



## LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Kakumiro District

(Vote Code: 614)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	2	40%
No	3	60%

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>LG submitted the performance contract for 2017/2018 to ministry of finance draft on 13/04/2017 as per copy of counter yellow receipt issued final on 10/7/2017 as per ministry register, beyond 30th June</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>LG submitted budget as part of the performance contract and the accompanying approved procurement plan stamped received by ministry of finance on 4/8/2017 was accompanying. Copy was also submitted to PPDA and Auditor General.</p>	Yes
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			
<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	xxxxx	<p>LG submitted the annual performance report to ministry of finance on 1/8/2017 as per counter copy of yellow receipt issued. However beyond 31st July</p>	No

<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>LG made all quarterly submissions Q1 16/11/2016, Q2 22/2/2017, Q3 12/5/2017 and Q4 1/8/2017 to ministry of finance as per counter copies of yellow.However beyond 31st July</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Assessment area: Audit</p>			
<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by April 30 (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action (PFMA Act 2015; Local Governments Financial and Accounting Regulations 2007; The Local Governments Act, Cap 243).</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>This district started operating in July 2016 ie 2016/17 FY and the report was not available with the Auditor General</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>The report issued by the Auditor General for 2016/17 indicate that the district is among those with Unqualified opinion and No. 54 on the list of districts on page 201</p>	<p>Yes</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Kakumiro District

(Vote Code: 614)

Score 40/100 (40%)

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	Physical Planning Committee in place, CAOs letter appointing them dated 5/9/2017 appointing 14 members as per Physical Planning Act seen, Committee sat twice 24/05/2017 and 14/09/2017. District is new and has not made any physical development plan. However in FY 2017/18, six RGCs have been included in the budget for consideration to qualify for physical development plans.
	Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.	• All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2.	0	No investments have been submitted or approved so far.
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.	0	Under production, there was rabies vaccine and fridgerator for cold chain under AWP yet it was not prioritised in budget conference report
		• 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 Development Plan 2015/16-2019/20 in place and fully signed. Investments such as OPD Construction under health, manual and mechanised road maintenance under roads, borehole rehabilitation and construction under water, Fridgerator and vaccines under production in the AWP were derived from the 5 year Plan.
		• Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 1.	1	Booklet for project profile 2017/18 dated 28/oct/2016 seen and formatted as per format in planning guidelines of 2014. Also discussed in TPC sitting 21/12/2016 minute 38KDTPC/12/2016/17.

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	<p>Statistical Abstract 2016/17 seen disaggregated population figures, council committees, boards and commissions. It guided resource allocation for example Kisiita S/C with high population of 58,443 allocated proportionally more resources. TPC sitting 25/5/2015 discussed it under minute 70KDTPC/MAY/2016/1.7</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"> <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>	2	<p>Projects such as construction of Administration block, procurement of double cabin pick up for administration, classroom construction in Kihurumba, latrine construction in Katikara implemented last FY and also in AWP 2016/17</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	0	<p>52 projects sampled, 24 complete and 28 either underway, not started or proc underway. 54% incomplete and mainly boreholes and structures in Kakumiro central as per 4th QTR report .</p>
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>Kasiita-Katikara road budget 28,027 and spent 41,451, Bujaaja / Mpasaana road budget 3,442 and spent 45,033, desks in Kirindimula P/S budget 3,600 and spent 12,882. All outside the budget range and beyond max. 15% plus or minus. Figures in (0000s)</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>	0	<p>Maintenance budget for roads such as Rubaya –Kikoma, Kihumuro-Mazooba, Bagunyawana-Bukuumi, Munsa-Nkondo, Kyabasaija-Mubende boarder budget was 84,263 yet spent only 47,737 which is less than 80%. Figures in 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>	0	<p>None of 8 HoDs in post have their appraisals done (signed performance agreements and reports) as per the personal files e.g. Ag CFO file no.CR/D/10006, Ag DHO file no.cr/d/15319, Ag. DEO file no. CR/D/10040 etc.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<p>None of the 8 HoDs in post is substantively appointed. The district had no Deputy CAO by the time of assessment. This is attributed to the fact that the district is still new (became operational 1st July 2016).</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>All positions submitted to DSC for consideration in 2016/17 FY (Letter from CAO dated 7/2/2017 ref. CR/D/156) for 57 positions were handled during the DSC sitting from 21st February 2017 – 2nd March 2017 under minute KDSC/05/FEB/2017 approving the advertisement for the recruitment. The recruitment took place during the DSC sitting of 27th June 2017 under minute KDSC/26/JUNE/2017 and staffs were appointed effective 1st July 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>One staff (Dr. Tuhaise Judith) was submitted for confirmation in a letter dated 10th October 2016 ref. CR/D/156. Her case was considered during the DSC sitting of 21st February 2017 – 2nd March 2017 under minute KDSC/06/FEB/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>There was no discipline cases submitted to the DSC during 2016/17 FY hence the DSC did not fail in its duty. The DSC was appointed in January 2017.</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>	0	<p>Two (2) out of the six (6) staff i.e. 33.3% recruited during FY 2016/17 effective 1st March 2017 were on May 2017 payroll as per the staff list and payroll. The other four (4) i.e. 66.7% did not access payroll not later than 2 months from the time of recruitment.</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 2016/17 FY, 8 staff retired between 3rd July 2016 and 5th May 2017. By the time of assessment none had accessed payroll i.e. 0% accessed payroll within two months as the latest to retire has not accessed payroll after 8 months.</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	<p>The district became operational in 2016/17 and as such comparison cannot be made with figures for 2015/16.</p> <p>However OSR realised in 2016/17 =169,158,990</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	<p>Budgeted revenue 2016/17 before revising = 185,889,000</p> <p>Actual revenue = 169,158,990= revised budget</p> <p>= 185,889,000</p> <p>Less 169,158,990</p> <p>Short fall of 16,730,010 /185,889,000 = 9 %</p>



