



LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Luuka District

(Vote Code: 593)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	3	50%
No	3	50%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	xxx	<p>No, the final annual performance contract for the FY 2017/2018 was not submitted by 30th June according to the required evidence from MoFPED.</p> <p>According to date on the cover letter (Ref CR/103/2), the Final Performance Contract for Luuka DLG for the FY 2017/2018 was submitted to MoFPED on 4th July 2017.</p> <p>The contract was signed by the PSST on 26th July 2017 (Refer to Page 1 of the contract). According to the MoFPED Acknowledgement receipt serial number 4047, the signed contract was picked on 3rd Aug 2017.</p>	No
Assessment area: Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	xxxxx	<p>Yes, there is evidence that the Procurement Plan was submitted within the Performance Contract/ Budget for the FY 2017/2018. As per the dated stamps from PPDA, and MoFPED, the copy of the Luuka Procurement Plan for the FY 2017/2018 was submitted on 14th July 2017.</p>	Yes
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			

<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>XXXXXX</p>	<p>No, Luuka DLG did not submit her annual performance report on 31st July 2017.</p> <p>The report was submitted on 3rd August 2017.</p> <p>The Annual performance Report for the period FY 2016/2017 was received by MoFPED on 3rd Aug 2017 as per the MoFPED Acknowledgement receipt serial number 0899</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>XXXXXX</p>	<p>No. Despite the fact that the FY 2016/2017 performance report was submitted and included all the four quarters although the quarter 4 report was submitted later than 31 July.</p> <p>Refer to Quarter 1 Report submitted on 28th Nov 2016 as per the MoFPED Acknowledgement receipt serial number 0126</p> <p>Refer to Quarter 2 Report submitted on 14th Feb 2017 as per the MoFPED Acknowledgement receipt serial number 0336</p> <p>Refer to Quarter 3 Report submitted on 29th June 2017 as per the MoFPED Acknowledgement receipt serial number 0775</p> <p>Refer to Quarter 4 Report submitted on 3rd Aug 2017 as per the MoFPED Acknowledgement receipt serial number 0899</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>XXXXX</p>	<p>The LG had 10 issues raised in the Internal Auditor General's findings.</p> <p>All the 10 issues were responded to in the letter received in the office of the Internal Auditor General on 29th/11/2016 letter reference no. CR/251/1</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>The LG received an unqualified audit opinions. This was verified from the District audited financial statement for FY 2016/17 that was obtained at the Office of the Auditor General</p>	<p>Yes</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Luuka District

(Vote Code: 593)

Score 55/100 (55%)

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

Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.

Evidence that a municipality/district has:
• A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 2.

0

No, while the District has a Physical Planning Committee which was set up on 6th Oct 2014 when the 10 members were appointed, it is not functional.

Not all building application plans are approved by the committee. Instead they are approved by the District Health Inspector, District Natural Resource Officer, District Physical Planner, and District Engineer.

For appointment to the committee, refer to official letter written by the CAO on Monday 29th Jan 2018 to all the 10 appointed office bearers that are legally supposed to form part of the Committee as per the Physical Planning Act 2010. The committee is missing the surveyor in private practise.

The Physical planner notes that the committee met four times but only has evidence of two committee meetings held in the FY 2016/2017 as per the minutes shared; Quarter 3 minutes for meeting held 13th March 2017 which was printed and received in the Central Registry 27th March 2017. Quarter 4 minutes for meeting held 27th April 2017 which was printed and received in the Central Registry 4th May 2017.

The DLG has a building Plan registration book which was opened on 29th January 2016. For the FY 2016/2017 seven building plan applications were submitted.

Sample One: Building plan application submitted by St. Paul P/S on 10th Feb 2017, and discussed on 13 March 2017 during the committee meeting held 13 March 2017 under Min DPPC03/13/03/3017. Turnaround time is 21 days.

Sample Two: Building plan Application submitted by ATC Uganda Limited on 10th Feb 2017, and discussed on 12th March 2017. This plan was approved by the District Health Inspector, District Environment and Natural Resource Officer, District Health Inspector, District Physical Planner, and District Engineer. Turnaround time is 20 days.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2. 	0	<p>No, there is no evidence that new infrastructures with approved plans have been built according with the approved plans. While there is evidence of inspection reports – the authenticity of the inspection reports is questionable.</p> <p>The two reports for the FY 2016/2017 developed by the Physical Planner on 27th March 2017 and 26th June 2017 are similar word for word in all sections save the introductory paragraph. The reports do not clearly specify that the follow up inspection of construction sites with approved plans was conducted</p>
2	<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2. 	2	<p>Yes, there is evidence that the priorities in the AWP for the current FY were based on the outcomes of the budget conference for FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>Note: The Budget Conference was held on 16th Nov 2017 as per budget conference report shared. The report included the summary of key issues discussed and agreed upon, as well as the program and conference attendance schedule.</p> <p>Refer to the Conference report dated 15th Dec 2016 in the priorities investments under Education sector (Page 2). The investments identified included 5 stance pit latrines for 3 primary schools in Bukooma S/C, Waibuga S/C, and Ikumbya S/C respectively. A review of the planned activities in the FY 2017/2-18 AWP under Education Department planned outputs (Page 22) indicates that the DLG planned to construct 5 stance latrines in primary schools within 5 sub counties 3 of which were those derived from the Budget Conference namely Bukooma S/C, Waibuga S/C, and Ikumbya S/C.</p> <p>Similarly refer to the Conference report in the priorities investments under Water and Sanitation sector (Page 3). The investments identified included a department vehicle and construction of public toilets in 2 RGCs. A review of the planned activities in the FY 2017/2-18 AWP under Water planned outputs (Page 27) indicates that the DLG planned to buy a department vehicle, as well as construct public latrines in Bulanga and Bukanga – Bukedi RGCs.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If different, justification has to be provided and evidence that it was approved by Council. Score 2. 	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>	<p>Yes there is evidence that indicates that the capital investments in the Approved Annual Work Plan for FY 2017/2018 were derived from the DDP. A review of the project profiles for capital investment activities in the FY 2017/2018 AWP from page 242 to 273 indicates a linkage with the two documents.</p> <p>For example a review of the project profile for the procurement of a department vehicle under Water (Page 248) can be traced back to Page 27 of the AWP for the FY 2017/2018 under Education where purchase of transport equipment for the sector was planned for.</p> <p>Another example can be viewed on Page 261 in the project profile for the construction of primary school classrooms under Education and Sports. This can be traced back to Page 21 of the AWP for the FY 2017/2018 under Education where the construction of primary school classrooms for the sector was planned for.</p> <p>Note: The AWP and Budget for the FY 2017/2018 for Luuka DLG was approved by the District Council at a council meeting held 26th May 2016 under Minute 07/LDC/05/2017</p> <p>The five year DDP for Luuka DLG was also approved by the District Council at a council meeting held 25th Feb 2015 under Minute 07/LDC/2/2015</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 1. 	<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>	<p>Yes, there is evidence that profiles for investments in the AWP for the FY 2017/2018 have been developed and discussed in the TPC as per the LG Planning Guidelines.</p> <p>The Luuka DLGG contains project profiles for all planned investment activities. Refer to page 242 to 273 which covers Financial Years from 2015 /16 to 2019/20.</p> <p>Refer to the Extended DTPC meeting held 8th Nov 2016 where all departments and members of the DEC presented and discussed the 2017/2018 Proposed projects under Min 08/11/2016</p>

