



LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Nakaseke District

(Vote Code: 569)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	3	50%
No	3	50%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.	xxx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nakaseke DLG submitted to MoFPED a Final Performance Contract FY 2017/18 on 6th/7/2017 while the Draft had been submitted on 30/03/2017 	No
Assessment area: Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).	xxxxx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nakaseke DLG submitted to MoFPED a Budget for FY 2017/18 that included a Procurement plan on 28/2/2017 	Yes
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			
LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)	xxxxxx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nakaseke DLG submitted to MoFPED the Annual Performance Report for FY 2016/17 on 01/09/2017 	No
LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)	xxxxxxx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nakaseke DLG submitted to MoFPED all the 4 Quarterly budget performance reports on the following dates: Quarter I: 28/10/2016 Quarter II: 15/02/2017 Quarter III:05/05/2017 Quarter IV:01/09/2017 It is evident that quarter IV report was submitted past the due date 	No

Assessment area: Audit

<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by April 30 (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action (PFMA Act 2015; Local Governments Financial and Accounting Regulations 2007; The Local Governments Act, Cap 243).</p>	<p>xxxxx</p>	<p>Nakaseke provided and submitted information to the PST/ST on the implementation of Internal Auditor General findings for the financial year 2016/2017 in a letter REF AUD/112/01 dated 20th March 2017 and was received by the Internal Auditor General's office on 21st March 2017. This was before the deadline of 31st April, 2017.</p> <p>All the 7 findings in the internal audit report for the FY 2016/17 were responded to.</p> <p>The district further responded to all 9 findings in the OAG's report for the FY ended 30th June 2016 in a letter REF AUD/112/01 dated 20th March 2017 and was received by the office of the Internal Auditor General on the 21st March 2017. All the 9 issues in the OAG's audit report were responded to.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>xxxxx</p>	<p>The audit opinion on the Financial statements of the District for the FY ended June 2016 was not adverse or disclaimed. The audit opinion was, in fact, unqualified.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Nakaseke District

(Vote Code: 569)

Score 59/100 (59%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality; and (ii) all Town Councils in a District are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a municipality/district has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 2. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical planning committee was in place. • Only two sets of Committee minutes were seen/reviewed for the meeting of 19/10/2017 and 28/1/2016. • However registration book was not in place yet there was evidence of approval of building plans . • It was not possible to establish whether approval was within 28 days as provided for in the LGPA manual because no evidence of submission date or fees payment date was available at time of this assessment.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District physical plan was not in place. • 1 out of 5 plans sampled had got final approval by the Physical Planning Committee, that is, Kabuubu Faith Allena Primary School (in meeting of 28/1/2016), while the other 4 had got interim approval by relevant sector specialists including Physical Planner, DHI and District Engineer pending final approval by the Physical Planning committee.
2	<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p>			<p>The report of the Budget conference held on 11/11/2016 (annex 1 –BFP presentation) gave the following priorities for FY 2017/18:</p> <p>Production sector (pg. 14-16 of BC and on pg. 41-42 of AWP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of 2 maize cribs and 2 coffee drying yards at 3 demonstration sites • Establishment of 4 crop on farm demo sites • Establishment of 2 small scale irrigation demonstration sites

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

2

• Establishment of 2 rangeland improvement demonstration sites

• Establishment of fisheries technology development sites

Health (pg. 17 and on pg. 44 of AWP)

• Fencing of Kapeeka HC III and Semuto HC IV (phase ii)

• Renovation of Biddabugya HC III

• Upgrading of Kikamulo HC III to HC IV

Education (pg.18-22 and on pg. 47-48 of AWP)

• Coordinate construction and expansion of 5 PS to benefit from World Bank

• Renovation of Education offices

• Renovation of schools infrastructure in selected schools

Roads (pg. 24-26 and on pg. 50-54 of AWP)

• Construction of a perimeter wall

• Bush clearing landscaping and grading 100 acres of the District land

• O&M of district investments

• Routine maintenance (labour based) of 367.6km district feeder roads

• 40.8 km mechanised routine maintenance (pot improvement /gravelling)

• 12 culvert line installations

• Periodic maintenance of Kiwoko-Kasambya (7km) and Kabuubu-Mityomere (10.5km)

Water (pg. 28 and on pg. 56-58, 60 of AWP)

• A 4-stance VIP communal latrine in RGC

• Drilling of 9 boreholes

• Major Rehabilitation of 14 boreholes

Natural resources priorities (pg. 30 and pg. 92 of AWP)

• Establishment of tree nursery and distribution of seedlings

Many of the comments were in concurrence

				<p>with the set priorities.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If different, justification has to be provided and evidence that it was approved by Council. Score 2. 	2	<p>The following capital investments in the approved Annual Work Plan for FY 2017/18 were drawn from the approved five year district development plan (DDP) 2015/16-2019/20:</p> <p>Production sector (pg. 41-42 of AWP derived from DDP pg.63)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of 2 maize cribs and 2 coffee drying yards at 3 demonstration sites • Establishment of 4 crop on farm demo sites • Establishment of 2 small scale irrigation demonstration sites • Establishment of 2 rangeland improvement demonstration sites • Establishment of fisheries technology development sites <p>Health (pg. 44 of AWP derived from DDP pg. 63-64)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fencing of Kapeeka HC III and Semuto HC IV (phase ii) • Renovation of Biddabugya HC III • Upgrading of Kikamulo HC III to HC IV <p>Education (pg. 47-48 of AWP derived from DDP pg. 64)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate construction and expansion of 5 PS to benefit from World Bank • Renovation of Education offices • Renovation of schools infrastructure in selected schools <p>Roads (pg. 50-54 of AWP derived from DDP pg. 64-67)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a perimeter wall • Bush clearing landscaping and grading 100 acres of the District land • O&M of district investments • Routine maintenance (labour based) of

				<p>367.6km district feeder roads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40.8 km mechanised routine maintenance (pot improvement /gravelling) • 12 culvert line installations • Periodic maintenance of Kiwoko-Kasambya (7km) and Kabuubu-Mityomere (10.5km) <p>Water (pg. 54-58, 60 of AWP derived from DDP pg. 67)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 4-stance VIP communal latrine in RGC • Drilling of 11 boreholes • Rehabilitation of 11 boreholes
		<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. 	0	No evidence was provided to prove that the TPC discussed the investment profiles
3	<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual statistical abstract, with gender disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making-maximum 1 point. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statistical abstract had not been compiled (last drafting was said to have been done in 2015) • However updating of the abstract was planned for under the FY 2017/18 (pg. 73 of approved budget and work plan 2017/18)

4

Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.