11	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the transfer schedule LST revenue realised =24,157,500</li> <li>less Town Council share 3,187,500 =</li> <li>Net = 20,970,000 X 65% = 13,624,000 remitted to LLG on voucher No,5/10/2016 dated 17/10/2016</li> <li>From tendered services (Markets/parks) revenue realised =24,230,000</li> <li>Less VAT 3,696,102 paid by district</li> <li>Net= 20,533,898 X 65 % = 13,347,034 remitted on voucher No.02/8/2026 dated 11/8/2016.</li> </ul> <p>The schedule verified by Internal Auditor on 12/10/2016</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>Standing Committee code: 138207 (222103,221011,227001,227004) =13,687,000</p> <p>Political &amp; Executive over sight code 138206 (227001) = 23,485,000.</p> <p>Total = 37,172,000</p> <p>OSR = 169,158,990</p> <p>= 22%</p>
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.

- Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2

0

The position of Senior and Procurement Officers are approved in the KDLG structures: vide ARC135/306/01 dated; 27th June 2017 by PS Public Services

Evidence that the Senior Procurement Officer is Substantively appointed

1. Ag. Senior Procurement Officer secondment letter Ref: CR/D/156/1 dated 29th /6/2017 DSC Min 26/KDSC/June/2017
2. Procurement Officer is on Secondment as above

The department not fully fledged

- Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1

1

Reports are Adhoc based on service points as listed below;  
Sampled documents include;  
TEC Report dated 27th September 2017 project:  
Kaku614/Wrks/17/18/0004;  
Construction of a classroom Block with an Office and A store at Kyakuterekera P/S. 6 members of TEC, Recommended Kinombe Nyarizinga Construction Co. Ltd  
Amount: 73,177,700UGX  
TEC Report dated: dated 18th September 2017; Project:  
Kaku/614/Wrks/17-18/0007  
Construction of Kisiita Town Water Supply and Sanitation System Phase 3 Under Rural Water Grant, 5 Members, Contractor: Daikam Technologies Ltd, Amount 143,459,470UGX

		<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>DCC approved the TEC recommendation;  CC minutes LG DPA Form 20, dated 29th September 2017  Approved Kaku614/Wrks/17/18/0004;  Construction of a classroom Block with an Office and A store at Kyakuterekera P/S Kinombe Nyarizinga Construction Co. Ltd  Amount: 73,177,700UGX vide Agenda No.5 Minute 88/CC/2017/18  CC minutes LG DPA Form 20, dated 29th September 2017  Kaku/614/Wrks/17-18/0007  Construction of Kisiita Town Water Supply and Sanitation System Phase 3 Under Rural Water Grant, 5 Members, Contractor: Daikam Technologies Ltd, Amount 143,459,470UGX. CC  Approved the project by TEC under Agenda No. 8 Minute 89/CC/2017/18</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>	2	<p>The Kakumiro DLG PP FY 2016/17 is produced by Kibale District Local Government. Vide 4th October 2016 Submission to PPDA stamped Received. The Plan is dated 16th September 2016.  The AWP and Budget KDLG2015/16-2019/20 Second 5 Year DDP page 145, Construction of Administration Block, Amount 400,000,000 UGX Proposed start date: 1st July 2016. The Procurement Plan has all investment projects in AWP. E.g. Item No 1 FY 2016/17 Administration Amount, 400,000, 000 UGX Bid Invitation 30th April 2016 Bid Closure &amp; Opening 25th May 2016, Bid Notice Display: 15th June 2016 and Award 15th June 2016, Contract Signing: 1st July 2016, Completion 30th June 2017.</p> <p>Bid Advertisement on the above project not seen</p>

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

Current FY PP Kakumiro DLG dated prepared 3rd August 2017 signed by CAO received by PPDA and MoFPED on 4th August 2017.

Infrastructure/Investments are 7 in PP and 87 selective procurements.