3	<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual statistical abstract, with gender disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum 1 point. 	1	<p>Yes, there is evidence that a statistical abstract for FY 2016/2017 was developed and contains gender disaggregated data. For example refer to Page 34, Page 40</p> <p>There is also evidence that a statistical abstract for FY 2016/2017 was developed and presented to the TPC during meeting held 8th June 2017 under Minute 04/TPC/06/2017</p>
4	<p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2 	2	<p>Yes there is evidence that the infrastructural projects implemented by Luuka DLG in FY 2016/2017 were derived from the Annual Work plan for FY 2016/2017.</p> <p>For example refer to the FY 2016/2017 LG Quarterly Performance Report under the Cumulative Department Work plan Performance for Administration (Page 78) where one Council Hall was rehabilitated and the 1ST phase of construction of the DLG Administration block was undertaken. A review of the AWP FY 2016/2017 Work plan Details for the Administration (Page 84) indicates that the rehabilitation of 1 Council Hall, and Phase One construction of the DLG Administration block was planned for.</p> <p>Also refer to the FY 2016/2017 LG Quarterly Performance Report under the Cumulative Department Work plan Performance for Production and Marketing (Page 87) where the construction of the one crop diagnostic lab was undertaken. A review of the AWP FY 2016/2017 Work plan Details for Production and Marketing (Page 92) indicates that construction of the one crop diagnostic lab was planned for.</p> <p>Note: The AWP and Budget for the FY 2016/2017 for Luuka DLG was approved by the District Council at a council meeting held 9TH May 2016 under Minute 07/LDC/05/2016.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	4	<p>Yes, data indicates that the investment projects implemented in FY 2016/2017 were completed as per the FY work plan.</p> <p>A review of the Highlights of Revenue and Expenditure for the FY 2016/2017 indicates 100% cumulative annual average absorption under the Domestic Development, and Donor Development grant. Refer to pages 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22 24, 25 of the 2016/2017 Annual Performance Report.</p>
5	<p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects and assets during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	2	<p>Yes, investment projects in the previous FY were completed within the approved Budget – plus or minus 15%</p> <p>A review of the Annual Performance Report for the FY 2016/2017 under the tabular Highlights of the Revenue and Expenditure of the 11 departments indicates a cumulative absorption rate of 100%. As such there is no cumulative variance (0%) on the budget under total expenditures under Domestic Development Expenditures and Donor Development Expenditures specifically.</p> <p>To review the data used to calculate the percentage of total expenditure in comparison to the approved Budget, look at the tabular highlights of the Revenue and Expenditure of the 11 departments on pages 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22 24, 25 of the 2016/2017 Annual Performance Report.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	2	<p>Yes, the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O and M budget on infrastructure. A review of the tabular Cumulative Department Work plan Performance for the FY 2016/2017 indicates that the O and M expenditure for four sampled departmental project activities is at an average of 86.3%.</p> <p>For example refer to Page 78, under Administration under Rehabilitation of the Council Hall up to 100%.</p> <p>Refer to Page 79, under Finance under Machinery Other was utilized by up to 53.1%.</p> <p>Under Roads and Engineering refer to Pages 116 – 118 for the budget under periodic and routine maintenance of District Roads utilized by up to 75.3%.</p> <p>We can also refer to Water Department under Rehabilitation of Deep Boreholes (Page 123) where the budget was utilized by up to 86.3%.</p>
--	--	---	---	--

Assessment area: Human Resource Management

6	<p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	0	<p>Seen annual performance reports for (2) heads of departments (on assignment) for D/Production Officer and D/Natural Resources Officer. Their annual performance reports for FY 2016/17 were signed on 30/6/17 and 20/6/17 respectively. However, the annual performance reports for the other (8) HoDs were not availed to the assessor.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3 	0	<p>There are (10) Heads of departments (HoDs) as per the approved structure dated 2/4/2017. Out of the (10) positions of HoDs, only (1) position of the district planner was substantively filled. While (8) positions are filled with staff on assignment. They include DE, DEO, DCDO, DNRO, DHO, CFO, D/Commercial Officer and DPO. The position of D/CAO fell vacant on 12/1/17. It was noted that (2) positions were advertised (D/Engineer & D/Production officer under external advert No.3/2016) but failed to attract qualified candidates. It was further noted that a number of personnel files for staff on assignment were missing due to poor records keeping and inadequate space for the registry (open space) hence high risk of losing documents</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"> • Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	0	<p>In FY2016/17, a total of (45) posts were submitted to DSC for filling by the CAO as per the (5) submission letters dated between 22/8/16 and 15/6/17. #27 out of (45) posts were considered by the DSC under the following minutes: minutes of the 4th LK DSC meeting held on 10/3/17 under min.23/LK/DSC/03/17 (iii-ix); minutes of the 5th LK DSC meeting held on 27/3/17 under Min.23/LK/DSC/03/17 (iv); minutes of the 7th LK DSC meeting held on 27/5/17 under Min.38/39/LK/DSC/5/17 (h); and minutes of the 6th LK DSC meeting held on 19/5/17</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	0	<p>In FY 2016/17, the CAO submitted (74) LG staff to DSC for confirmation as per (6) submission letters dated between 25/10/16 and 23/5/17. #14 out of (74) LG staff were considered by the DSC. Refer to the minutes of the 60th meeting of LK DSC held on 21/7/16 under Min.3/LK/DSC/21/7/2016. In addition, (51) health workers were confirmed during the 8th LK DSC meeting held on 16/6/17 under Min.43/LK/DSC/06/17 e (i) but submission list not seen.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	1	<p>In FY 2016/17, the CAO submitted (14) cases of abandonment for disciplinary action to DSC as per the letter dated 11/4/17. The DSC considered all the (14) cases during the 5th LK DSC meeting held on 7/4/17 under Min.28/LK/DSC/04/17 (vi)</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"> • 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 	0	<p>From a list of new employees recruited in FY 2016/17, it was found that 89.3 % (25) out of (28) new staff recruited on probation accessed the salary payroll within (2) months after appointment. Only 10.7% (3) LG staff did not access the payroll within the stipulated time. E.g. a) IPPS no.1011468 (appointed on 30/5/17 and accessed the payroll in October 2017); b) IPPS no.1011474 (appointed on 10/4/17 and accessed in August 2017); etc. This was because positions were not created on the IPPS</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2 	0	<p>From the status report of pensioners who retired in FY 2016/17, it was found that all the (13) LG staff who retired in FY 2016/17, did not access the pension payroll within 2 months after retirement. E.g. IPPS nos.249834 (retired on 9/12/16 and accessed in October 2017); 250287 (retired on 24/9/16 and accessed in September 2017); 250048 (retired 26/1/2017 and not yet accessed); 252195 (retired on 30/12/16 and not yet accessed), etc.</p>
Assessment area: Revenue Mobilization				
9	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If increase in OSR from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10% : score 4 points If the increase is from 5 -10% : score 2 point If the increase is less than 5% : score 0 points. 	4	<p>From the review of the annual final accounts of FY 2015/16 & 2016/17 it was found out that Luuka District increased its local revenue collections by 34% from UGX 91,007,030/= that was collected in 2015/16 FY to UGX 122,317,417/= that was collected in 2016/17 FY.</p>
10	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10% : then 2 points. If more than +/- 10% : zero points. 	2	<p>The LG had budgeted to collect UGX 89,609,020 this was later revised to UGX 122,317,417/= since the LG Act permits Local Governments to approve supplementary budgets, the assessment team considered the approved revised budget (the same budget that is reflected in the audited final accounts)</p> <p>In 2016/17 the District was able to collect all the 122,317,417/= hence realizing a budget collection ration of 0.</p>

11

Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

• Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2

0

The LG collected the following taxes on behalf of the LLG:

- o LST of UGX 75,557,413;
- o Animal husbandry UGX 616,000;
- o Trading licenses 8,820,000;
- o Market due 3,410,000
- o Total collected UGX 88,403,413

Of the 88,403,413 the District remitted UGX 52,099,444/= which was 59% of the local revenue collected on behalf of the LLG.

This was below the allowable 65%

• Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2

2

The LG spent only UGX 1,500,000/= of its local revenue to finance council expenses which is 1.6% of the local revenue of the previous financial year. This was to cater for burial expenses of a Councillor who had passed on

o Paid on 11th May 2017

All other expenditures for council were financed using the unconditional grant in total UGX 133,913,000/= was used to finance Council expenditure this was far higher than the total local revenue collections for the whole financial year.

The reason given for not using the local revenue to pay for Council expenditure was that the LG only collects very little revenue and this little collected is used to top up the departments that lack sufficient resources for example; natural resources, audit, education (supervision component), administration and community

The assessor has awarded the LG the score since the indicator was only assessing a percentage of local revenue that was used to finance council expenditures.

Although the LG has obtained the score, using the unconditional grant to finance Council Expenses constrains other departments from attaining finances to run their operations since a very big percentage of the grant was taken by Council

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

Yes , there was evidence of an appointment on promotion from procurement to senior procurement Officer dated 8th February 2018 under Min.64/LK/DSC/02/18(a) signed by CAO Makumbi Henry Harrison.

On the same file the Procurement Officer was last renewed the assigned duties of Senior Procurement Officer by CAO Maweje Andrew on 28th January 2016.

The assessor notes the freshness of the appointment of the sole officer and the effort to comply with the assessment.

There was no substantive appointment for a procurement Officer. .