• 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

The following Infrastructure projects implemented in FY 2016/17 were derived from the AWP for the said year:

Education (pg. 130-131 of Qtr 4 report 2016/17 was derived from pg 89 of AWP)

- Construction of classrooms in Nyakalongo PS
- Teachers house construction at Kiribwa PS
- Provision of desks to Kyakagonya PS, Wakayamba PS and Kiribwa PS and Nakaseke SDA PS

Health (pg. 128 of Qtr 4 report 2016/17 was derived from pg. 83 of AWP)

- Fencing of Kapeeka HC III and Semuto HC IV
- Re-roofing of Kikandwa HC III

Though the printed out version of the AWP erroneously omitted the Roads & Engineering and Water sector the Performance contract 2016/17 pg 23-25 captured the following priorities:

Water (pg. 150-. of Qtr 4 report 2016/17)

- Construction of public latrine in Kabeere RGC
- Protection of spring well in Nakigulube
- Drilling of 10 boreholes

Roads and Engineering (pg. 139-148 of Qtr 4 report 2016/17)

- Community access roads maintenance including Kyamutakasa-Kyambogo road
- Reshaping of Community access roads e.g Namasengere-Bugabo road
- Periodic road maintenance including Nakaseke-Butalango
- Mechanised routine maintenance including in Ngoma TC, Nakaseke-Buziba road

Quarter 4/ Annual Performance report for FY 2016/17 indicated that many of the

• 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

2

projects were completed within the FY including:

Education (pg. 130-131 of Qtr 4 report 2016/17)

- Construction of classrooms in Nyakalongo PS
- Teachers house construction at Kiribwa PS
- Provision of desks to 5 PS (Kyakagonya PS, Butalangu PS, Wakayamba PS, Kiribwa PS and Nakaseke SDA PS)

Health (pg. 128 of Qtr 4 report 2016/17)

- Re-roofing of Kikandwa HC III

Water (pg. 150-155 of Qtr 4 report 2016/17)

- Construction of public latrine in Kabeere RGC
- Protection of spring well in Nakigulube
- Drilling of 10 boreholes (8 installed successfully)

Roads and Engineering (pg. 139-148 of Qtr 4 report 2016/17)

- 18/18 bottlenecks on Community access roads cleared including Kyamutakasa-Kyambogo road
- 12.5/12.5 km of Community access roads re-shaped including Namasengere-Bugabo road

However the following projects (most under Roads and Engineering sector) were reported as partially achieved in the Annual performance report 2016/17 thus bringing the overall performance to 83.8%:

- 18 out of 20(ha) of tree nursery established (pg.26,157)
- Fencing of 1 (Semuto HC IV) out of 2 Health Centres (pg. 128)
- Only 6 out of 16 km of urban unpaved roads Periodically maintained including Nakaseke-Butalango road (pg. 141)
- Only 55 out of 122km of urban unpaved roads maintained under Mechanised routine maintenance including in Ngoma TC (pg. 142-144)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Only 13 out 15 Km of district roads periodically maintained (pg.145)• Only 263 out of 408 km of district roads maintained under mechanised routine maintenance (pg. 146-147) |
|--|--|---|

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

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.

- 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

The following sampled projects as captured in the Nakaseke DLG Annual performance report 2016/17 indicates a total expenditure of 862,003,000= against 973,637,000= budget (-11.5%) which is within the acceptable range of Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget in the FY 2016/17.

Education: (-2.6% [194,922,000= budget against 200,207,000= budget] pg. 130-131)

- Construction of classrooms in Nyakalongo PS
- Teachers house construction at Kiribwa PS
- Provision of desks to 5 PS (Kyakagonya PS, Butalangu PS, Wakayamba PS, Kiribwa PS and Nakaseke SDA PS)

Health (-9.3% [18,371,000= expenditure against 20,260,000= budget] pg. 128)

- Reroofing of Kikandwa HC III
- Fencing of Semuto HC IV

Roads and Engineering (-22.5%, pg. 148)

Total expenditure of 347,839,000 out of 448,628,000 total budgets for Sector Conditional grant.

- Water (-1.4% of budget, pg. 154, 155)
 - Construction of 1 public pit latrine at Kabeere RGC (18,770,000= expenditure of 13,101,000= budget, that is +43.3% of budget)
 - Drilling of 10 deep boreholes (277,501,000= expenditure of 281,441,000= budget, that is -1.4% of budget)

Natural Resources (-54% [4,600,000= budget against 10,000,000= budget] pg. 157)

- 18 (ha) of tree nursery established

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2 	0	<p>Based on the sample below as presented in Nakaseke Annual performance report FY 2016/17 the LG budgeted for O&M of infrastructure however only 77.5% of this was spent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roads and Engineering spent 347,839,000= of the 448,628,000= budget for O&M (pg. 148)
--	--	---	---	--