Examples of soft copies seen

- Borehole Bid document dated 26th /8/2017
  - Health Center III 26th /8/2017
  - Renovation of a Class Room Block at Kinunda: 26th 8/2017
  - Construction of a Class room Black with an Office and Store at Kyakuterekera PS 26th/ 8/2017
  - Piped Water at Kisiita Water Supply and Sanitation System Phase 3: 26th August 2017
  - Construction of a Classroom Block at St Noah Kasuju: 26th/8/2018
  - Drilling and Pump installation at Mpasana 26th August 2017
- Bid documents above were in soft copies and dates tested above were from document properties.in word document

Date of issuance of Bid documents are 18th September 2017 to Bidders

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

0

No Register for 2016/17 the current register 2017/18 is in soft copy in Excel Database created a day before assesment (23rd/01/2018)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2.</li> </ul>	2	<p>Open Domestic Bidding: Kaku614/Wrks/17-18/0008 Drilling of 7 Boreholes I Various Sub Counties, 123,284,276 UGX, Contractor PMP Holdings Ltd.</p> <p>Selective Bidding: Below 50 m Kaku614/Supls/2017/18/0065: Supply, Delivery and Distribution of 20 Bore she goats and 20 Boer He goats to Kakumiro District HQ, Molecule Investments Ltd, Amount 13,600,000 UGX</p> <p>Micro Procurement Below 1 Million: Kaku614/Supls/2017/18/0024 Lot18. Supply and Delivery of a medium sized 4 shelved cabinet (metallic) to DCDO at Kakumiro District HQTrs, Amount 987,000 UGX, Contractor Juscona Enterprises LTD</p>
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>Certificate: Kaku614/Wrks/2016-2017/00051, Construction of Kakumiro District HQ, Date:27th June 2017</p> <p>Interim Certificate: dated 31st May 2017</p> <p>Inspection Report: 31st May 2017 Signed by Ag. District Engineer</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>All works have no provision for signage's in the BOQs thus lack of installation of site boards</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	<p>The cash books sampled for Administration, works &amp; DDEG proved that Bank reconciliation are prepared monthly.</p> <p>works on 6/1/2018</p> <p>Administration on 3/1/2018</p> <p>DDEG on 9/1/2018</p>
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	<p>The district does not maintain Payment claim register and was not easy to make verification.</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"> <li>Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor and produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 3.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	0	<p>There is no substantially appointed Internal Auditor</p> <p>No minutes of PAC sittings to discuss audit queries and status of implementation thereof was availed. PAC reports for quarter 1 &amp; 2 dated 7/10/2017 and not dated respectively does not address the issues for the all financial year as there are no reports for quarter 3 &amp; 4</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>Although the reports were produced for all the 4 quarters the dispatch book showed that only report for quarter 4 was distributed to and received as follows:</p> <p>CAO 4/9/2017,PAC 4/9/2017,Secretary Finance 6/9/2017,LC V Chairperson 6/9/2017, Speaker 25/9/2017, RDC 28/9/2017 and CFO signed without date.</p>
19	<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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	<p>Although assets register is being maintained, the information required to be captured are partially entered. Eg,on page 913 of register for motor vehicles and cycles, Yamaha motorcycle had no chassis and engine No. recorded as well as the cost.</p> <p>All roads equipment from the ministry of works have no costs entered in the register as on pages, 911,912,913 etc</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 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</p>	4	<p>The audit opinion for the previous financial year as published by the Auditor General in its report on page 210 shows that the district is among those with unqualified opinion. No. 54 on the list.</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>Council sat 30/05/2017 and under minute 59/IKDLG/30/05/2016 discussed and approved supplementary budget 2016/17, under minute 61/IKDLG/30/05/2017 discussed and approved the revenue enhance plan. The Council of 30/03/2017 discussed and approved procurement plan, capacity building plan and AWP 20117/18. Etc.</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>No person has been designated to handle grievances and complaints and no evidence of feedback.</p>
23	<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published: • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</p>	0	<p>Pay roll of October 2017 seen displayed on the notice board. Need to display more including pension schedules.</p>
	<p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>Best evaluated bidder notice indicating even contract amounts dated 11/12/2017 and fully signed by CAO seen. For example Doto Logistics for latrine construction at 8,100,000, Robflow for vaccine supply at 4,500,000, Supply of goats at 7,800,000 etc</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications, are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1.</li> </ul>	0	<p>N/A</p>
24	<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>DDEG guidelines 2017/18 dissemination report dated 12/11/2016 with attendance lists including LLG officials seen. This needs to improve.</p>
	<p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	0	<p>No substantive baraza was conducted. Only Community dialogue by gender officer on 8/6/2017 and 12/6/2017 on gender based violence.</p>
<p>Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards</p>				



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

Kibale DLG Extract for Kakumiro DLG Second 5-year Development Plan 2015/16-2019/2020 District Situational Gender Analysis Page 65-69  
Project Profiles per sector FY 2016/17 page 143-214  
Gender Mainstreaming and Mentoring for LLG 22nd to 24th May 2017, Report dated 27th May 2017.  
Report on Mobilisation of Communities During the Various Road Works in the District dated 23rd June 2017  
Dissemination of Gender and Equity Guidelines and Score cards to District Sectors/Departments Dated 16th June 2017.  
Minutes of the 6th Session of Kakumiro District Council held on 30th May 2017. Minute 59/1KDLC/30th /05/2017: Approval of supplementary Budget for YLP and UWEP.