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	1	<p>Yes there was evidence that TEC produced reports as evidenced by ;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LUUK 593/Supp/16-17/0001 Toyota double cabin Hilux report dated 8/8/2016 submitted for DCC decision on 15/8/2016 under Min 05/DCC/08/2016. LUUK 593/Wrks/16-17/0002 construction of a 2-classroom block and Furniture at Nakabugu Muslim Seed Secondary School recommended by TEC on 8/8/2016 and awarded by DCC of 15/8/2016 under Min 05/DCC/08/2016(e) LUUK 593/WRKS/16-17/0006 construction of 2 Five stance lined pit Latrines at Bukhaana and Buyinze P/Ss which was submitted to DCC on 7/9/2016 under Min.05/DCC/09/2016(b) LUUK 593/WRKS/16-17/0009 completion of a science diagnostic lab recommended by TEC on 16/8/2016 and awarded by DCC on 7/9/2016 under Min 05/DCC/09/2016(a) LUUK 593/WRKS/16-17/000 10 construction of a Four stance Lined Pit Latrine with Urinal at Bukanga –Bukendi which was awarded by DCC of 7/9/2016 under Min 05/DCC/09/2016(i). <p>In summary, the TEC prepared reports and submitted to DCC</p>
--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	1	<p>Yes, there was evidence that TEC recommendations were upheld by DCC given the samples below;</p> <p>LUUK 593/WRKS/16-17/0005 completion of classroom block with an office at Buwologoma P/S awarded to Tubutute at 44,499,570/=</p> <p>LUUK 593/WRKS/16-17/00012 Renovation of the Council hall to Ms MUZA General Enterprises at 32,984,000/=</p> <p>LUUK 593/WRKS/16-17/0003 construction of a two classroom block at St. Thomas Makulutu P/S by Ms Barike Investments Ltd</p> <p>On top of the sampled ones above .</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"> • 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 	0	<p>The assessor notes that the AWP and Budget copy availed was not duly signed by the heads of departments and did not contain the workplan details and output sections. It also does not depict the LLG submissions under the District heads of department much as the cover page bore the Signature of the LC V Chairman of 1/7/2017.</p> <p>On page 17 of the education planned outputs was construction a 2 classroom block included Ikumbya p/s which was not reflected in the Procurement plan.</p> <p>Construction of 5-stance latrines in the AWP was listing Nawansega, Mawundo and Ntayigirwa while the Procurement plan contained Mawundo ,Namulanda and BUgabula</p> <p>Desks: the work plan was targeting Budoma, Nakavuma, Busala, Bulanga and Ikumbya while the Procurement plan catered for Bulanga, Budoma, and Nakavuma.</p> <p>4 Stance Latrine in Budondo s/c was not refelctng in the AWP and Budget.</p> <p>Water sources of 12 boreholes to be drilled were not all reflected in the Procurement plan.</p> <p>Roads were so lumped yet the AWP details were not availed.</p> <p>In summary the assessor finds the procurement plan not covering all the infrastructure projects as laid out in the AWP</p>

		<p>(adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2</p>		<p>and Budget.</p> <p>b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan for the previous FY.</p> <p>In the Procurement report Qtr 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • was opening and shaping of Busiuro – Nanvuunano- Kasone (3km) road was not found in the Procurement plan of Waibuga sub county. • Renovation of proposed structure for Luuka T/C HCIII (phase II) was not found in the procurement plan • Spot improvement of Bukanga – Bukyega – Buwologoma – Nakamiti was not in the procurement plan. There was no evidence to the claim of decision by the sub county executive due to presidential visit. <p>It was concluded then that the LG made some procurements that did not adhere to the procurement plan of FY2016/17.</p>
14	<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30: score 2 	2	<p>Yes, there was evidence by the advert in the Daily Monitor of 16th May 2017 on page 34 of bid Notice published on 16/5/2016 and closing date of 5/6/ 2017.</p> <p>Secondly the standard Bidding Documents for construction of 12 Deep wells , construction of a 2-classroom block and construction of latrines were all issued in May 2017</p> <p>The quarterly reports 1 and 2 of 17/18 were all under open domestic bidding .implying that the bids were all in place by the time of the advert. The assessor concludes that over 80% of the bids were prepared by 30th August.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2 	0	<p>There were 17 (out of which 6 were under open domestic) action files presented for 2016/17 and the contracts register contained 18 projects for 2016/17.</p> <p>The sampled files included:</p> <p>Some files contained only interim certificates and not completion certificates because they were still pending for retention releases which the contractors had not requested for e.g installation of Hand pump borehole parts SVCS 0001 and Renovation of Doctors House at Kiyunga HC iV wkrs 00016</p> <p>. The assessor notes that MoSE has a standard certificate which does not cater for interim certification under SFG projects. This aspect was therefore overlooked for SFG procurements in education.</p> <p>Construction of a two classroom block with furniture at Nakabugu Muslim seed school lacked a progress report and Certificate 01 dated 31/01/2017 worth 86,951,144.</p> <p>Some action files lacked the environment certification yet the completion certificates were attached.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	2	<p>Yes, the procurement register, the procurement reports and adverts as well as the action files were perused and the assessor found no violation of the threshold guidelines. Besides, in 2017/18 all projects were advertised under open domestic national. The assessor therefore concludes that the LG adhered with the thresholds.</p>

15

The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

- 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

0

- MoSE certificates do not specify interim and completion but they were dully signed.
- Some files were pending for retention clearance hence lacked the Completions certificates
- Nonetheless the certificates of some sorts were on flie for each action file
- Construction of Nakabugo Muslim Secondary School omitted CAOs signature on the certificate.

Not all files were appropriately certified as implemented in the previuos FY.

- Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2

0

Yes, there was evidence that all works projects for the current FY are labelled as per the samples below;

- Budoma Muslim Primary School in Bukanga s/c had a visible label on the wall but it did not indicate the contract value. The school had an agreement for the land owned by the muslim community but none with the LG.

They had received 38 desks all labelled.

(Latitude 0.7146 ; Longitude 33.397; Altitude 1106.2)

- A fresh slab for a borehole (seemingly old) at Butimbwa was labelled DWD 61431 dated 08/02/2018. The land owner did not seem certain of the land agreement.

(Latitude 0.6256 ; Longitude 33.40356; Altitude 1128.2)

- At Mawundo Pr. Sch in Waibuga s/c was a 4 stance pit Latrine hurriedly labelled on the rough cast surface. It also lacked the contract value.

(Latitude 0.5886 ; Longitude 33.4107; Altitude 1104.5)

Bridging of Kigaya – Itakaibolu 400 swamp along Waibuga – Busiro Road by Installation of one line 600mm-900mm culverts and levelling was labelled without contract value. The label was at (Latitude 0.6389 ; Longitude 33.364; Altitude 1173ft)

The assessor visited four projects due to distances and time since the next assessor was waiting.

In conclusion the labels lacked detail hence not clear

16	<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4 	4	<p>From the review of the cashbooks, it was observed that the LG made monthly bank reconciliations for all accounts. And these reconciliations were up-to-date.</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"> • If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2. 	2	<p>For all the contracts that were implemented in 2016/17 it was found out that the LG paid all suppliers on time (that is to say no outstanding bills for over two months) apart from one payment which was:</p> <p>Payment to MAA technologies for drilling and pump testing 6 boreholes an invoice was raised on 25th/10/16 and payment effected on 21st/03/2017.</p> <p>The reason given for this delay was that the contractor was expected to drill 6 boreholes but by the time of his invoicing he had only successfully completed 5 boreholes the 6th one was a dry well (not producing water) thus the invoice was not certified until when the contractor had successfully finalized all the pending works. The certificate of completion was thus given on 21st/02/17 and the payment was effected on 21st/03/2017 thus the assessor has awarded scores to the LG</p>

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.

3

The department is headed by a Chief Internal Auditor (Principal Level) by the names of Tenywa Joseph who was appointed on promotion on 11th June 2003. Min No. 61/2003.

The internal audit department has produced all the four quarterly internal audit reports on the following dates:

- o Q1 on 15th/10/2016
- o Q2 on 9th/03/2017
- o Q3 on 27th/04/2017
- o Q4 on 13th/08/2017

- Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries: score 2.

0

There was no evidence seen confirming that the accounting officer has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings

What was seen were quarterly internal audit responses and implementation status of the recommendation for FY 2016/17

However the assessment team could not consider these sufficient since they were addressed to the Chairperson Regional Audit Committee Eastern and not copied to either the District Chairman or Council and there was no evidence seen to confirm that the District chairman and Council received copies of these reports.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1 	0	<p>The internal audit department produced and submitted all the four quarterly internal audit reports to the LG registry on the following dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Q1 on 24th/11/2016 o Q2 on 21st /03/2017 o Q3 on 29th/05/2017 o Q4 on 29th/08/2017 <p>LG PAC reviewed 2 of the four internal audit report and produced Minute and reports as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o District Public Accounts Committee Report after examining the Internal Audit Report for Luuka District Departments for Q1 for the FY 2016/17 produced on 24th May 2017 o District Public Accounts Committee Report after examining the Internal Audit Report for Luuka District Departments for Q2 for the FY 2016/17 produced on 24th October 2017 <p>The LG failed to score on this indicator for two reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Not all the internal audit reports were discussed o No evidence seen on follow up of LG PAC reports.
19	<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	0	<p>The District has an assets register that was last updated on 29/12/2017.</p> <p>This assets register is however not comprehensive, it does not include buildings and land. The focus was mainly on cars, plants and equipment.</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 LG received an unqualified audit opinion this was verified from the review of the audited annual final accounts for 2016/17 that was obtained at OAG.</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>Yes. The council meets and discusses service delivery issues including the DTPC reports, performance, and monitoring reports.</p> <p>For example the District Council held a meeting on 23 May 2017 and discussed and approved key service delivery policy documents like the Good Governance and Anti - Corruption Strategy, Luuka O and M policy, HIV AIDS work place policy. Annual Work Plan, and the Local Revenue Enhancement Plan. Refer to MIN.NO 07/LDC/05/2017 Page 9 where the council deliberated on and approved the O and M policy.</p> <p>In addition the LG PAC reports are submitted to the office of the District Chairperson. Ref to Quarter 1 LG PAC report dated 24th May 2017 received by the District Chairperson on 7th Dec 2017. This is evidenced by the signature of the Secretary to the District Chairperson Ms. Mutesi Hadija.</p>
22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2.</p>	2	<p>No, there is evidence that the district has a designated team that has been formally assigned to respond to grievances, feedback from the citizens on the budget desk.</p>