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 	2	<p>HoDs were appraised using the standard guidelines from the Ministry of PS. A version of appraisal guidelines titled “Guidelines on the Implementation of Performance Agreements” was produced and viewed as guidelines always used during appraisals. This practice was also confirmed by the Chief Administration Officer herself. All HoDs were appraised.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the new structure there are 14 heads of department. Out of these, only 8 positions are filled substantively. These are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Administration position (appointment letter dated 30th June 2008), ? Dist. Health Officer (appointment letter dated), ? Dist. Education Officer), ? District Planner, ? Principle Human Resources Officer, ? Senior Procurement Officer ? Dist Service Commission Secretary ? Senior Procurement Officer. <p>The rest of HoDs are just acting only by assignment. Therefore only 57% of HoD positions are filled.</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 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruitment process for FY 2016/17 was 8 staff conducted as per submission made dated 3rd Nov. 2016 with Ref.: HRM/57/65/01. All submissions sent to DSC for FY 2016/17 totalled to 8 positions for recruitment and all the 8 were considered on various dates such as 27th July 2017, 4th Nov. 2016, 4th April 2016..
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	1	<p>The FY 2016/17, 16 cases for confirmation were recorded/received and submitted to DSC as per submission letter verified. All 16 cases were viewed and submissions to DSC verified. By count, 16 out of 16 confirmation submissions cases were all considered and handled via DSC and finally concluded by HR.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	1	<p>The district had 6 cases submitted to DSC for disciplinary action. Looking at the documentation for disciplinary action for the 6 cases, the process followed procedure and guideline involving submissions by/from HR and CAO's sign offs and eventually all concluded. Evidence that shows this conclusion are cases followed for Nabatanzi concluded</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 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A random sample of 3 staff recruited during FY 2016/17 was selected to ascertain if they accessed payroll for salary within 2 months of recruitment: <p>Alice Najjuma (Education assistant) was recruited on 1st July 2017 and accessed salary payroll on 28.8.17.</p> <p>Esther Dorothy Nabasumba (Education Assistant II) was also recruited on 1st July 2017 and accessed salary payroll on 28th July 2017.</p> <p>Emmanuel Sebugwawo (Workshop Assistant) was recruited on 13th June 2017 and accessed salary payroll on 28th July 2017. Therefore all staff recruited during FY 2016/17 accessed payroll for salary within 2 months of recruitment.</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>There is no evidence to show that all retired staff accessed pensioners' payroll within 2 months of retirement during FY 16/17. A pensioners payroll dated 20th June 2017 instead revealed that the list composed of staff who retired over 12 months from the date of their retirement. Therefore there are no staff who accessed pension payroll during within two months of retirement during FY 2016/17.</p>
Assessment area: Revenue Mobilization				
9	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If increase in OSR from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10% : score 4 points If the increase is from 5 - 10% : score 2 point If the increase is less than 5% : score 0 points. 	0	<p>The district LG OSR reduced by 0.6% from UGX 830,412,390 in the FY 2015/16 to UGX 825,502,542 in the FY 2016/17. (Source:Nakaseke District Final accounts for FY 2015/16 and FY 2016/17). This is very low rate of increment.</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 actual/budget revenue collection ratio for the FY 2016/17 was 100% (UGX 825,502,546/824,302,089). This resulted in abudget variance of 0% which is lower than 10%. (Source: Nakaseke District Budget and accounts for FY 2016/17)</p>
11	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	0	<p>There was evidence in the financial statements for the FY 2016/ that only UGX 12,805,000 out of the total UGX 79,967,681 (16%) instead of 65%, collected by the LG were remitted to Lower Local Governments in the FY 2016/17.(Source: Final Accounts for FY 2016/17 and transfer payment vouchers). This was less than the required remission.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2 	2	<p>The LG spent UGX 72,482,500 in the FY 2016/17 on Council allowances and emoluments compared to UGX 830,412,390 collected in the FY 2015/16. This was 8.7% of OSR for the FY 2015/16 (less than 20%) as per Section 4 of the Local Governments Act. (Source: the Nakaseke DLG final accounts for the FY 2015/16 and FY 2016/17)</p>
--	--	---	---	---

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

12	<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The key positions in the Procurement Unit are substantively filled. The district Senior Procurement Officer was appointed on 1 August 2008 (CAO's Letter Ref CR/D/10079 dated 30 June 2008) and the Procurement Officer was confirmed in service on 22 March 2011 (CAO's letter Ref. CR/D/10622).
		<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>The minutes and reports of the TEC were contained in the procurement files e.g. Minutes of TEC sitting on 1 December 2016 (Min 02/Naka/eval/Dec/16-17) recommended KLR (U) Ltd to drill 10 boreholes at selected sites at a cost of UGX 189,991,989.</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>The Contracts Committee minutes were available and contained in the procurement files e.g. Contracts Committee meeting of 23 August 2016 considered and upheld the recommendation of the TEC and awarded contract NAKA569/WRKS/2016-17/00001 to KLR Uganda Ltd (Minute 11/Naka/DCC/Aug/16-17) valued at UGX 189,991,989.</p> <p>However, for this specific contract (NAKA569/WRKS/2016-17/00001), there is discrepancy in the date of TEC sitting and report (December 2016) and Contracts Committee meeting (August 2016).</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 (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2 	2	<p>The procurement and disposal plan for FY 2017-2018 covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan. E.g. NAKA569/WRKS/2017-18/00001 for drilling nine deep boreholes, NAKA569/WRKS/2017-18/00041 for the construction of four stance pit latrine at Magoma Primary School.</p> <p>Procurement in FY 2016-2017 adhered to the procurement plan. E.g. Drilling of ten deep boreholes and two classroom block at Nyakarongo were procured as contracts NAKA569/WRKS/2016-17/00001 and NAKA569/WRKS/2016-17/00003, respectively.</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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of the consolidated procurement plan for 2017/18 shows that 27% of the bid documents for infrastructure were prepared by August 30.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Contracts Register for 2016/17 was available but not updated. The last entry was made on 4 August 2016. The procurement activity files were complete with relevant documents such as copy of pre-qualification and solicitation documents, record of bid opening and closing, evaluation reports, contracts committee decisions, notice of best evaluated bidder, letter of acceptance, among others.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sampled projects indicate the procurement thresholds were adhered to. E.g Open National Bidding (ONB) for Contract NAKA569/WRKS/16-17/00003 valued at UGX 56,487,254 and NAKA569/WRKS/16-17/00002 valued at UGX 84,655,250 which are within the ONB threshold of more than UGX 50,000,000. Contracts NAKA569/WRKS/16-17/00041 valued at 15,520,000; NAKA569/WRKS/16-17/00031 valued at UGX 16,978,200 and NAKA569/WRKS/16-17/00006 valued at UGX 6,319,577 are within Selective Bidding threshold of not exceeding UGX 50,000,000.
15	<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed projects were certified with interim or Completion Certificates e.g. NAKA569/WRKS/2016-17/00039 dated 14 June 2017 for the upgrading of Nabisojjo Cattle Loading Site and Interim (Payment) Certificate 1 dated 21 April 2017 for 10 handpump boreholes (NAKA569/WRKS/2016-17/00001).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2 	0	<p>Project sites visited had no site boards e.g. Kirinda Primary School where construction of a two classroom block is on-going.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management				
16	<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4 	4	<p>All the monthly reconciliations for the FY 2016/17 and those for the period July to December 2017 were in place. They were all signed by Accounts Assistants and countersigned Senior Finance Officer in charge of expenditure. The dates of approval/verification of the reconciliations statements ranged between 1 to 16 days.</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. 	0	<p>A sample of 12 transactions from health, water, education and production departments showed that all payments were not fully within the period of payment timelines of 30 days as indicated in Contracts respectively. The range of payment timeline for the sampled vouchers was from 8 days to 64 days which was outside the maximum recommended period of 30 days.</p>
18	<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor and produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 3. 	0	<p>The Head of Internal Audit department (Mr Ntibiri Fred) has never been substantively appointed but was assigned duties by the CAO as per letter REF CR /D/10070 dated 1st December 2008. He was substantively appointed an Internal Auditor by the District Service Commission under Minute NO.68/2009/(ii) as per appointment letter dated 8th October 2009.He is therefore below the rank of a Senior Internal Auditor as required by the LGPA Manual.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries: score 2. 	2	<p>There was evidence that the LG provided information to Council and LGPAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings. The Ag District Internal Auditor had produced and submitted the 1st quarter, 2nd quarter, 3rd quarter and 4th quarter to LGPAC on 12th Dec 2016, 16th March 2017, 31st May 2017 and 28th July 2017 respectively. Consequently, the LGPAC produced and submitted the reviewed audit reports to the Council which discussed them under Minute No 12/NDC/15-1y FY-4(c-d) of 27th October 2017.</p>
		<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 	1	<p>The internal audit reports for the FY 2016/17 were submitted to AO and LGPAC and the LGPAC reviewed them. For example, the audit reports on Semuto Town Council and Kito Sub-County were discussed/reviewed by LGPAC on 14th June 2017 while those relating to the headquarter Works and Finance departments were discussed/reviewed on 13th Dec 2017.</p>

