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"> <li>Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>LG notice boards at the district health office and the respective health facilities hae information posted on PHC non wage allocations</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"> <li>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</li> </ul> <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>	2	<p>The procurement request was prepared by DHO on 8th Aug 2017 and submitted to PDU on 7th sept 2017</p> <p>The PDU confirms receipt of the procurement request and form.</p> <p>The procurement request form(PP5) was submitted to PDU on 7th Sept 2017 and was acknowledged by Procurement officer</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"> <li>Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time:</li> <li>100% - score 8</li> <li>70-99% – score 4</li> <li>Below 70% - score 0</li> </ul>	4	<p>Some facilities have been left out in the out in the procurement plan to NMS e.g Kichompya HC II</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points</li> </ul>	2	<p>Rehabilitation of Toonya Health Centre III worth 39,840,788 by Sandeson Construction Co. Ltd</p> <p>Date of contract: 31/3/2017</p> <p>Date of Certificate No. 1: 4/5/2017</p> <p>Date of payment: 9/5/2017</p> <p>Voucher No: PV-HE00238</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"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>Q1 31/10/2016, Q2 15/1/2017, Q3 5/5/2017 and Q4 27/7/2017 as submission dates to ministry. But submissions online by OBT was by mid July to planning unit for consolidation as confessed by planner.</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>In quarter 3 all health facilities did not account for 67,611,135 and no documents was availed for action taken in addressing the audit issues raised at the end of the financial year.</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"> <li>Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>There are at least 2 women in the HUMC as seen in the HUMC list in Dwooli HC III and kigorobya HCIV</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidelines were not available at the health facilities visited. There are facilities like Mugyalia HCII, Tonya where patients share toilets with health staff indicating that the guidelines are not followed if available.</li> </ul>

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"><li>• Evidence that the LGs has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal : score 2 points.</li></ul>	0	<p>Guidelines not seen at the health facility; no record of issue. Facilities for medical waste disposal lacking in Dwoli HCIII</p>
----	---	---	---	---



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Hoima District

(Vote Code: 509)

Score 97/100 (97%)

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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Five sub-counties; i.e. Kitoba (80%), Kyangwali (73%), Bugambe (63%), Kigorobyia (63%) and Buseruka (55%) are below the district's average water coverage (81%)</li> <li>Provision has been made for all the five sub-counties in FY 2017/18 budget. 10 out of the 15 planned siting and drilling of deep boreholes is in the low-coverage sub-counties as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Kitoba: 1 borehole</li> <li>o Kyangwali: 3 boreholes</li> <li>o Bugambe: 1 borehole</li> <li>o Kigorobyia: 3 boreholes</li> <li>o Buseruka: 2 boreholes</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

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"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<p>15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As per reviewed quarterly progress reports, all the five sub-counties with inadequate water coverage were catered for in FY 2016/17 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Kitoba: 1 new deep borehole; 1 new protected spring; while 4 deep boreholes were rehabilitated</li> <li>o Kyangwali: 2 new deep boreholes; 3 deep boreholes rehabilitated</li> <li>o Bugambe: 1 new deep borehole; 3 deep boreholes rehabilitated</li> <li>o Kigorobya: Kapaapi Mini piped water supply system, built by Zimu Construction Ltd (cost: UGX 234m; via Rural Water Grant)</li> <li>o Buseruka: 2 new deep boreholes; 4 deep boreholes rehabilitated</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
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>15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three major WSS projects under the DWO docket were implemented in FY 2016/17: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Siting, drilling and installation of 14 deep boreholes by Icon Projects Ltd</li> <li>o Construction of protected spring by Muda Construction Ltd</li> <li>o Construction Kapaapi Mini WSS by Zimu Construction Ltd</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Construction supervision and monitoring reports for the deep boreholes, spring and mini WSS were reviewed/assessed as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o For the boreholes: dated January 13, 2017; January 27, 2017; February 20, 2017; and March 14, 2017</li> <li>o Protected spring: dated March 20, 2017; April 7, 2017; April 26, 2017</li> <li>o Kapaapi Mini WSS: dated 10 and 27 April, 2017</li> <li>o 3 out of 3 Projects: 100%</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
----------	--	---	--



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"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hoima LG intends to implement the following WSS projects during FY 2017/18: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Spring construction (4 No.)</li> <li>o Drilling and installation of 15 No. deep boreholes</li> <li>o Rehabilitation of 12 No. boreholes</li> <li>o Construction of a public toilet at Kapaapi trading centre, Kigorobya sub-county</li> <li>o Survey and design of Kyarusesa mini piped water system</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The above list is consistent with MIS records obtained from MoWE</li> </ul>
---	--	---	----	---

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>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DWO submitted procurement requests for all the five projects listed in performance measure 4 on April 20, 2017</li> <li>• The PDU records confirm the above</li> </ul>
---	---	---	---	---

The DWO has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts

Maximum 8 points for this performance measure

• 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

2

• DWO was appointed Contract Manager (by Chief Accounting Officer) for the WSS projects on dates that follow:

o Borehole drilling (14 No.): December 27, 2016

o Spring construction: April 3, 2017

o Kapaapi Mini WSS: December 27, 2016

• Regular site visits are conducted for the aforesaid projects as showcased by periodic monitoring and supervision reports the Assessor reviewed

• If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2

2

• Field assessment was conducted for the three major projects in FY 2016/17; i.e. deep boreholes, spring and public sanitation facility; it was established the facilities were built as per designs.