23	<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published: • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</p>	2	<p>Yes, the LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedules were posted on the wall at the HR office. There is no evidence that Procurement and Contracts were published on notice boards within the DLG Admin block No, there is evidence to show that the district performance results for the FY 2016/2017 and budget implications are shared and published.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1 	0	<p>There is no evidence that Procurement and Contracts were published on notice boards within the DLG Admin block</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications, are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1. 	0	<p>No, there is no evidence to show that the district performance results for the FY 2016/2017 since the assessment has not been carried out in the previous year.</p>
24	<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1 	0	<p>There is no evidence that the policies, guidelines and circulars shared with the District were submitted to the LLGs.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG during previous FY has conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc..) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1. 	1	<p>Yes, there is evidence to show that the district engages the community to share feedback on the status of project implementation.</p> <p>For example a review of the LG Performance Report for the FY 2017/2018 under Production and Marketing indicates that the 4 market information reports were disseminated within all her trading centres (Page 88). The report also indicates that the DLG engaged community members on an ongoing district project in apiculture within 8 sub counties (Page 87)</p>
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				

<p>25</p> <p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG gender focal person has provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities score 2. 	0	<p>There was no evidence that gender focal person gave guidance to the sector departments.</p> <p>The Officer (DCDO) referred to some TPC minutes which were not availed for the assessment and later on he acknowledged they were for previous FY, but still not availed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that gender focal point has planned activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and that more than 90% of previous year's budget for gender activities has been implemented: score 2. 	2	<p>The assessor found generic statements with no specific emphasis to women empowerment in the AWP and Budget fir the current FY. The meetings and training aspect therein was to focus on children rights, gender based violence, gender issues and group dynamics.</p> <p>Given that there were 50 groups to be mobilised and trained including women and youth groups the assessor takes it that women groups would be trained accordingly.</p> <p>FY 2016 the total CBSD Approved Budget was 143,270,000 /=</p> <p>The releases were;</p> <p>Local Revenue = 1,870,246</p> <p>13 Staff Wages = 93,701,000</p> <p style="text-align: right;">138,365,097/143,270,000</p> <p>=96.6%</p>

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

0

Yes, The Environment Officer is AG. DNRO, lands Officer and Physical Planner they are a lean team in the department.

There was evidence of projects being screened in 2016/17 under the roads and water sectors where mitigation measures were suggested by the Environment Officer and forwarded to CAO on a date which was vague by the stamp.(the assessor requested the officer to prove that the screening was submitted to CAO).

Mitigation measures were not planned and budgeted for deliberately. Even under Natural resources there was no budget under environment monitoring and inspections. However, the BoQs for the water and education projects provided for environment aspects.

In conclusion, there was no deliberate plan and budget in the AWP and Budget for mitigation measures.

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

0

There was no evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents. The PDU uses the standard formats of PPDA which are not environmentally and socially updated

- Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1

0

There was no evidence of ownership for the projects that were being implemented. The Lands Officer however alluded to a title for the district headquarters which was not availed as evidence to the assessor.

There was only a cadastral survey for Nawanyago Parents in Ikumbya Sub county which was submitted on 7/2/2018 by Jensonstar Solutions.

The Lands Officer noted lack of coordination with the other sector heads and within the department given that she was not aware of the assessment exercise.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2 	2	<p>Yes, there was evidence of 9 environmental and social Mitigation Certification Forms for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two Eco stoves of 2017-18, dated 18th September 2017 • Budhabangula – Naigobya road (9.8km) dated 20/6/2017 • Busaala -Namulanda (13.7km) dated 21/6/2017 both under Force on Account • Rehabilitation of 41.6km in Nakalama and Nawandala s/c roads under CAIP dated 11/04/2017 again certified on 21/12/2016 but tress had not been planted then • Completion of a 2-classroom block with Office at Buwologoma P/s in Bukanga s/c dated 21/12/2016 • Construction of a science diagnostic lab dated 10th Jan 2017 • Completion of a 2-classroom block with Office at Buwologoma P/S in Bukanga s/c dated 21/12/2016 • Construction of a 2 classroom block at Kituuko P/s dated 14/12/2016 all the above signed by the Environment Officer <p>The assessor could not trace the certificates for all completed projects but the above samples were presented for the assessment.</p>
--	--	---	---	---



LGPA 2017/18

Educational Performance Measures

Luuka District

(Vote Code: 593)

Score 31/100 (31%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				
1	<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4 	4	<p>There is evidence for budgeting in FY 2017/2018 with a wage bill of 8,190,238,000 catering for 88 Primary Schools as per performance contract submitted to MoFPED on 4/07/2017 by CAO</p> <p>Teachers budgeted for are 1,314 including Head Teachers as per page 17 of the Performance Contract.</p> <p>Budget in place for 1 head teacher & minimum of 7 teachers per school.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4 	0	<p>In FY 2017/2018 there are 72 Substantive Head teachers out of 88 Teachers required as per DEO's status report to CAO about status of Head Teachers on 10/01/2018. There are 1272 Teachers deployed inclusive of Head Teachers.</p> <p>There is a submission of vacancies for replacement on 24/01/2018 by DEO to CAO. There is an internal advert for 2 deputy head Teachers and 1 Senior Education assistant on the Noticeboard, run on 30/01/2018.</p> <p>Given the availability of the internal advert, all the vacant posts were not catered for in the advert.</p>

2	<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% score 6 If 80 - 99% score 3 If below 80% score 0 	3	<p>It's clear that out of the 1,314 teachers with wage bill provision in the performance contract FY 2017/2018 on page 17, the district has 1,272 teachers in place with a gap of 42 teachers as per DEO's submission to CAO on 14/08/2017.</p> <p>1272/1314 = 96.8% staffing rate.</p>
3	<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	0	<p>There are no substantive Inspectors of schools in the department.</p> <p>The approved LG staff structure as communicated by PS – public service on 2nd February 2017 clearly provides for 2 inspectors of schools, however there are people in acting capacity in the inspectorate such as Ag. DIS and Ag. Inspector of schools who are all former Head Teachers of primary schools and they have not yet accessed the pay roll of the district.</p>

4	<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of Primary Teachers: score 2</p>	0	<p>There are several submissions for recruitment made by Ag. DEO to CAO as shared below</p> <p>1. Submission of Vacancies for replacement for FY 16/17 for 19 teacher on 28/11/2017 received in registry on 1/12/2017</p> <p>There was a Minute extract issued by the Secretary DSC to CAO on 18/12/2017 and 22/12/2017 showing the 19 posts.</p> <p>There is no clear submission from the DEO to the HRM or CAO about positions reflected in the Recruitment plan of the District.</p> <p>The district recruitment plan was not seen to be evident at the department however some posts were seen to be declared to CAO but were not closing the gap in totality.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of School Inspectors: score 2</p>	0	<p>There was no submission evident at the time of assessment for filling of the positions of Inspectors of schools.</p>
5	<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY • 100% school inspectors: score 3</p>	0	<p>The (2) positions of inspectors of schools are not substantively filled as per the approved education department structure dated 2/2/17. The evidence on file indicated that: a) Nabwire Jane (assigned duties of Senior Inspector on 10/4/17 by CAO) was appraised for FY 2016/17 on 31/12/16 by DCAO b) There was no evidence of appraisal report for Mabuzi Moses (assigned duties as inspector of schools on 18/7/16 by CAO) for FY 2016/17</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>The annual performance reports for (88) primary head teachers for calendar year 2016 not seen, claimed to be still at sub county level</p>

Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection

<p>6</p>	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>0</p>	<p>There are some minutes of meetings held with head teachers capturing some of the communications as listed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minutes of a meeting held on 1/08/2017 for the Executive meeting which reflected communication about NIRA registration on page 1 2. Another set of minutes of a meeting held on 23/5/2017 at Rockland SS captured the DIS communicating about declaration of non – UPE candidates to UNEB. 3. In the same meeting on 23/5/2017 the DIS also communicated about the government programme on EGR training and plan to train current teachers. <p>However it should be noted that there was effort to communicate some of the Policies and guidelines top Head Teacher but not all the Policies were communicated</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level, including on school feeding: score 2 	<p>0</p>	<p>There is no evidence that the education department explained and sensitised schools about Policies especially the one on schools feeding.</p> <p>It was not evident at the time of assessment but the department informed the assessing team that they talked about it verbally.</p>

The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all private and public primary schools

Maximum 12 for this performance measure

• Evidence that all private and public primary schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59% score 1 o Below 50% score 0.

0

Only 3 Quarterly reports are in place with details as summarised below

Q1, - There was no evidence that Q1 report was prepared and submitted to CAO. However the DIS informs report was submitted to DES but could not retrieve it.