• 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.

2

Current FY Budget Provisions on Gender Mainstreaming Vide vote 614, output 108107 Gender Mainstreaming Amount 5,000,000 UGX.  
Previous FY AWP 2016/17 for Activities implemented: Outputs page 71, Previous Budget FY 2016/17 in AWP 5,063,000 UGX  
Expenditure per vouchers FY 2016/17 Amounts to 4,837,600 UGX a 96.7% utilisation.  
TPC Meeting held 27th February 2017, Minute 51/KDTPC/Feb/2016/17 Approval of UWEP projects 2016/17

LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

• 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

Seen the following EIAs

Kaku614/Wrks/2016-17/00003  
Construction of an Out Patients Department at Kabubwa HC II (Under DDDE Grant), Open National Bidding, BOQ date Issue 28th September 2016, ESF missing date of screening.

Kaku614/Wrks/2016/17/00005: Kasiita Piped Water Supply ESF dated 14/03/2017 DNRO.

Kakumiro DLG Project Profiles FY 2017/18 dated 28th October 2016 All projects have Environmental Assessment & Mitigation Plan

• Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1

0

Only 1 Bid seen: BOQ for Kaku614/Wrks/2016-17/00003  
Construction of an Out Patients Department at Kabubwa HC II, Contractor BAMU Gen. Construction & Supply, Dated 4th November 2016, BOQ item A Environmental concern 4.0-4.04, B, C Total Cost: 2,045,000 UGX.

Standardisation of BOQs limits the inclusion of Environment Concerns in the BOQs.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>No titles or agreements for all projects. Land under Bunyoro Kingdom.          CAO letter to Katikiro of Bunyoro Kitara Kingdom, dated 18th April 2017. CAO's Stamp 19th April 2017.          District Staff Surveyor letter to CAO Kakumiro Dated 11th August 2017 on the survey of the Land for District HQ, HCIV and Proposed Works Yard          CAO Letter to The Solicitor General: Request to File Defence, dated 16th June 2017, received by Ministry of Justice &amp; Constitutional Affairs dated 16th June 2017, Office of the Prime Minister 16th June 2017, Minister of State Office of the President 16th June 2017, Ministry of Local Government, 16th June 2017.          High Court of Uganda at Masindi Summons 24th May 2017, signed by Registrar.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>Only one project          Kaku614/Wrks/2016/17/00004 Drilling of 7 deep Boreholes, Certificate No. 4: ESC Dated 11th May 2017 DNRO.          Has full Certificates</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Educational Performance Measures

Kakumiro District

(Vote Code: 614)

Score 48/100 (48%)

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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The performance contract for 2017/18 shows budget for 581 teachers, page 19. No. of schools from the list of schools in DEOs file are 82, giving the average of 7 teachers per school.</li> <li>The above evidence indicates a below minimum standard of a teacher per class.</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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the sampled schools there was a head teacher and but less than 7 teachers in some instances.</li> <li>Sampled schools; Bukumi 8, Kanyawawa 8, Munsa 8, Kikada 7, Kyabasaija 7. pg 16-72 of the Performance Contract annex.</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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The performance contract 2017/18 pg 19 planned 581.</li> <li>• Performance contract pg 20 shows a short fall of 197.</li> <li>• However pay roll from HR office shows 596 teachers.</li> <li>• 596/(197+581) =76%</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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The department has not recruited to fill positions of inspectors, as per the approved structure available in HRM office.</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>• Due to limited wage bill allocation for FY 2017/18 does not allow recruitment of more teachers and school inspectors indicated in performance contract pg 20.</li> <li>• Basing on recruitment advert of New Vision with closing date of 3/4/17, DSC recruited 7 teachers but on replacement.</li> </ul>

		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	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due to limited wage bill allocation for FY 2017/18 does not allow recruitment of more teachers and school inspectors indicated in performance contract pg 20.</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>	Evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY • 100% school inspectors: score 3	0	The District has one (1) school inspector in acting capacity. There is no evidence of appraisal on her personal file i.e. 0% appraisal
		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	2	Eight (8) out of the 10 sampled head teachers had their appraisals (performance agreements and reports) completed and endorsed by their supervisors (Sub-County Chief and DEO) i.e. 80% appraisal done.
Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection				

The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools

Maximum 3 for this performance measure

• Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1

1

Circulars from MOES seen evident by;

- Registration of learners by NIIRA from the MOES. The meeting at the DEOs attended by Head Teachers, minutes No.3/7/17 office

Although the department claim to have disseminated the following circulars below, but there is no evidence at school.

- Distribution of teacher's supervision tool from DES dated 21/9/2017
- Dissemination of school feeding program in education institutions for head teachers dated 25/7/2016
- Circular on formation of SMCs, dated 18/10/17
- Circular on utilising UPE funds, implementation of EGR,

• 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

2

.  
DEOs meeting;  
Dissemination of school feeding program in education institutions for head teachers dated 25/7/2016; evidenced with attendants (H/teachers) signatures appended.