• If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2

2

• Visits to sampled WSS facilities entailed engaging beneficiary communities, and it was established the contractor handed over the WSS facilities – and communities were now in charge of daily O&M

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Project Manager/DWO certified the WSS projects and filed completion reports on the following dates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Borehole drilling (14 No.) – April 5, 2017</li> <li>o Spring construction – May 25, 2017</li> <li>o Kapaapi Mini WSS – June 17, 2017</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Completion certificates were prepared as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Borehole drilling (14 No.) – March 3, 2017</li> <li>o Spring construction – May 25, 2017</li> <li>o Kapaapi Mini WSS – June 17, 2017</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	3	<p>1) Construction of Kapaapi Mini Pipe Water System worth 234,796,695 by M/S Zimu Construction Co. Ltd.</p> <p>Date of contract: 13/4/2017</p> <p>Date of Certificate No. 1: 19/6/2017</p> <p>Date of payment:22/6/2017</p> <p>Voucher No: PIV-002661</p> <p>2) construction of 3 Stance Pit Latrine at Kiso market by Byonta Construction Co. Ltd worth 19,223,333</p> <p>Date of contract: 31/3/2017</p> <p>Date of Certificate No. 1: 31/5/2017</p> <p>Date of payment: 31/6/2017</p> <p>Voucher No: PIV-002600</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"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5</li> </ul>	5	<p>Q1 31/10/2016, Q2 15/1/2017, Q3 5/5/2017 and Q4 27/7/2017 as submission dates to ministry. But online submission to planning by OBIT was by mid July.as per planning unit.</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"> <li>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 5 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 If queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	5	<p>Issue of untrained water source committee raised in quarter 1 was addressed in quarter 2 and in quarter 3 &amp; 4 ie end of 2016/17 there were no issues pend in this sector.</p>

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

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"> <li>Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>Works and Technical services committee sat 12/7/2016, 7/12/2016, 14/2/2017 and 23/05/2017 and discussed among others water reports and made action points, BFP 2017/18, departmental reports, budget and annual work plan 2017/18</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>Presented BFP 2017/18 during council sitting of 22/12/2016</p>

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

2

• The annual workplan and budget are displayed at the District Water Office notice board. Information for the Water and Sanitation Development Grant shows of the budgeted UGX 786m for FY 2016/17 only 744m was actually spent. In light of the same UGX 611m is budgeted water and sanitation expenditure for 2017/18.

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

2

• Projects assessed during fieldwork are labelled with details of name (including village/parish), financial year of construction, contractor and funding source. For the 2016/17 MWE-funded projects, contractor details were labelled as follows:

o Borehole drilling (14 No.) – ICON Projects

o Spring construction (Kitoba) – Muda Construction Ltd

o Kapaapi Mini WSS – Zimu Construction Ltd

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the time for the assessment, evaluation results and award notifications for 2017/18 were displayed on the district notice boards as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Survey, siting and drilling deep boreholes – ICON Projects (UGX 163m); East Africa Boreholes (140m)</li> <li>o Spring construction (4 No.) – Muda Construction Ltd (UGX 18.7m)</li> <li>o Construction of 3-Stance public lined VIP at Kapaapi – Katki (UGX 15.4m)</li> <li>o Survey and design of Kyaruseesa piped WSS (UGX 29.7m)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
12	<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community requests for water sources to the DWO are on file. Requests reviewed were from the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Ndaragi village, Kigorobya sub-county</li> <li>o Buraza village, Kigorobya sub-county</li> <li>o Kabanda village, Buserula sub-county</li> <li>o Rwengabi village, Kabwoya sub-county</li> <li>o Butimba village, Kiziranfumbi sub-county</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O&amp;M funds and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, for the current FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DWO maintains comprehensive records on functionality of water and sanitation committees (WSCs). Average district functionality stands at 77%. The summary of WSC facilities reviewed has data collection on user fees and whether WSC conducts regular O&amp;M.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---	---

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

13	The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental screening for all WSS projects was conducted, and Environment and Social Screening Forms (reports) for the same are available.</li> </ul>
	Maximum 4 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment and Social Mitigation Certification Forms are utilised to control for non-compliance. For the sampled projects, environmental compliance was on average &gt;85%, and the defects liability period will be utilised to make good on the few issues remaining.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clause 3 of the Technical Specifications for deep borehole addresses environmental protection on sites. The TC form part of the agreement between the LG and Contractor.</li> </ul>

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"> <li>• If at least 50% WSCs are women as per the sector critical requirements: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Of the sampled WSS facilities at least half the 7-person committee are women, and they hold key positions including Vice Chairperson and/or Treasurer</li> <li>• The district average for female composition in WSCs as per software reports stands at 52%</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district is only able to provide/budget for one new public sanitation facility per year, and there are not many facilities to assess</li> <li>• Whereas the newly constructed facility in Buseruka is sex-separated, there was no evidence of ramps for PWDs</li> </ul>