Q2 – report was prepared by DIS on 21/12/2016 and received by registry on 13/12/2016. 44 Government schools were inspected and 7 private schools were inspected.

Q3 – Report was submitted on 2nd April 2017. It covered inspection of 50 government schools and 10 private schools

Q4 – Report was evident as prepared on 28/6/2017 then submitted to CAO and it shows inspection of 65 government schools and 32 private schools. Inspection of 88 government schools once per term lead to 264 inspections in a year. 69 private schools translate to 207 Required Inspections in a year.

154/264 government inspection added to 49/207 private inspection yields to 203/417 = 43.09%

LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations

Maximum 10 for this performance measure

- Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4

0

The available departmental minutes in place reflect the department discussing issues about schools and some little inspection feedback.

However it is not evident that the Inspection reports were clear as an agenda item, hence little details were discussed. There were no corrective actions put in place after these meetings.

These minutes were held on 30/8/2017 and another meeting held on 13th April 2017. All these meetings were held in the DEO's office.

- 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

2

There is evidence for submission of inspection reports to DES by the DIS

Q1 Inspection report was submitted on 22/09/2016

Q4 Inspection progressive report was received by DES on 16/11/2017.

Q2 & Q3 report received by DES on 17/7/2017

- Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4

0

There was no follow up done on the inspection recommendations

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>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5</p>	5	<p>List of schools submitted in the EMIS report are consistent with those in OBT.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nawaka P/S 2. Busanda P/S 3. Budhana P/S 4. Namadope P/S 5. Kiroba P/s
		<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>Sampled school's enrolment data from the EMIS report doesn't tally with OBT as shown below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Budhaana P/S had 644 on EMIS database while 644 on the OBT report 2. Ikonja P/S had 1,095 pupils in EMIS report while 1,317 on the OBT report 3. Budhabangula P/S had 1,060 pupils on EMIS database while 2,359 pupils on OBT. 4. Namukubembe P/S had 673 pupils on EMIS database while 661 on OBT 5. Wandago P/S had 655 pupils on EMIS database while 654 on OBT. <p>The above data reflects that the EMIS data doesn't tally with the OBT report</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"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc...during the previous FY: score 2 	2	<p>Yes, there is evidence that the Standing Committee on Social Services met and discussed Education service delivery issues like sector performance.</p> <p>For example refer to committee meeting report developed for committee meeting held 14th Sept 2016 and presented by the Committee Chairperson Hon. Mukasa Ronald. Refer to Page 5 where the DEO shared sector performance for planned activities in the FY 2015/2016 and planned project areas for the FY 2016/2017.</p> <p>Sector recommendations were summarised by the Committee for presentation to the fuller council.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2 	2	<p>Yes. The sector committee presented issues that require approval from council.</p> <p>Refer to District Council meeting held 30th Sept 2016 Minute MIN.04/LDC/ 9/2016 where the Chairperson of the Standing Committee for Social Services presented a report on the sector performance for the FY 2015/2016 and the planned priorities for the FY 2016/ 2017 to the fuller District Council for discussion.</p> <p>This submission was extracted out of a standing committee meeting report presented by Hon Ronald Mukasa for meeting held 14th Sept 2016</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	<p>All the 88 Schools had not fully submitted SMC data including Lists and Minutes to the DEO's office.</p> <p>Only 24 schools had submitted their operations to the DEO's office. The following schools were sampled as listed below</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bokoova P/S had minutes of one meeting held on 9/6/2016 evident. 2. Budhangula P/S had only one minute on file evident to have been held on 7/6/2017 3. Nakabondho P/S had only one minute held on 26/7/2016 4. Waibuga P/S had no minutes on file for the Assessed year. <p>This reflects that out of the sampled schools, no school had the required 3 minutes showing a functional SMC of schools. Hence all the schools have SMC's but are not functional</p> <p>i.e 0/5 = 0%</p>
12	<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</p>	3	<p>Yes, there is evidence that they have displayed Q3 Releases to the schools on the notice board as signed by the DEO on 30/01/2018. Also seen were the releases of Q4 evident in DEO's office stamped and signed on 11/03/2016</p>

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

13	<p>The LG Education department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	<p>4</p> <p>Procurement plan was in place for the education department and procurement requests were seen to be in place as summarized below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Procurement requests for Construction of a 2 classroom block at St. Thomas Makuutu P/S issued by DEO on 11/7/2016 and received by PDU on 19/7/2016 Procurement requests of classroom block at Kituuto P/S issued by DEO on 11/7/2016 and reached 19/7/2016 Procurement of 108 desks issued by DEO on 11/7/2016 and reached procurement on 19/7/2016 Procurement request for 5 stance pit latrine at Buyunze P/S initiated by DEO on 11/7/2016 and reached PDU on 19/7/2016 <p>All the procurement requests seen reached PDU before the required deadline of April 30th.</p>
----	---	--	--

14	<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	3	<p>From the review of 7 contracts that were implemented by the department in 2016/17 FY it was found out that the department approved payment for suppliers on time. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Contract to Sunland General Contractor for construction of a 5 stance pit latrine at Buyunze and Buchana PS an invoice was raised on 11/1/17 and HoD certified on 17/1/17 o Contract to Equator Agro enterprises for supply of 108 3 seater desks to St. Thomas an invoice was raised on 17/1/17 and HoD certified on 23/1/17 o Contract to Tebutuke Investments Ltd for construction of 2 classroom Block at Buwologoma PS an invoice was raised on 14th/12/16 and HoD approved on 22nd/12/16
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				
15	<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	0	<p>No, there is no evidence that the Department of Education submitted annual performance reports for all four quarters to the planner by Mid - July for consolidation.</p>

16	<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 4 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points o If all queries are not responded to score 0 	0	<p>The assessment team was not able to find all audit responses from the department yet a number of queries had been raised for example in Q4 the following issues were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Un maintained basic accounting records in some schools o Un availed/limited audit o Poor and relaxed accounting system in some schools o Un maintained contracts committees in some schools o Poor academic performance in some schools o Un authorized expenditures in some schools o Un titled school land among others
----	---	--	---	---

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

17	<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc...: Score 2 	0	<p>There was no evidence for dissemination of guidelines on how senior women teachers/Senior Men Teachers would provide guidance to girls and boys about hygiene</p> <p>However the attendances are claimed to be there for the training but they were not seen</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2 	0	<p>There was no activity held in the areas of girls sanitation and PWD's</p> <p>There was no evidence to prove that guidelines were issued out to schools.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	0	<p>Not all schools were adhering to the Gender Guidelines of At-least 2 women on the Foundation body. Sampled schools include</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. St. Thomas Makuutu P/S was not Complying as appointed on 21/6/2017 2. Buwiiri P/S was not complying as per appointment on 21/6/2017 3. Bigunho P/S was compliant as per appointment on 21/6/2017 4. Bukedi P/S was compliant as appointed on 21/6/20174 5. Bugabula P/S was compliant as appointed on 21/6/2017 <p>The above information shows that 3 out of the 5 schools sampled had schools meeting the gender guidelines of SMC's. This means that all the schools were not meeting the guidelines on gender composition</p>
18	<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 3: 	3	<p>There was an environment meeting held in DEO's office on 31/8/2016 chaired by the DIS in collaboration with Environment department. It was agreed to give out some seedlings to school.</p> <p>However trees planted were evident at the sampled schools as given out by the Environment department in collaboration with the Education Department</p> <p>Schools visited</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Budhabangula P/S 2. Naigobya P/S 3. Kiyunga P/S



LGPA 2017/18

Health Performance Measures

Luuka District

(Vote Code: 593)

Score 20/100 (20%)

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>	0	<p>There was no evidence of filling the PHC with wage bill. There was no recruitment plan from health department to HR, recruitment was on replacement basis namely the cold assistant in Kiyunga HCIV and Senior Clinical Officer in Waibuga HCIII.</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>	0	<p>There was no recruitment plan to HR and at HR there was no recruitment plan received from health department for the current year.</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>	0	<p>The annual performance appraisal report (2016/17) for the health facility in-charge (Bikaba Frank) for Kiyunga HC IV not seen.</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"> • Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers equitably, in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY: score 4 	0	<p>No deployment was done because no recruitment took place only two deployments happened on replacement basis.</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"> • Evidence that the 		<p>There was no evidence the DHOs office communicated all policies, guidelines and circulars. Most facilities didnt have circulars and few policies where available at facilities. Details are below.</p> <p>At the DHOs office the following policies and guidelines were available. Service Standards and Service Delivery Standards for the Health Sector July 2016, A guide for Reaching Every District and Every Child in Uganda National Expanded Programme on Immunisation, Investment Case for RMNCAH Sharpened Plan for Uganda 2016/17-2019/20, Consolidated Guidelines for Prevention and Treatment of HIV in Uganda. Health Sector Quality Improvement Framework and Strategic Plan 2015/16- 20119/20</p> <p>The following circulars were available. : Dated 19th August 2016 Pilot Testing of the Integrated Health Facility Electronic Data management tool, 3rd November 2016 Facility Assessment and mentorship Training in 30 Districts, 16th August 2016 Request for Collaboration on an Essential Child Medicines Assessment in the Public and Private Sector, 5TH June 2017 Conducting Health Facility Readiness Assessment to Receive Cold Chain Equipment 2017, 6th June 2017 Conducting an Ambulance Census in the Elgon and Busoga Sub Region, 24th August 2017 PMCTC Impact Evaluation</p> <p>At the facilities Kiyunga HCIV thee following guidelines were found: Consolidated Guidelines for Prevention and Treatment of</p>
---	--	---	--	--