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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>100% - score 12</li> <li>90 to 99% - score 10</li> <li>80 to 89% - score 8</li> <li>70 to 79% - score 6</li> <li>60 to 69% - score 3</li> <li>50 to 59% - score 1</li> <li>Below 50% - score 0.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No inventory of schools inspected seen. Therefore hard to establish the number of inspected schools over the total no. of private and government schools.</li> </ul>
8	<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>District inspector of schools report led to DEOs involve in conflict resolution at Busingye p/s, dated on 8/6/2017.</li> <li>DEOs communication to department staff meeting on 24/7/2017; Minute no.10/24/17: Mismanagement of school finances.</li> <li>Head teacher interdicted from duty, Ref.CR/KAK/156/3, signed by CAO, on 2/10/17</li> </ul>
		<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>Form 4 in DEOs office, indicates acknowledgement of submissions received by 0782265426 on 18/8/17.</li> <li>And Another submission on 02/12/2016 received by 0782484078.</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>• Circular on utilising UPE funds, implementation of EGR on 31/1/2017.</li> <li>• District inspector of schools report led to DEOs involve in conflict resolution at Busingye p/s on 8/ 6/2017</li> <li>• DEOs communication to department staff meeting on 24/7/2017; Min.10/24/17: Mismanagement of school finances</li> <li>• Headteacher interdicted from duty, Ref.CR/KAK/156/3, signed by CAO.</li> </ul>
9	<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5</li> </ul>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 82 primary schools were submitted MOES on 9/1/2018, which is consistent with performance contract 2017/18 annex.</li> </ul>
		<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5</p>	0	<p>EMIS enrolment data is incomplete and no data to compare with.</p>
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <li>• Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Committee sat discussed and presented to council of 30/03/2017 which approved the AWP 2017/18 under minute 48/KDLG/30/03/2017.</p> <p>General Purpose Committee sat 10/11/2016 and recommended to council changing classroom construction from Kihumuro P/S to Kalangara P/S. Council sitting 12/12/2016 under minute 31/KDLG/15/11/2016 part 13 approved the change.</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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could not establish this in DEOS office because it was not easy to identify SMCs report files.</li> <li>• At the schools sampled, the mandatory 3 meetings, once per term were not evidently seen in all committees.</li> <li>• Out of 49 schools the list has 47 SMCs fully registered.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department of education displayed UPE grants on notice board.</li> </ul>
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>Basing on procurement requests sampled, requests for latrine construction- (seven sites), classroom construction, and renovations of school buildings, signed by user department on 7/8/17, were submitted to CAO and PDU on 8/7/17.</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 5 stance Latrine with urinal at Wchwanga Primary school Bwanswa Sub County wort 8,798,080 by Ms Heavy Investments Ltd.</p> <p>Contract date: 16/1/2018</p> <p>Certificate Date:3/4/2018</p> <p>Payment date: 5/4/2018</p> <p>Voucher No. 01/14</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 14/11/2016, Q2 20/05/2017, Q3 10/5/2017 and Q4 28/7/2017 as compilation dates. But submissions made before mid July as testified by 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</li> <li>o If sector has no audit query score 4</li> <li>o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points</li> <li>o If all queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	0	<p>The department had unaccounted for funds worth 157,886,872 on page 19 of internal audit report for quarter 4.</p> <p>DEO summoned before PAC by letter dated 12/12/2017 to appear on 19/12/2017 although he appeared before PAC there is no report as per copies of missing accountability documents he presented during the assessment there is no report or PAC minutes produced</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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activity report dated 16/6/2017; Dissemination of gender and equity guidelines.</li> <li>• Report on Girl Guide implementations, held on 25-31/8/2017.</li> <li>• DEOs communication to head teachers; minute no..1 and 2/1/17: special attention to crosscutting issues for safer learning environment.</li> <li>• Hand washing facilities seen at places of convenience at places visited.</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>	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DEOs communication with head teachers; minute no.1 and 2/1/17: Special attention to crosscutting issues for safer learning environment. these include sanitation, HIV /AID's, environment among others.</li> <li>• Activity report, dated 16/6/2017; Dissemination of gender and equity guidelines.</li> <li>• Department of education with support of World Vision have trained senior woman teachers on how to use localised materials to make pads.</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>	<p>1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All committees in sampled schools adhered to gender guidelines as stipulated the in education act 2008, second schedule;. A minimum of 2 or more members out of 6 founding members should be females. Kanyawawa p/s has 6 females, Kikada has 2 , Munsa 5, Bukuumi girls 7.</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>• DEOs Communication to H/ teachers dated 30/1/2017 ; instructing head teachers to plant at least 100 fruit and timber trees.</li> </ul>
----	--	---	---	---



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Health Performance Measures

Kakumiro District

(Vote Code: 614)

Score 67/100 (67%)