19	<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	4	<p>The LG maintains updated and comprehensive assets registers. The latest update on the assets register was the entry of a Motor Vehicle Nissan Hard Body No LG 0023 086 procured on 2nd January 2017 and Motorcycle Model XTZ125E which was donated by the Ministry of Gender and Community Development on 21st March 2017. There was no evidence of any other asset that was not registered in the Assets Register.</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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unqualified audit opinion: score 4 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0 	4	<p>The LG received unqualified audit opinion on the financial statements for the FY 2016/17. (source: The OAG audit report for the FY 2016/17 for Nakaseke District)</p>
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				

<p>21</p>	<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>	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following 6 sets of Minutes of District Council meetings reviewed for FY 2016/17 confirmed that the Council discussed service delivery related issues including TPC reports, LG PAC reports, for the FY 2016/17: <p>a) Meeting of 25/5/2017 considered motions and statements from the DEC including on appointment of Area Land Committees, authorisation of grant and conversions to Freehold and leasehold on public land in the district under Min.40/NDC/16-17 FY; and Standing Committee reports, updated 5 year DDP, departmental reports Qtr 3 and Qtr 4 workplans, DSC report 2016/17, Charcoal production ordinance 2017 and District Budget estimates and workplan 2017/18 under Min.41/NDC/16-17 FY</p> <p>b) Meeting of 23/3/2017 considered motions and statements from the DEC under Min 34/NDC/16-17 FY, Laying of District Budget Speech 2017/18</p> <p>c) Meeting of 28/2/2017 considered motions and statements from the DEC including customization of the Nakaseke DLG structure in line with the Review and Restructuring of LG staff structures under Min 27/NDC/16-17 FY, Standing Committee reports and PAC reports quarter IV 2015/16 and quarter I 2016/17</p> <p>d) Meeting of 22/12/2016 considered motions and statements from the DEC including capacity building plan, PAC reports quarter IV 2015/16 under Min 18/NDC/16-17 FY, Standing Committee reports Nov-Dec, progress reports 2016/17 under Min 19/NDC/16-17</p> <p>e) Meeting of 27/10/2016 considered motions and statements from the DEC including revision of District budget /work plan 2016/17 under Min 11/NDC/16-17, Standing Committee recommendations under Min 12/NDC/16-17</p>
-----------	---	--	----------	--

22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Senior Human Resource officer, Ms. Navubya Imelda, had been assigned in a letter dated 18/9/2015 under reference no. HRM/256/01 by the CAO to coordinate response to feedback (grievances /complaints) The following response to the citizens was seen: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An instruction by CAO to the Sub County Chief Kasangombe SC dated 7/8/2017 to provide response to an allegation land grabbing.
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>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule were not published on notice boards at the District headquarters. District had not established a website
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts were not published on the notice boards at the District headquarters.
		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Applicable. The Central Government did not conduct the Annual Performance Assessment for LGs in FY 2016/17

24	<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1 	1	<p>Nakaseke DLG had communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs and was demonstrated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fact that during some of the DTPC meetings (attended by LLG staff -Senior Assistant Secretaries and Town Clerks) the following guidelines were disseminated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Social Assistance Grants for the Elderly (SAGE) programme guidelines in meeting of 15/06/2017 under Min. 058/DTPC/16-17. - Uganda Women Entrepreneurs Programme (UWEP) in meeting of 10/11/2016 under Min. 027/DTPC/16-17.
		<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 feedback on status of activity implementation: score 1. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Radio program was held under Production sector (pg. 118 of Qtr IV Performance report 2016/17 and Green Charcoal Project report Nakaseke DLG pg.7-8)
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				
25	<p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG gender focal person has provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities score 2. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence was availed to show that guidance and support was provided to sector departments on gender mainstreaming.
		<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities planned for FY 2017-2018 include gender mainstreaming sensitisation, support to women's councils and implementation of Uganda Women Entrepreneurship Programme. A comparison of the budget for gender activities against expenditure shows 90% of the budget was used in 2016-2017 (e.g. of payment vouchers PV-CM00200 dated 20 June 2017; PV-S00440222 dated 15 June 2017, PV-S00420952 dated 31 January 2017).