<p>DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>HIV in Uganda, Integrating Nutrition Assessment Counselling and Support in Health Service Delivery, Health Sector Quality Improvement Framework and Strategic Plan 2015/16-2019/20 and Uganda Clinical Guidelines 2016, there was no circular for previous year.</p> <p>Bukanga HCIII: Achieving Equity in Immunisation Coverage by Reaching Every Community 2017, Immunisation in Practice Uganda 2017, Integrated Management of Childhood Illnesses 2017, Consolidated Guidelines for prevention and Treatment of HIV in Uganda 2016, Integrating Nutrition, Assessment and Counselling and Support into Health Service Delivery 2017, Maternal and Perinatal Deaths Surveillance and Response Guidelines 2017 there was no circular for the previous year.</p> <p>Bukendi HCII there was one policy Integrated Management of Childhood Illnesses 2017 and there were no circulars.</p> <p>Ikonja HCIII: There were no policies available and circulars.</p> <p>Both Balaam HCII and Nawampiti HCII were closed at the time of the visit.</p> <p>Irongo HCIII: Integrated Management of Childhood Illness , Viral Load Monitoring 2017, Integrating Nutrition Assessment Counselling and Support in Health Service Delivery, A Guide for Reaching Every District and Reaching Every Child In Uganda 2017, Maternal and Perinatal Death Surveillance and Response Guidelines 2017, Health Sector Quality Improvement Framework and Strategic Plan 2015/16 -2019/20, Achieving Equity in Immunisation Coverage by Reaching Every Community 2017 and there were no circulars.</p>
<p>• 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</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>There were no meetings held with facility in charges regarding the dissemination of policies guidelines and circulars.</p>

6

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

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

0

There is no evidence that DHT supervised Kiyunga HCIV. At Kiyunga HCIV there was no supervision from DHT in the supervision log book.

Maximum 6 points for this performance measure

Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY: • If 100% supervised: score 3 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0

0

There was no evidence DHT supervised the lower facilities mainly because the information in the support supervision reports at the DHOs office was not consistent with information in the supervision log books at the facilities.

There were supervision reports on file at the DHOs office the first report was not dated but indicated October 2017. The report didn't indicate the supervision period and team. The following facilities were supervised: Buwologoma, Bukanga, Busalamu, Lwaki, Waibuga, Itaikaibolu, Busiuro, Naigobya, Naigobya Lutheran, Nairaika, Busanda, Innula Bugambo. The report had two main sections the positives and negatives. On the same report other facilities supervised were Bukoova, Ikumbya and Nantamali but these were not included in the table. Please note facilities names dint indicate level of facility and report was not signed. The second report was dated 15th May 2017 and supervision was conducted on 8th May 2017 Bukanga HCIII, 9th May 2017 Ikonja HCIII, 10th May 2017, Irongo HCIII, and Waibuga HCIII on 11th May 2017. The report had positive, negative and recommendations/action plan. However, the reports were not signed.

Also, on file there was a laboratory support supervision on Bukoova HCIII, Ikumbya HCIII and Naigobya Uday HCII and the recommended supervision template was used clearly indicating the supervision objectives, methods used, areas addressed, achievements, lessons learnt challenges and action plan

At the facilities Bukanga HCIII there were DHT supervisions on 22nd Feb 2017 on performance, 6th Mar 2017 on EPI/FP 27th Mar 2017 and 23rd June 2017 on general issues, and 13th Au 2017 on TB.

Bukendi HCII there was no supervision from DHT while at Irongo HCIII: There was a supervision on 11th July, 7th Sept all 2016 for biostatistician. On 1st Mar and 12th May 2017 there was EPI and mentorship policies supervision respectively. While on 31st May there was a support supervision.

7	<p>The Health Sub-district(s) have effectively provided support supervision to lower level health units</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities have been supervised by HSD and reports produced: • If 100% supervised score 6 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 4 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 2 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	0	<p>There was no evidence of HSD supervision because the report at Kiyunga was not consistent with the supervision log books at Bukanga, Ikonia and Irongo HCIII. In addition, the report at Kiyunga HCIV was not authentic.</p> <p>There was one supervision report on file at the DHOs office and at Kiyunga HCIV dated 10th May 2017 the period for the supervision was not indicated and the following facilities were supervised: Ikumbya HCIII, Bukoova HCIII, Irongo HCIII, Ikonia HCIII, Waibuga HCIII, Bukanga HCIII, Kiyunga HCIV .</p> <p>At the facilities at Bukanga HCIII Irongo HCIII and Ikonia HCIII there was no evidence of HSD supervision in the supervision book.</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>	<p>• Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</p> <p>• Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</p>	0	<p>There was no evidence of reports being discussed and used to make recommendations.</p> <p>There was no evidence the recommendations were followed up and activities implemented to address the action plan.</p>
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>	<p>• 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</p>	0	<p>The list of facilities in HMIS and OBT were not consistent and accurate. There were four facilities three of them government not reporting in HMIS and yet receiving PHC funds. These were Buyongo HCII, Itakaibolu HCII, Butogonya HCII and Borch HCIII. There was a letter on file dated 7th August 2014 requesting MOH to code the four facilities. This letter was received at MOH on 1st Sept 2014.</p>

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<p>10</p>	<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the council committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 	<p>2</p>	<p>Yes, there is evidence that the Standing Committee on Social Services met and discussed Health service delivery issues like sector performance.</p> <p>For example refer to committee meeting report developed for committee meeting held 14th Sept 2016 and presented by the Committee Secretary Hon. Mukasa Ronald.</p> <p>Refer to Page 5 where the DHO shared sector performance for planned activities in the FY 2015/2016 and planned project areas for the FY 2016/2017.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	<p>2</p>	<p>Yes. The sector committee presented issues that require approval from council.</p> <p>Refer to District Council meeting held 30th Sept 2016 Minute MIN.04/LDC/ 9/2016 where the Chairperson of the Standing Committee for Social Services presented a report on the sector performance for the FY 2015/2016 and the planned priorities for the FY 2016/ 2017 to the fuller District Council for discussion.</p> <p>This submission was extracted out of a standing committee meeting report presented by Hon Ronald Mukasa for meeting held 14th Sept 2016</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"> • If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5 • If 80-99% : score 3 • If 70-79%: : score 1 • If less than 70%: score 0 	0	<p>There is no functional HUMCs in Luuka District mainly because the minutes were not complete(not signed or attendance list missing) and budget/workplan issues not discussed.</p> <p>Kiyunga HCIV had on file five meeting minutes for HUMC. On 25th May 2017 the attendance list indicated only the first names of four members out of six. Budget and workplan issues were not discussed and the minutes were not signed. 9th Mar 2017 the attendance list had three females and three males and there was no discussion on budget/workplan. On 25th May 2016 eleven members attended the meeting, five were females and six were males. The minutes were not signed by chairperson but PHC funds were discussed. On 11th October 2016 the minutes were not signed and budget/workplan issues not discussed.</p> <p>Bukanga HCIII there were minutes on 13th May, 20th May, 14th July, of 2016 and 8th Feb, 7th April and 10th June of 2017. Except for the meeting on 7th April 2017 budget /workplan issues were not discussed and all the minutes were not signed.</p> <p>Bukendi HCII: There were minutes for 4th Octo and 14th Nov of 2017 and 24rd Jan 2018. There was no attendance list to all the minutes, minutes were not signed and budget/workplan issue not discussed.</p> <p>Ikonia HCII there were no minutes for HUMC.</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"> • Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	0	<p>The health department didn't publicize all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants. There is no notice board at DHOs office in Luuka District.</p>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				

13	<p>The LG Health department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2 <p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	0	<p>There was one capital investment in performance contract and it was construction at Nantamali HCII, however this capital investment changed to Irongo HCIII. Efforts to establish formal change from Nantamali to Irongo were futile. This capital investment however was managed by DDEG.</p> <p>There no evidence health department submitted procurement request form PP5.</p>
14	<p>The LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time: • 100% - score 8 • 70-99% – score 4 • Below 70% - score 0 	8	<p>This activity was supported from the center. At the DHOs office there was procurement plan for Kiyunga HCIV and for district HCIII and HCII.</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"> • Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points 	2	<p>There were no projects undertaken in the department in 2016/17 FY</p>

Assessment area: Financial management and reporting

16	<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4 	0	<p>No, there is no evidence that the Department of Health submitted annual performance reports for all four quarters to the planner by Mid - July for consolidation.</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>	4	<p>From the review of all the four audit reports, the assessment team did not find any query raised against the department despite having been audited in the 1st quarter of 2016/17</p>