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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than 80% filled: score 6 points,</li> <li>• 60 – 80% - score 3</li> <li>• Less than 60% filled: score 0</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Local Government Performance contract 2017/18 FY dated 7th July 2017. On Pages 16-18 the health sector had no provision PHC wage bill for new recruitment in 2017/18 FY. The total PHC wage for 2017/18 FY is 1,027,404,000.</li> </ul> <p>Only 51% of the posts are filled with PHCworkers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No recruitment was done.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• The Local Government Performance contract 2017/18 FY dated 7th July 2017. On Pages 16-18 the health sector had no provision PHC wage bill for new recruitment in 2017/18 FY.</li> </ul> <p>The recruitment plan has one vacancy for assistant DHO( Environmental health).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No recruitment was done.</li> </ul>

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>	0	<p>The District has two (2) HCIVs and no Hospital i.e. Kakumiro HCIV and Kakindo HCIV. Both In charges have no appraisal done for FY 2016/17 as per their files i.e. 0% 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The staff list is dated 5th Aug 2017 and shows staff deployment to all the health facilities in the district. All health facilities including HCII have at least a qualified staff deployed. These include 2 HCIV;5HCIII;7 HCII; and 7 NGO facilities</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision				

5

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

Maximum 6 for this performance measure

• Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3

0

The guidelines seen at DHOs office are; Uganda clinical guidelines, essential supplies.

No communication letters or distribution records were seen.

Some of the guidelines were found at the health facilities visited e.g. HIV however there is no evidence that the DHO effectively communicated all guidelines and circulars issued in the previous FY.

Some guidelines like the Uganda clinical guidelines were distributed by NMS with supplies directly to the health facilities

• 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

3

• The Meetings were held on 16th June 2017, health assembly on 28th June 2017; and meeting of health facility in charges on 16th Oct 2016

• The guidelines were seen at the health facilities visited e.g. Kasambya HCIII and Kakumiro HCIV

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>DHT holds monthly meetings to review progress e.g on 14th Nov 2016,24th April 2017,8th May 2017,15th May2017</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support supervision log books show supervision recommendations on reporting using Mtrac; documentation; sanitation; staffing</li> </ul>
		<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% supervised: score 3 points</li> <li>80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2</li> <li>60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 1</li> <li>Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</li> </ul>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All health facilities were supervised as evidenced by the integrated and focused support supervision reports;2nd Feb 2017,,9th April 2017,20th July 2017.</li> <li>Kyabasajja HC on 7th Oct 2016, Nkooko HC on 18th June 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If 100% supervised score 6 points</li> <li>80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 4</li> <li>60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 2</li> <li>Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</li> </ul>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support supervision reports e.g. Nalweyo HCIII on 24th April 2017, Masaka HCII on 2nd may 2017</li> <li>Support supervision reports dated 2nd Feb 2017,13th Jan 2017,30th Oct 2016.</li> <li>Support supervision focused on TB on 21st Feb 2017-25th Feb 2017</li> </ul>

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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</li> </ul>	<p>4</p> <p>6</p>	<p>DHT holds weekly and monthly meetings to make recommendations e.g. minutes of 14th Nov 2016,24th April 2017,8th May 2017</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Health facility support supervision log books have recommendations and follow up actions e.g reporting using Mtrac; documentation; sanitation; staffing</li> <li>• E.g in Kasambya HCIII the supervision reports of 23rd Aug 2016, 29th Sept 2016,1st Oct 2016,19th Oct 2016,9th May 2017,30th May 2017,1st June 2017,6th June 2017, and 26th June 2017.</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: o List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10</li> </ul>	<p>10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The list in OBT and HMIS are consistent; all 21 health facilities submit HMIS reports using MTRAC</li> </ul>
<p>Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>				

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>Committee discussed and presented to council 30/03/2017 to approve the AWP 2017/18</p> <p>General Purpose Committee 23/02/2017 recommended that CAO should write to PS/ST to enhance PHC (wage) to enable the district pay up to the year and also be able to recruit more staff to improve from 50% to 70%. Council sitting 28/2/2017 approved under minute 39/LDLG/02/04/2017</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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All health facilities have HUMC.</li> <li>Copies of HUMC meetings were not available with DHO nor seen at the health facilities visited reportedly locked by the in charge.</li> </ul>
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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The website is non-functional. No publication of PHC non-wage grants was seen at DHOs office nor in the health facilities visited e.g. Kakumiro HCIV, Kasambya HC III</li> </ul>
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>	2	<p>The procurement request was received on 8th Aug 2017 by PDU and covers the investment items</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>	2	<p>Form PP5 for rehabilitation of Kabubwa HCII worth 128,441,000 was received by PDU on 8th Aug 2017</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>	8	<p>All Health facilities listed in the LG performance contract were supported on 6th Jan 2017 to prepare and submit a procurement plan to NMS.</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>Construction of outpatient department at Kabubwa HC phase 1 DDEG funds worth 55,347,280 by Banu General Construction &amp; Supply Ltd.</p> <p>Date of contract : 21/6/2017</p> <p>Date of Certificate : 2/6/2017</p> <p>Date of payment : 2/6/2016</p> <p>Voucher No. 7/6/17</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>	<p>• Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4</p>	4	<p>Q1 14/11/2016, Q2 20/2/2017, Q3 10/05/2017 and Q4 28/7/2017 as compilation dates, but submissions made by early mid July as testified 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>No information was provided yet internal audit report for quarter 4 showed that there was unaccounted 3,000,000 on page 21, 129,252,728 on page 3 and quarter 3 6,322,300</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>All HUMC have at least 2-3 female representatives in the committee e.g. Kakumiro HCIV of 10 HUMC members 4 are female. The Guidelines from MOH stipulate female representation not any number of females</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	<p>Guidelines on sanitation were not seen at the health facilities and the toilets are not labelled as separate for male and female patients</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"> <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 on medical waste management were not seen at the health facilities visited e.g. Kasambya HCIII and Kakumiro HCIV</p> <p>Toilets in Kasambya HC are not labelled as female or male and are used interchangeably</p> <p>All HCIIIs have placenta pits for medical waste disposal</p>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Kakumiro District