26	<p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available reports indicate environmental screening was done for projects. E.g. Screening Report, signed by the Environment Officer in October 2016, for drilling of 10 boreholes at selected sites in the district.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	1	<p>Environmental and social management plans are integrated in the bid documents. E.g. Section 63.4.1 Page 29 of the contract with KLR (U) Ltd to drill 10 boreholes at selected sites.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1 	0	<p>Although the environmental screening report indicates that there was no land acquisition problem for the selected borehole sites, no evidence was availed on the ownership of the land where projects are implemented.</p>
		<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 	0	<p>No evidence was availed to show Environmental and Social Certification of all completed projects.</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Educational Performance Measures

Nakaseke District

(Vote Code: 569)

Score 66/100 (66%)

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>Performance agreements, lists of schools and staff lists in the DEO's office were examined to determine the extent to which the District met this performance measure. Lists of a few schools namely Katooke Umea Primary School, Kaloke Christian Primary School, Kyoga Baptist, Kisoga Primary School, and Nakaseke SDA Primary School were selected to verify the information available. The information indicated that for the current FY 2017/18, the District has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers for schools at P7 level and a minimum of 1 teacher per class for schools below P7 level as required by the guidelines. Out of 113 schools, 51 have head teachers and a minimum of 7 teachers budgeted for based on the wage bill availed to the District.</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 	4	<p>Examination of teachers' lists from various schools indicated that the teachers whose names appear in the lists are deployed in the schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each school has a HT and minimum of 7 teachers deployed; verified from sampled schools outlined above. Only 85% of teachers are fully deployed due to limitations of the wage bill.

2	<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision o If 100% score 6 o If 80 - 99% score 3 o If below 80% score 0 	3	<p>According to staffing lists examined, the HRM register, and the approved local government structure, positions for primary school teachers with a wage bill provision have all been filled, evidenced by the signed staff lists and performance contracts for FY 2016/17 and 2017/18.</p> <p>The current total ceiling for primary teachers in Nakaseke District is 932; ie 113 Head Teachers, 113 Deputies, and 706 classroom teachers. Out of this total, 685 teachers are in place leaving vacancies for 21 teachers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Of the 91 vacancies for Deputies, only 22 have been filled • HTs 15 in place and 62 vacancies. • 87 – 92% positions filled
3	<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	6	<p>Nakaseke District has 1 District Inspector of Schools and 2 Area Inspectors; all positions are substantively filled.</p> <p>Ideally, there should be 6 inspectors in place. Currently positions of Sports Officer, Guidance and Counselling Officer, and Special Needs Officer are not been provided for in the wage bill.</p>

4	The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.	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	2	According to the recruitment plan for the current FY 2017/18, requests have been made to fill vacant positions for teachers. Documents dated 12 May 2017 and 1 June 2017 attest to this effort.
	Maximum 4 for this performance measure	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	2	According to the recruitment plan for the current FY 2017/18, requests have been made to fill vacant positions for inspectors. Documents dated 12 May 2017 and 1 June 2017 attest to this attempt.
5	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.	Evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY • 100% school inspectors: score 3	3	All the 3 Inspectors of schools were appraised during FY 2016/17; Senior Inspector of Schools (Katamba) was appraised on 3rd Sept. 2017 according to appraisal report verified. The other two Inspectors of Schools, Kalema Kayemba and Galiwango Annet, were appraised as revealed by the appraisal reports accessed from their personnel files on 20th July 2016 and 30th June 2017 respectively.
	Maximum 6 for this performance measure	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	3	Out of 113 Primary schools and therefore the same number of Head Teachers, 12 head teachers' personal files were sampled out to check if the head teachers were appraised 2016/17. 11 out of 12 head teachers were found to be appraised. This represents a percentage of 92%. According to the scale of percentages provided, this percentage figure falls within maximum score of compliance.
Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection				

6	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1 	1	<p>There is ample evidence that guidelines, circulars and policy documents are being communicated to schools and they sign for them as proof of receipt, eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circular No. Adm/48/315/01 on Commencement of Civil Work for Construction of School Facilities, dated 19 Sept 2017; • Circular on School Feeding Programme in Educational Institutions, dated 15 May 2017; • Schools and Other Institutions Calendar 2018, dated 2 Oct 2017.
		<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 	2	<p>Meetings with head teachers and SMCs held to explain and sensitise them on the purpose and implementation modalities of the issues presented in the documents, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meetings on School feeding, dated 15 June 2016; 19 Sept 2016; 7 March 2017
7	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all private and public primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all private and public primary schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59% score 1 o Below 50% score 0. 	3	<p>A total of 70 out of 113 schools (ie 62%) inspected in FY 2016/17, according to inspection reports of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3rd and 4th Oct 2016/17; - 1st March 2017/18; - 2nd Sept 2017/18.

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	4	<p>Documents/Minutes of meetings cited below served as evidence that school inspection reports are discussed by the District Education Department and recommendations made for improvement in weak areas as well as for corrective action on errant staff. Such meetings are held soon after submission of the inspection reports to the DEO, as evidenced by the meetings of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 10 Oct 2016 - 12 March 2017 - 18 Sept 2017
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 	0	<p>The District Inspector of Schools claimed that Nakaseke submits consolidated inspection reports directly to Directorate of Education Standards (DES) and the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES), not through the regional representative because the latter is not effective.</p> <p>No evidence was found to support this claim; moreover, Nakaseke is not on the inspection list of districts we obtained from DES.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physical follow up by the District Education Officer (DEO) and DIS on serious cases (letter to Permanent Secretary MoES and Minister of State MoES dated 9 Nov 2017) The Education Department holds quarterly staff meetings to discuss findings and recommend the way forward, eg meetings of: 7 Oct 2016; 1 Feb 2017; 27 March 2017; 23 June 2017.