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

18	<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2 	0	<p>It was difficult to establish the composition at Kiyunga HCIV in one of the minutes it was three women and three men and another meeting five females and six males. Bukanga HCIII had six females and one male and after expiry of term it became two females and five males. Bukendi HCII it was difficult to establish with no attendance list on all the minutes.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2 	0	<p>There is no evidence the local government issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women.</p>

19	<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that the LGs has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal : score 2 points.	2	<p>There is evidence local government issued guidelines on medical waste management including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste management. There were SOPs in Irongo HCIII, Busalamu HCII and Ikonja HCIII.</p>
----	---	---	---	--



LGPA 2017/18

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Luuka District

(Vote Code: 593)

Score 86/100 (86%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				

1	<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: score 10 	10	<p>Yes, the LG Water department has targeted the less safe coverage Sub-counties. The District safe water coverage average is 70.4% and all the Sub-counties with safe water coverage below the District average safe water coverage (Irongo – 63.8%; Bukooma – 52.8%; Ikumbya – 64.5%; and Waibuga – 69.0%) have been targeted to receive 8 out of 12 new Hand Pump Boreholes and 3 out of 6 old boreholes rehabilitated for FY2017/18, distributed as Irongo allocated 3 new and no rehabilitated boreholes; Bukooma allocated 3 new and 1 rehabilitated boreholes; Ikumbya allocated 1 new and 2 rehabilitated boreholes; Waibuga allocated 1 new and no rehabilitated boreholes; in the current FY 2017/18. Evidences can be traced from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Annual Workplan/Budget for LUUKA DWSCG for FY2017/18, submitted to the Permanent Secretary MoWE and received by DWD on 17/08/2017 with content of 12No. Deep bore drilling; 06No. Borehole rehabilitation (inclusive of assessment, supervision allowances to district staff, facilitation to HPMs and purchase of spare parts); Design of 02No. Piped water schemes for RGCs; Construction of 01No. Public Latrine in RGC; and 10 Water quality surveillance; Summary report dated 05/12/2017 by the DWO on completed works of siting, motor drilling, pump testing and water quality analysis of 12 deep boreholes with contract number 2017/GWC/DBDR/LUUK/0001 for FY 2017/18. The Status report for the water sector to The Chairperson of DWSCC on 16/05/2017 by the DWO indicated new borehole drilling of 12 boreholes and rehabilitation of 6 old water sources, distributed as Irongo S/C allocated 3 new and no rehabilitated boreholes; Bukooma S/C allocated 3 new and 1 rehabilitated boreholes; Ikumbya S/C allocated 1 new and 2 rehabilitated boreholes; Nawampiti S/C allocated 2 new and 1 rehabilitated boreholes; Waibuga S/C allocated 1 new and no rehabilitated boreholes; Bukanga S/C and Bulongo S/C each allocated 1 new and 1 rehabilitated boreholes.
---	---	--	----	---

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"> • Evidence that the LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY: score 15 	15	<p>Yes, the LG water Department implemented budgeted 6 new boreholes and 12 old rehabilitated boreholes in targeted sub-counties of Ikumbya S/C with 64.5% coverage was allocated 1 new and 4 Old rehabilitated boreholes; Bukooma S/C with 52.8% coverage was allocated 2 new and 3 Old rehabilitated boreholes; Nawampiti S/C with 52.8% coverage was allocated with 2 new and 1 rehabilitated boreholes; Bukanga S/C with 53.2% coverage was allocated with 1 new and 1 rehabilitated boreholes; and Waibuga S/C with 69.0% coverage was allocated with 1 new and 3 rehabilitated boreholes; in the FY 2016/17. Evidenced from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Workplan/Budget for Luuka DWSCG for FY2016/17 submitted to the Permanent Secretary of MoWE and received by the DWD on 15/07/2016 with content of 8 deep borehole drilling; 6 borehole rehabilitation (inclusive of assessment and purchase of spare parts); 1 water quality surveillance; construction of a composite latrine in RGC. • Payment voucher number 10513 dated 16/08/2017 in respect to commissioning of water sources drilled in FY 2016/17. • Report on commissioning of water sources for FY 2016/17 by ADWO/M to CAO, dated 18/08/2017 • Luuka District LG Summary Report by the DWO to CAO dated 04/12/2017 on completed works by MAA Technologies (U) Ltd using motor drilling for 12 deep boreholes under contract with ID 2017/GWC/DBDR/Luuka/0001 for siting, drilling, pump testing and water quality analysis for FY 2017/18 and the period 15/08/2017 to 16/10/17. • Second Quarter report and Third quarter budget request for FY 2016/17 by the CAO to Permanent Secretary MoWE, received on 13/01/2017
Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision				

3	<p>The LG Water department carries out monthly monitoring and supervision of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually. • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15 • 80 - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10 • 70 - 79%: score 7 • 60 - 69% monitored: score 5 • 50 - 59%: score 3 • Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored -score 0</p>	15	<p>There is evidence of monitoring each WSS facilities annually as evidenced from the following documents with the DWO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report by the DWO to CAO, dated 07/12/2017, on installation of Hand pumps in the boreholes by M/S Luuka District Water and Sanitation Association during the FY 2016/17. • Final report on installation of hand pumps in 12 boreholes by M/S Luuka District Water and Sanitation Association during the FY 2016/17 by the DWO to CAO, dated 07/12/2017. • Status progress Report by the DWO to CAO dated 30/11/2016 on constructed boreholes in FY 2016/17 by MAA Technologies (U) Ltd • Status progress Report by the DWO to CAO dated 16/10/2016 on drilling works of six boreholes in FY 2016/17 boreholes in FY 2016/17 by MAA Technologies (U) Ltd • Report by DWO to CAO dated 30/11/2016 on constructed Boreholes in FY 2016/17 by M/S MAA Technologies (U) Ltd in the month of November 2016 <p>Overall, the supervision and monitoring reports of each project matches with over 95% of the monitoring plans for the facilities.</p>
---	--	---	----	---

4	<p>The LG Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10 	10	<p>Yes, the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the FY 2017/18. The list of water facilities submitted for the FY 2017/18; 12 Deep Borehole drilling (Hand pump); Design of 02No. Piped water scheme in RGCs; 06No. Borehole rehabilitations; construction of 01No. Public Latrines in a RGC; and 10 Water quality testing for old sources in the sector MIS, the Performance contract reports and in the OBT are accurate and consistent. The numbers of facilities tally with those filled in the procurement requisition forms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract Document between Luuka District LG and MAA Technologies (U) Ltd on Sting, Drilling, Pump Testing, Casting and water quality analysis of 02No. Production Boreholes at Bukoova Rural Growth Centre in the District under LOT 2 with Procurement Reference Number 2017/GWC/DBDR/LUUK/0002 and signed on 14/08/2017. Contract Document between Luuka District LG and MAA Technologies (U) Ltd on Sting, Drilling, Pump Testing, Casting and water quality analysis of 12No. Deep Boreholes in the District under LOT 1 with Procurement Reference Number 2017/GWC/DBDR/LUUK/0001 and signed on 14/08/2017.
---	--	---	----	--

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	<p>The PDU had a file that contained the submitted list of all investment items from the DWO in the approved sector AWP and Budget on time. The DWO submitted a Water Department Annual Procurement Plan for FY 2017/18 to the CAO and the following are supporting documents;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement Requisition LG PP Form 1 with reference Luuk593/SUPLS/2016-17 with subject supply of one motor vehicle Toyota Hilux Double Cabin-Pickup, prepared by DWO on 01/07/2016. • Procurement Requisition LG PP Form 1 with reference LUUK593/WRKS/2016-2017/00010 with subject on construction of 4-stance lined VIP Latrine with a urinal as specified in the BOQs, prepared by DWO on 01/07/2016. • Procurement Requisition LG PP Form 1 for Project reference LUUK593/WRKLS/2016-17/ ... with subject of casting 12 Borehole platforms and cleaning of 01No. Borehole; prepared by DWO and dated 01/07/2016.
6	<p>The DWO has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the DWO prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2 	2	<p>The CAO variously appointed the Contract Managers in following letters who prepared the contract management plans for implementation of the WSS infrastructure projects as seen from: Letter of Appointment of Ag. District Engineer /DWO as the Contract Manager by the CAO for Supply of 01No. Toyota Hilux Double Cabin, Casting of 12 borehole platforms and construction of a 4-stance lined pit latrine with a urinal at Bukanga-Bukendi RGC during the FY 2016/17, dated 26/09/2016. There is evidence that monthly site visits were conducted for all the WSS infrastructure projects following the contract management plans as seen from for example:</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	2	<p>Yes, the five Water sources visited that included Namavundu DWD61429; Kimanto Lukotaimu DWD58556; Kigaya Nakabaale DWD58557; Bugomba-Buwanda DWD58558; and Katenga DWD61430 were all constructed as per the designs and Borehole log sheets and borehole record card; the construction of Sanitation facility at Bukanga-Bukendi RGC was also according to the design.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	2	<p>Yes, contractors handed over all completed WSS facilities as seen in the written evidences of facility completion and payment in the Contract management file/records;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on commissioning of water sources for FY 2016/17 by ADWO/M to CAO, dated 18/08/2017 • A Certificate given to the beneficiary community during the facility Launching and handover as a letter that confirms in the local language that the borehole is completed and it is signed and stamped by both the Chairperson LC V and the RDC. • Payment Certificates seen for the engaged contractors and consultants, such as: (i) Interim Certificate dated 25/10/2016 for MAA Technologies (U) Ltd for drilling of boreholes in Luuka District with project ID of LUUK593/Wrks/16-17/00001; (ii) Interim Certificate dated 21/02/2017 for MAA Technologies (U) Ltd for siting, motorized drilling, test pumping and water quality analysis of 06No. boreholes in Luuka District with project ID of 2016/GWC/DBDR/16-17/LUUK/00002; (iii) Final Payment Certificate No.2 issued to Luuka District Water and Sanitation Association on 07/12/2017 for contract with reference Number 2016/GWC/BHINST/LUUK/0005 for a contracted period of 20/12/2016 to 20/03/2017 in relation to installation of borehole hand pumps for 12 boreholes rehabilitated in FY 2016/17.