(Vote Code: 614)

Score 89/100 (89%)

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"> <li>• Kakumiro is one of the districts with acute water challenges – with global coverage averaging 45%</li> <li>• Five (out of 11) sub-counties are below the district's average coverage</li> <li>• The below-average-coverage sub-counties are: Birembo (30%), Kakindo (36%), Kisiita (31%), Nkooko (41%) and Mpasana (14%)</li> <li>• Provision has been made for all the five sub-counties in FY 2017/18 budget. 4 out of 8 new deep boreholes and 5 out of 10 boreholes due for rehabilitation are in the low-coverage sub-counties as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Birembo: one new deep borehole; one due for rehabilitation</li> <li>o Kakindo: one new deep borehole; two to be rehabilitated</li> <li>o Kisiita: one borehole due for rehabilitation</li> <li>o Nkooko: one borehole due for rehabilitation</li> <li>o Mpasana: two new deep boreholes</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Kisiita and</li> </ul>

				<p>Mpasaana sub-counties have also been earmarked for piped water supply systems (WSS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of UGX 173m has been made for construction of Kisiita piped WSS Phase III, while two production boreholes will be drilled in FY 2017/18 to aid feasibility and design of the piped WSS for Mpasaana</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>	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As per quarterly progress reports, all the five low-coverage sub-counties were catered for in FY 2016/17 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Birembo: one deep borehole was rehabilitated</li> <li>o Kakindo: three new deep boreholes; one rehabilitated</li> <li>o Kisiita: Phase II piped WSS; rehabilitation of two boreholes</li> <li>o Nkooko: two new deep boreholes; one rehabilitated</li> <li>o Mpasaana: two 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>• Four major projects were implemented in FY 2016/17 under the DWO's docket: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Siting, drilling and installation of 7 deep boreholes by KLR</li> <li>o Construction of Kisiita piped WSS Phase II</li> <li>o Rehabilitation of 10 deep boreholes by Art Centre Ltd</li> <li>o Construction of 5-stance lined VIP latrine at Katikara Market by SEV Electronics Ltd</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The assessor reviewed periodic progress reports prepared by the DWO and post-construction monitoring as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Supervision report dated April 27, 2017: addressed the 7 No. drilled boreholes; the 10 No. boreholes undergoing rehabilitation; Kisiita piped WSS; and the VIP latrine at Katikara</li> <li>o Progress report dated June 30, 2017: documented the borehole drilling supervision; Kisiita piped WSS; functionality of water sources; and O&amp;M status of water source committees</li> <li>o 4 out of 4 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: o List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10</li> </ul>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kakumiro LG intends to implement the following WSS projects during FY 2017/18: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Drilling and installation of 7 No. deep boreholes</li> <li>o Drilling of 2 No. production wells and pump testing</li> <li>o Rehabilitation of 10 No. boreholes</li> <li>o Construction of Kisiita piped WSS Phase III</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The above list is consistent with MWE's MIS records for district WSS facilities FY 2017/18</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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DWO submitted procurement requests for the projects listed in performance measure 4 on August 3, 2017 – with the following details: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Construction of Kisiita piped WSS Phase III (UGX 152m)</li> <li>o Drilling and installation of 7 No. deep boreholes (UGX 140m)</li> <li>o Drilling of 2 No. production wells and pump-testing (UGX 54m)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The PDU records confirm submission of the PRs was beyond the April 30 deadline</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

- From the contract management documents reviewed, the LG's political leadership, technocrats, opinion leaders and water users work hand-in-hand to secure timely and quality completion of WSS projects

- Commissioning notes dated May 20, 2017 address the ground opening of Kisiita piped WSS and also document readiness of the boreholes drilled in FY 2016/17 for takeover from the contractor

- The documents in the DWO's office suggest the LG did not have any major with contractors as whatever concerns raised were addressed by latter