9	<p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5 	5	<p>Copies of lists of schools were verified and the submissions were found to be accurate and consistent, according to communications dated 12 July 2017, acknowledged 31 July 2017; 17 Jan 2018.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5 	5	<p>Verification of the enrollment data indicated that the submissions were accurate and consistent according to communications dated 12 July 2017, acknowledged 31 July 2017; 17 Jan 2018.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 sets of Minutes of the District Health, Education and Sports Standing Committee meeting seen: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meeting of 8/5/2017 discussed Budget estimates FY 2017/18 and proposed recommendations to District Council and under Min. 27/HESC/16-17FY and scrutinised Nakaseke District LG charcoal production, licensing, transportation, package, storage, and marketing control ordinance 2017 under Min. 28/HESC/16-17FY • Meeting of 10/4/2017 discussed Proposed recommendations on Education to District Council and under Min. 27/HESC/16-17FYii • Meeting of 31/01/2017 discussed proposed recommendations on Education to District Council under Min. 17/HESC/2016/17 FY 1B including the need for District Council to expedite the approval of Education ordinance. They also discussed PAC reports for Quarter 1FY 2016/17 under Min. 17/HESC/2016/17 FY 2 in which they recommended that PAC recommendations should be SMART so as to enable recovery of funds mismanaged and punish the law breakers. • Meeting of 29/11/2016 discussed Departmental Performance reports October and November 2016 and recommendations under Min. 14/HESC/2016-17 FY 1
----	--	--	---	---

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting of 27/9/2016 discussed recommendations to District Council on Departmental Performance reports Qtr I FY 2016/17 and revised Qtr II work plans FY 2016/17 • Meeting of 29/8/2016 discussed recommendations to District Council on Departmental Budget workplans Qtr I FY 2016/17 and Progress reports July-August 2016, Standard procedures for LG Councils in Uganda (2014) under Min. 4/HESC/2016-17 FY. <p>The Council Committee could not have discussed performance assessment results because the performance assessment had not taken place.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee presented to the District Council the District Health, Education and Sports Committee report and recommendations in meeting of 25/5/2017 under Min.41/NDC/16-17 FY and also in meeting of 27/10/2016 under Min.12/NDC/16-17
11	<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO) • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80% schools: score 0</p>	3	<p>Records in the office of the DEO show that 90 % of schools have functional SMCs. This was confirmed from minutes of meetings in sampled schools: Magoma Orthodox Primary School, City of Faith Primary School, Maranather Primary School, and Wakayamba Primary School.</p>
12	<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	3	<p>The list of schools receiving non-wage releases (UPE) published on the notice board in the DEO's office but not seen on other public notice boards. However, all the sampled schools have these lists posted on the school notice board.</p>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				

13	<p>The LG Education department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4 	0	<p>Evidence from the DEO's office indicates that although the department makes procurement requests and submits them to the Procurement Unit as required, the submission are far too late, eg submissions dated 15 May 2017 and 25 Sept 2017, much later than the stipulated date of April 30th at the latest.</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 	0	<p>The LG education department certified and recommended some payments to suppliers outside the time limits. A sample of 3 payment vouchers and 3 LPOs which were examined and compared with the payments registrar indicated that one payment was made at 14 days, another at 45 days and another one at 64 days compared to maximum period of 30 days indicated in the LPOs .</p>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				
15	<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 evidence was available to confirm that the LG Education department had submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning unit</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 	4	The education department did not have audit queries
----	---	--	---	---

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	Although the DEO says the department is working closely with the Probation Officer and orphanage schools regarding this issue and although schools visited also claim to be implementing this obligation, there is no evidence of consultations between the DEO and the gender focal person, neither is there evidence to support the claims by the schools.
		<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	No evidence in form of hard copies of documents given to the schools nor minutes of meetings availed for confirming that this performance measure is being met.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	1	Evidence from the DEO's office and the sampled schools confirm that all the SMCs adhere to the guideline on gender composition. Communications made 18 Jan 2018 and 5 Dec 2017 are about this requirement.

18	<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 3: 	0	<p>According to the DEO the Education Department is working closely with the environmental officer and efforts are being made to plant trees. But these efforts are undermined by a number of challenges including destruction by animals and insects, little cooperation from the community and underfunding.</p> <p>There are no evidences to support these claims</p>
----	--	---	---	--



LGPA 2017/18

Health Performance Measures

Nakaseke District

(Vote Code: 569)

Score 58/100 (58%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human resource planning and management				
1	<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 80% filled: score 6 points, • 60 – 80% - score 3 • Less than 60% filled: score 0 	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The last FY wage budgetary allocation was 3.7B and 3.4B was spent (92%). • Over 80% of the approved staff establishment was filled
2	<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 4</p>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was evidence of recruitment where interviews were done on December 22, 2017 but the process is not yet completed because they have not yet appointed some of the positions who sat for interviews
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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0 	8	<p>Nakaseke district has only 2 Health centre IVs called Ngoma HC4 with In-Charge called Mutebi Kasoma Ronald and Semuto HC 4 with In-Charge called Kakeeto Bernard Richard. Appraisal report viewed shows that In-Charge of Semuto HC 4 was appraised on 15th July 2017. In-Charge of Ngoma HC 4 had not yet reached his appraisal period since he was recruited on 22th June 2017. Since during there was only one staff eligible for appraisal during the FY 2016/17 and this staff was appraised, there was therefore no case of staff that was not appraised. Therefore all HC 4 In-charges are appraised in the FY 2016/17.</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 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The health workers were deployed according to the staff lists in the OBT reports. • The last FY wage budgetary allocation was 3.7B and 3.4B was spent (92%).
---	--	--	---	---

Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision

5	<p>The DHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no available evidence that DHO knew what guidelines they had received and no evidence at DHO's Office to suggest that guidelines were supplied to health facilities. • However, several of them, such as HIV, TB, Malaria were seen in the sampled health units Kikamulo HCIII, Biddabugya HCIII, Nakaseke hospital, Semuto HCIV and Kapeka HCIII
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the DHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no available evidence or any minutes to suggest that there was any meeting to discuss guidelines, policies or circulars with the in-charges
6	<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3</p>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quarterly reports for previous financial year were seen but only after obtaining them from Finance department and there was evidence that HSD of Ngoma and Semuto, and Nakaseke hospital had been supervised on a quarterly basis.