• If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports:
score 2

2

Yes, the DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports with examples of Certificate sent together with payment requisition forms for facilities implemented in FY 2016/17, including but not limited to:

- Completion report by the DWO to Cao dated 30/01/2017 on casting of 12 borehole platforms in the FY 2016/17 by M/S Migan (U) Ltd with project reference 2016/GWC/BHPC/LUUK/0004.
- Certificate of Completion dated 07/12/2017 for Project with reference 2016/GWC/BHINST/LUUK/0005 on installation of borehole hand pumps of 12 boreholes in the district by M/S Luuka District Water and Sanitation Association.
- Interim payment Certificate issued on 22/02/2017 for project ID of 2016/GWC/BHINST/LUUK/0005 on installation of borehole hand pumps for 12 boreholes rehabilitated in FY 2016/17 by Luuka District Water and Sanitation Association with start date of 20/12/2016 and Partial Completion date of 20/03/2017.
- Measurement of completed works for installation of borehole hand pumps for certificate No. 1 by the project manager, as of 22/02/2017.
- Interim payment Certificate issued on 04/12/2017 for project ID of 2017/GWC/BHDR/LUUK/0001 on siting, motorized drilling. Test pumping and water quality analysis of 12 deep boreholes in FY 2016/17 by MAA Technologies (U) Ltd with start date of 16/08/2017 and Partial Completion date of 16/10/2017.
- Completion report by DWO to CAO, dated 22/10/2017 for project ID of 2016/GWC/BHINST/LUUK/0005 on installation of hand pumps in 12 rehabilitated boreholes by M/S Luuka District Water and Sanitation Association.

7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	0	<p>From the review of 8 projects that were undertaken by the department, it was found the HoD approved payments for contractors on time with exception of one contract:</p> <p>Payment to MAA technologies for drilling and pump testing 6 boreholes an invoice was raised on 25th/10/16 and the head of department approved on 21/2/17 over three months after the invoice had been submitted.</p> <p>The reason given for the delay was because the contractor had failed to deliver works as per the contract thus the District engineer could not certify the work until when the contractor had successfully delivered as per the contract. The District water engineer could thus not approve a sub-standard payment.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				
8	<p>The LG Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5 	0	<p>No, there is no evidence that the Department of Water submitted annual performance reports for all four quarters to the planner by Mid - July for consolidation</p>
9	<p>LG Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year 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 	5	<p>From the review of all the four audit reports, the assessment team did not find any query raised against the department despite having been audited in the 1st quarter of 2016/17</p>

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

<p>10</p>	<p>The LG committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3 	<p>3</p>	<p>Yes, there is evidence that the Standing Committee on Works met and discussed Water service delivery issues like sector performance.</p> <p>For example refer to Minutes of committee meeting which sat on 14th Sept 2016 and presented by the Committee Secretary Hon. Nagaya Alimansi. Refer to MIN 03/LDW/9/2016 where the DWO shared sector performance for planned activities in the FY 2015/2016 on the priority activities and planned project areas for the FY 2016/2017.</p> <p>Sector recommendations were summarised by the Committee for presentation to the fuller council.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	<p>3</p>	<p>Yes. The sector committee presented issues that require approval from council.</p> <p>Refer to District Council meeting held 30th Sept 2016. Minute MIN.04/LDC/ 9/2016 where the Chairperson of the Standing Committee for Social Services presented a report on the sector performance for the FY 2015/2016 and the planned priorities for the FY 2016/ 2017 to the fuller District Council for discussion.</p> <p>This submission was extracted out of a standing committee meeting report presented by Hon Ronald Mukasa for meeting held 14th Sept 2016</p>
<p>11</p>	<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"> 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 	<p>0</p>	<p>There were no displays of information on the district notice boards (at the District Central Notice Board and the DWO Notice Board) regarding the AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2 	2	<p>From a sample of WSS projects checked (Namavundu DWD61429; Kimanto Lukotaimu DWD58556; Kigaya Nakabaale DWD58557; Bugomba-Buwanda DWD58558; and Katenga DWD61430), it was found that all WSS projects were clearly labelled on the platform concrete casting indicating the name of the source (Village), the DWD Number, and the date of platform casting/construction, and the source of funding (DWSCG).</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	2	<p>Yes, there is evidence that information on tenders and contract awards are displayed as observed from (i) the Display of best evaluated Bid Notice - Open bidding published on 04/07/2016 by the CAO for a Display period of 16/08/2016 to 29/08/2016; (ii) Public Notice dated 15/08/2016 and signed by Head of the PDU on the best evaluated Bidders for Civil Works under open bidding for FY 2016/17; (iii) Display of best evaluated Bid Notice – Selective bidding by CAO, dated 08/09/2016 for a period of 10 working days; (iv) Public Notice for best evaluated Bidder for civil works and supplies for FY 2016/17, displayed by the PDU during the period 08/09/2016 to 22/09/2016.</p>
12	<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	1	<p>Yes, the communities make applications for water sources and each application found in a file with the DWO, clearly spell out that in case of the offer, community contributions (of UGX 200,000 in case of Deep borehole or UGX 100,000 in cases of Shallow well or rehabilitation of a borehole or shallow well or UGX 50,000 to 100,000 in case of a spring) have to be made. During the visits to the five sampled facilities (Namavundu DWD61429; Kimanto Lukotaimu DWD58556; Kigaya Nakabaale DWD58557; Bugomba-Buwanda DWD58558; and Katenga DWD61430) it was confirmed that for every community that received a facility, they actually made community contribution, set up WSC within 2 weeks from the village feedback meeting and fulfilled all other requirements.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O&M funds and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, for the current FY: score 2 	2	For each of the five water supply facilities visited (Namavundu DWD61429; Kimanto Lukotaimu DWD58556; Kigaya Nakabaale DWD58557; Bugomba-Buwanda DWD58558; and Katenga DWD61430), the WSCs were found to be well constituted of 5 to 8 members and were active (conduct regular meetings, collecting UGX1000 per household per month for carrying out O&M, preventive maintenance and minor repairs).
--	--	--	---	---

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

13	<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	2	Yes, there is evidence that Environmental screening (as per templates) were followed for the new and old boreholes in selected Sub-counties in Luuka District for the FY 2016/17 and FY 2017/18; and the screening results were included in the advocacy meetings and BOQs. The evidences are seen in the following: (i) A Report by the DWO dated 02/04/2017 to the CAO on follow up on planted trees at boreholes in the month of March 2017; (ii) Report on Environment Screening of proposed water projects for FY 2017/18 to CAO by the District Environment Officer, dated 04/06/2017; provided the potential environmental impacts, the mitigation measures in an Environmental Management Plan for water projects in FY2017/18.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1 	1	No evidence was adduced or seen to this effect since no serious environmental incidences were ever encountered or noticed.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	0	There were no inclusion of an Environmental clause in the Technical Specifications for construction and supervision agreements/signed contracts.

14	<p>The LG Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If at least 50% WSCs are women as per the sector critical requirements: score 3 	3	<p>The facilities sampled and visited did not meet the sector critical requirements of women on the WSCs to be at least 50%. For the facilities visited, the composition of women on the WSCs of Namavundu DWD61429 was 3/6; Kimanto Lukotaimu DWD58556 was 3/5; Kigaya Nakabaale DWD58557 was 4/8; Bugomba-Buwanda DWD58558 was 3/6; and Katenga DWD61430 was 3/6.</p>
15	<p>Gender- and special-needs sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/RGCs.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3 	0	<p>The sanitation facility visited was in Bukanga-Bukendi Trading Centre, was a lined Emptiable VIP Latrine having 4 stances (two for women and two for male) and a Urinal for men. However there was no stance for PWDs and no Ramp for their accessibility.</p>