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

2

- Field assessment was conducted for select WSS projects implemented in FY 2016/17; i.e. deep boreholes and public sanitation facility

- Whereas details of visited sites are provided in subsequent sections, it was established all the facilities were built as per designs



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the field assessments for selected WSS projects, the water users affirmed they were in charge of daily O&amp;M – complete with functional user committees</li> </ul>
<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 prepared completion reports and issued interim certificates for the assessed WSS projects. Certified works included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Rehabilitation of 10 No. deep boreholes – Art Centre Ltd (completion report April 28, 2017; payment certificate May 3, 2017 – UGX 29m)</li> <li>o Drilling, casting and installation of 7 No. deep boreholes –KLR Uganda Ltd (certificate of works April 18, 2017 – UGX 120.5m)</li> <li>o Construction of a 5-stance lined VIP at Katikara Market – SEV Electronics Ltd (April 4, 2017; UGX 10.5m)</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 Town Water Supply &amp; Sanitation Systems Phase 2 under Rural Water Grant worth 303,079,885 by Kesacon Services Ltd</p> <p>Contract date: 13/3/2017</p> <p>Certificate date: 28/6/2017</p> <p>Payment date:29/6/2018</p> <p>Voucher No.15/6/2017</p> <p>2) Drilling of 7 Deep Boreholes in Kakumiro DLG under PAF worth 125,874,140 by KLR Uganda Ltd.</p> <p>Contract date: 16/1/2017</p> <p>Certificate date: 18/4/2017</p> <p>Payment date: 51/5/2017</p> <p>Voucher No.7/5/2017</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 14/11/2016, Q2 20/2/2017, Q3 10/05/2017 and Q4 28/7/2017 as compilation dates, but submissions made by early mid July as testified by planner.</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>	3	<p>There was a query in quarter 3 for unaccounted funds worth 9,559,300. Accountability was later presented to the Internal Auditor and was cleared on 3/5/2017 as per Internal Auditor's stamp.</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>Committee discussed and presented to council of 30/03/2017 which approved the AWP 2017/18 under minute 48/KDLG/30/03/2017</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>No other issues were presented to council for approval. Except AWP 2017/18 under minute 48/KDLG/30/03/2017</p>
11	<p>The LG Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The annual workplan, budget and/or Water Development Grant are not displayed at the District notice board</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field assessment conducted on January 24, 2017 established WSS projects are properly labelled – with details of village, DWD unique number, date of completion, funder and contractor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Borehole #1 – Village: Kyaruzumba; Funder: Poverty Action Fund (PAF); MWE/DWD No.: 57090; Date: 16.03.2017; Contractor: KLR</li> <li>o Borehole #2 – Village: Kigoma; Funder: Poverty Action Fund (PAF); MWE/DWD No.: 57089; Date: 15.08.2017; Contractor: KLR</li> <li>o Borehole #3 – Village: Kaguwa; Funder: Poverty Action Fund (PAF); MWE/DWD No.: 57088; Date: 16.03.2017; Contractor: KLR</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
		<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 of assessment the following information was displayed on the district notice board: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Prequalified service providers</li> <li>o Successful bidders for borehole and drilling</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 from the following communities were reviewed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Kikora Parish, November 6, 2017; subject: new borehole</li> <li>o Kisiita Parish, January 14, 2018; subject: borehole spares</li> <li>o Nalweyo SSS, September 7, 2017; subject: borehole source</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>• Form 4. Source Functionality, Management and Gender is utilized to maintain water source records per county – disaggregated to village level</li> <li>• Records available include whether WSCs collect management fees, what the collections are used for – minor repairs and otherwise</li> <li>• The records are updated annually</li> <li>• Average district functionality stands at 81%</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				

13

The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management

Maximum 4 points for this performance measure

• 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

2

- The district natural resources officer (DNRO) prepares Environment and Social Screening Forms (ESSFs) for all WSS projects

- ESSFs for the sampled WSS projects proposed mitigation measures such as fencing boreholes, planting paspalum, and fulfilling community contributions – including the soak-away pits

- Mitigation measures were implemented as detailed in the corresponding Environment and Social Mitigation Certification Forms

• Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1

1

- For the sampled projects, only construction of Kisiita piped WSS had significant environmental concerns

- Mitigation measures proposed by the DRNO (that were acted upon) include restoration of borrow pit, availing protective gear – including first aid kits – to site crews and vegetation clearing

		<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>• Environmental protection is catered for in BOQs, which form part of works contracts for WSS projects</li> <li>• Provision for environmental protection include planting paspalum at water sources, installing cut-off drains and boarded fencing around the water sources</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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DWO does not maintain records of WSC composition – and was unable to avail evidence the LG conforms to sector requirements</li> <li>• It was agreed information on WSC, which the DWO claims is only kept at sub-county level, will be available before the next LG assessment</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>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 5-stance public VIP latrine at Katikara Market is sex-separated and easily accessible by PWDs</li> <li>• Budget limitation restrict the LG to not more than one new sanitation facility per year – or none at times</li> </ul>