		<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY: • If 100% supervised: score 3 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no evidence and even facility records did not confirm that quarterly integrated support supervision was done - There were only two quarterly reports seen for first and last quarter for 2016/17 where only about 15/27 were visited per quarter
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no evident at both HCIV and at facilities that all facilities were being supervised. Only 10-15 facilities were supervised per quarter. • Only specific programs were being supervised
8	<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no minutes to provide evidence that reports for the quarterly supervision had been discussed at the DHO's Office level. However, there was evidence that the district executive committee was discussing health sector issues in their minutes. Health problems were among the "Action List" for the CAO's chaired meeting of February 20, 2017. Given the concern of the District Executive Committee, the District Health Team should have discussed these matters, but they did not.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was scattered evidence especially from the minutes of the executive committee that some issues in health were being followed up. Such evidence include the minutes of February 20, 2017 showing that the plight of the incinerator at Nakaseke hospital was discussed although it is still non-functional. But a company “Green label” was contracted to dispose the hazardous waste.
9	<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for health facility lists as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All government PHF beneficiary facilities are included in the OBT and HMIS which is evidence of consistent data. However, there are more lists of health centers for Private Not-For Profit (PNFF) facilities in the HMIS. The Ministry of Health requires LGs to also submit PNFP under HMIS which is not required under OBT.

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>			<p>6 sets of Minutes of the District Health Education and Sports Standing Committee meeting seen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting of 8/5/2017 discussed Budget estimates FY 2017/18 and proposed recommendations to District Council and under Min. 27/HESC/16-17FY and LG charcoal production, licensing, transportation, package, storage, and marketing control under Min. 28/HESC/16-17FY Meeting of 10/4/2017 discussed Proposed recommendations on Health to District Council and under Min. 27/HESC/16-17FYiii and scrutinised Nakaseke District LG charcoal production, licensing, transportation, package, storage, and marketing control ordinance 2017 under Min. 28/HESC/16-17FY.
----	---	--	--	--

<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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting of 31/01/2017 discussed proposed recommendations on Health to District Council under Min. 17/HESC/2016/17 FY 1A including the need to call on Ministry of Health to support the District supply Hepatitis B vaccine. <p>They also discussed PAC report for Quarter 1 FY 2016/17 under Min. 17/HESC/2016/17 FY 2, including the need for PAC to prioritise considering Health department in the next quarter.</p> <p>They further considered the Updated 5 year HIV/AIDS Strategic FY 2016/17- FY 2020/2021 under Min. 17/HESC/2016/17 FY 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting of 29/11/2016 discussed Departmental Performance reports October and November 2016 and recommendations under Min. 14/HESC/2016-17 FY 2. • Meeting of 27/9/2016 discussed recommendations to District Council on Departmental Performance reports Qtr I FY 2016/17 and revised Qtr II work plans FY 2016/17 under Min. 9/HESC/2016-17 FY. • Meeting of 29/8/2016 discussed recommendations to District Council on Departmental Budget workplans Qtr I FY 2016/17 and Progress reports July-August 2016, Standard procedures for LG Councils in Uganda (2014) under Min. 4/HESC/2016-17 FY. <p>However evidence that Committee had discussed supervision reports was not availed for review.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee presented to the District Council the District Health, Education and Sports Committee report and recommendations in meeting of 25/5/2017 under Min.41/NDC/16-17 FY and also in meeting of 27/10/2016 under Min.12/NDC/16-17

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 	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All health facilities(100%) had functional boards. However, the quality of some minutes was substandard. For example, in Semuto HCIV minutes had no list of attendees.
12	<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The list of PHC allocations per health facility for the last quarter in the current FY was available but was not on notice board.

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

13	<p>The LG Health department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2 	0	<p>The procurement plans were not available.</p>
		<p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	0	<p>The procurement plans were not available.</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 	0	<p>- There was no sufficient evidence although some medicine order forms from a few health facilities (seven) were seen in the DHO's office</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>The LG Health department certified and recommended payments to suppliers on time. Examination of 3 payment vouchers and 3 contracts indicated that payment were made within 11 days, 23 days to 29 days respectively compared to maximum period of 30 days indicated in the contracts.</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 evidence was available to confirm that the LG Health department had submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning unit</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</p> <p>• If all queries are not responded to score 0</p>	4	<p>The Health department did not have audit findings.</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>	<p>• Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2</p> <p>• Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2</p>	2	<p>• The health unit management committee were constituted according the stipulated guidelines and had at least one woman on board</p>
			0	<p>• No guidelines available</p>
19	<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>• Evidence that the LGs has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal : score 2 points.</p>	2	<p>There was evidence of existence of medical waste management guidelines with posters seen in all facilities</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Nakaseke District

(Vote Code: 569)

Score 41/100 (41%)

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 	0	<p>Nakaseke district has a safe water coverage of 85% as per the Uganda Water atlas 2017. It has three sub counties that are below the district coverage and these are: Kinoni 31%, Ngoma 61% and Kinyogoga 57%.</p> <p>As evidenced in the AWP FY 2017/18 submitted to MWE dated 18th July 2017 its only Ngoma S/C (Bulamba village), and Kinyogoga S/C (Kinyogoga Trading Centre) that were budgeted for and Kinoni S/C was left out and it has the lowest safe water coverage of 31%.</p>
2	<p>The LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <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 	0	<p>Annual Progress report for the previous financial year (2016/17), that was submitted to MoWE dated 18th July 2017, was reviewed and found out that in Kinyogoga Sub county (Butebere village) drilling of a deep hole was done as planned though was unsuccessful. However no project was implemented in Ngoma and Kinoni.</p>
Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision				

3	<p>The LG Water department carries out monthly monitoring and supervision of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually. • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15 • 80 - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10 • 70 - 79%: score 7 • 60 - 69% monitored: score 5 • 50 - 59%: score 3 • Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored -score 0</p>	5	<p>From the monitoring and supervision reports on file submitted to CAO on 24th May 2016 and for the period of July to September 2016, October to December 2016, April to June 2017, it was established that 660 monitoring visits were done. Projects monitored were protected springs, deep boreholes (new and old), VIP latrines that were constructed and still under construction.</p> <p>Therefore 65% of the WSS facilities were monitored.</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>	<p>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: o List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10</p>	10	<p>Form 4 reports about functionality status of the existing water sources was submitted to MoWE on 18th July 2017, and it's the same information that was submitted in the OBT that was submitted on 18th July 2017 to MoWE. In both OBT and sector MIS the following were reported, functional boreholes are 317 (78%), Hand dug wells 222 (54%).</p>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				

5	<p>The LG Water department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	0	<p>From the DWO it was established that a list of procurement requests for borehole siting, design and supervision and consultancy services of 6 sources deep boreholes were submitted to PDU on 2nd May 2017 beyond the deadline (30th April 2017), though the district had planned for 10 deep boreholes as evidenced in the Annual Work plan and OBT.</p>
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>DWO prepared a well detailed contract management plan for FY 17/18 and site reports were on file.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	2	<p>Five deep boreholes were visited, in Mbukiro, Kibiradongo, Kyambogo, Lusanja and Gangu villages and they were well constructed as per design.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	2	<p>KLR Ug Ltd handed over a completion report of all the 10 deep boreholes to DWO as per the contract and were done in the sub counties of Semuto, Nakaseke, Kito, Kapeeka, Kikamulo, Kasangombe and Kinamuto</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2 	2	<p>From the payment certificate file dated April 21st 2017 in works, it was established that all the projects (10 deep boreholes) implemented by KLR Ug Ltd as planned for the (FY)2016/17 were certified by DWO for payment and completion reports attached.</p>
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>The LG Water department certified and recommended the contract for payments to suppliers outside the recommended timelines in the contract. Sample of 8 payment vouchers and contracts/LPOs indicated that 3 of the payment were made at 61 days 57 days and 62 days respectively compared to maximum recommended timeline of 30 days indicated in the contracts and LPOs.</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 evidence was available to confirm that the LG Water department had submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning unit</p>

9	<p>LG Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 o If queries are not responded to score 0 	5	<p>The Water department did not have audit findings.</p>
---	--	---	---	--

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10

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

Maximum 6 for this performance measure

• 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

5 sets of Minutes of the District Works and Natural Resources Standing Committee meeting were reviewed:

- Meeting of 2/5/2017 scrutinised Nakaseke District LG charcoal production, licensing, transportation, package, storage, and marketing control ordinance 2017 under Min. 27/WNRC/16-17/FY

- Meeting of 11/4/2017 considered and made recommendations to District Council on Updated 5 year Development District Plan FY 2012/17-2020/21, Departmental reports and workplans for 4th Qtr 2016/17 under Min. 22/WNRC/16-17/FY

- Meeting of 1/2//2017 discussed and made recommendations on the state of district address as at 22/12/2016, PAC reports for 4th Qtr 2015/16 FY and 1st Qtr 2016/17 under Min. 17/WNRC/16-17/FY

- Meeting of 28/11/2016 discussed Departmental progress reports and made recommendations for District Council approval under Min. 14/WNRC/16-17/FY

- Meeting of 28/09/2016 discussed Cumulative Departmental performance reports and revised Qtr 2 workplans 2016/17 and made recommendations for District Council approval under Min. 8/WNRC/16-17/FY

However no evidence of discussion of submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination (DWSCC) was availed for review.

0

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	3	<p>The Committee presented to the District Council the Works and Natural Resources Standing Committee report and recommendations in meeting of 25/5/2017 under Min.41/NDC/16-17 FY and also in the District Council meeting of 22/12/2016 under Min. 19/NDC/16-17 FY.</p>
11	<p>The LG Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2 	0	<p>There was no evidence of display of development grant releases and expenditures on the on the district notice board on the assessment days of 22nd and 23rd January 2018.</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>Five deep boreholes were visited, in</p> <p>Mbukiro village (Kikamulo S/C), DWD 506553, DOC 11th May 2017. Contractor KLR Ug Ltd,</p> <p>Kibira dongo village (Nakaseka S/C), DWD 57112, DOC 28TH March 2017.</p> <p>Kyambogo village (Nakaseke S/C), DWD 57113 DOC 29th March 2017. Lusanja village (Kito S/C), DWD 57114 DOC 30TH March 2017.</p> <p>Gangu villages (NakasekeS/C) DWD 60653 DOC 01st Dec 2017 .</p> <p>They were well installed, funded by Nakaseke DLG (DWSCG) and functional.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2 	0	<p>Information on tenders and contract awards was not displayed on the notice board on the assessment dates of 22nd and 23rd January 2018.</p>

12	Participation of communities in WSS programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1 	0	Community applications, Land agreements, capital contributions, Operation and Maintenance fees for the current FY 2017/18 were not on file. They only had for FY 2016/17 on file.
	Maximum 3 points for this performance measure	<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	Out of the five deep boreholes visited, it was evidenced that Mbukiro village had collected 30,000/ for operation and maintenance as evidenced in their collection book but don't have an account.

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

13	The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2 	0	Environmental screening was not done for both FY 2016/17 and 2017/18
	Maximum 4 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1 	0	Since Environmental screening was not done there were no environmental concerns raised to be followed up. In the completion report submitted by KLR Ug Ltd for the 10 deep bore holes (FY) 2016/17 there were no environmental issues reported on.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	0	Two contract reports from Galaxy and KLR contractors were reviewed and there was no evidence of a clause on environmental protection

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>Five WSCs for five deep boreholes were sampled in the report on file in DWOs office dated 1st November 2016 and they all had 50% women on the committees that is:</p> <p>Ssegalye water source: 3 females, 3 males</p> <p>Mbukiro water source: 3 females 3 males</p> <p>Kakoola(Lubyamu) water source: 5 females 2 males</p> <p>Kyambogo water source : 4 females 2 males</p> <p>Bujaji water source: 3 females 4 males</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 	3	<p>Two VIP latrines were visited one at Nakaseke District headquarters constructed by Later Day saints. It has separate stances and well marked (Gents, Ladies), there is a ramp for PWDS and has adequate access.</p> <p>Another VIP Latrine was constructed in Bwanga village, Nakaseke S/C funded by Nakaseke district. It has separate stances for men and women, with a ramp for PWDS, but still under construction.</p>