



LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Namisindwa District

(Vote Code: 617)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	0	0%
No	2	100%

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"> • LG submitted a draft performance contract on 14/07/2017, there was no final performance contract to view and ascertain timely submission of the same. 	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"> • Budget was submitted but procurement plan submitted as a separate document on 04/09/2017. 	No
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			
LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)	xxxxx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A, LG was not in establishment. 	N/A
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"> • The LG had not attained a district status by then. 	N/A
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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG had not attained a district status in 2016/2017. 	<p>N/A</p>
<p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer</p>	<p>xxxxx</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG had not attained a district status by 2016/2017. 	<p>N/A</p>



LGPA 2017/18

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Namisindwa District

(Vote Code: 617)

Score 8/100 (8%)

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: • A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 2.</p> <p>• All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2.</p>	0	<p>There is a Physical Planning Committee in place but non functional. No meetings are taking place and there is no plans register in place.</p> <p>There are no new infrastructure investments with approved plans.</p>
2	<p>The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles</p>	<p>• Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.</p>	0	<p>• LG did not conduct a budget conference to inform the budgeting of FY 2017/18, this was a transition period as it was being curved out of Manafwa DLG.</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. 	0	<p>The LG formulated a 3 –year Development plan which is still in draft and soft form. Its approval could not be ascertained because the council minutes approving it were still in draft and soft form, however an extract of priority projects per sector was available to look at but by sampling, the linkage with the AWP was lacking for some projects, see below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of the administration block. – DDP extract page3, AWP page 2. • Renovation of former Buboto S/C office HQs. - DDP extract page3, AWP page 1. • Construction of maternity and general ward. - DDP extract page5, AWP page 4 • Construction of 5stance lined pitlatrines in 5 primary schools. - DDP extract page6, AWP page 5 • Construction of 6 spring wells. – NOT IN DDP extract, AWP page 11. Etc.....
		<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	Project profiles were not developed.
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"> • Annual statistical abstract, with gender disaggregated data was not compiled.

4	Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A, during FY 2016/17 LG had not been established.
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A, during FY 2016/17 LG had not been established.
5	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A, during FY 2016/17 LG had not been established.
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.	<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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A, during FY 2016/17 LG had not been established.

Assessment area: Human Resource Management

6	LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having been part of Manafwa DLG, Namisindwa was not yet established as an independent DLG during FY 2016/2017 to have its own HoD personnel to be appraised.
	Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.	<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"> Having been part of Manafwa DLG, Namisindwa was not yet established as an independent DLG during FY 2016/2017 to have its own HoD personnel.

7	The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having been part of Manafwa DLG, Namisindwa was not yet established as an independent DLG during FY 2016/2017 to have its own DSC with the mandate of handling recruitment.
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having been part of Manafwa DLG, Namisindwa was not yet established as an independent DLG during FY 2016/2017 to have its own DSC with the mandate of handling confirmations of staff.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having been part of Manafwa DLG, Namisindwa was not yet established as an independent DLG during FY 2016/2017 to have its own DSC with the mandate of handling disciplinary cases.
8	Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having been part of Manafwa DLG, Namisindwa was not yet established as an independent DLG during FY 2016/2017 to have its own payroll onto which new staff would be accessed.
	Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2 	0	Having been part of Manafwa DLG, Namisindwa was not yet established as an independent DLG during FY 2016/2017 to have its own pension payroll onto which retired staff would be accessed.
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG had not attained a district status by 2016/2017. Not Applicable.
10	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10% : then 2 points. If more than +/- 10% : zero points. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG had not attained a district status in 2016/2017. Not Applicable.
11	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG had not attained a district status in 2016/2017. Not Applicable.
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG had not attained a district status in 2016/2017. Not Applicable
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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Namisindwa Local government has an Acting Senior Procurement Officer with transferred from Manafwa District Local Government following the creation of Namisindwa Local Government on 1st July 2017. Was appointed as a Procurement Officer while at Manafwa DLG on DSC Minute No. 355/2016 – 3.9 • The LG doesn't have a Procurement Officer

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1 	0	Not Applicable
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1 	0	Not Applicable
13	<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The approved procurement plan FY2017/18 contains all the infrastructural projects that were planned in the district annual work plan for the FY2017/18 that was approved by Manafwa District Council in March 1st 2017 (Namisindwa was being created and was by then still part of Manafwa DLG), under Min No. DLG/MIN.253/05/2016/17, revised by Namisindwa District Planning Unit on July 4th, 2017 Namisindwa local government started operating in the FY2017/18 and therefore has no procurement for the FY 2016/17.
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 For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2 	0	<p>The bid documents indicated that they were prepared on November 2nd 2017. The delay was caused by the fact that the LG was new and that user departments and sectors delayed to submit the necessary specifications and BOQs</p> <p>Not Applicable</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2. 	0	Not Applicable
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 	0	Not Applicable
		<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	Except for the construction of a maternity, OPD and General ward at Bukhabusi HC III which too, has no site board. No other works projects has been or being implemented.
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG makes monthly reconciliations and are up to date to the latest month end which is 31st December 2017.
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG had not attained a district status by then. Not Applicable.

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. 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. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It had not attained a district status by then. Not Applicable Not applicable because the LG had not attained a district status by then. The LG had not attained a district status by then. Not Applicable.
19	<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG does not maintain an updated Assets Register. The un-updated copy seen did not comply with the required Format.
20	<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY: • unqualified audit opinion: score 4 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG had not attained a district status by then. Not Applicable.
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				

21	<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A, during FY 2016/17 LG had not been established.
22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no one assigned to coordinate this role in the LG.
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"> • The LG Payroll was seen displayed on the notice board but the Pensioner Schedule was not seen any where published.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1 	0	<p>Whereas there was a list of best evaluated bidders for various procurements on the notice board, the procurement plan was not published.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications, are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1. 	0	<p>N/A, The Central Government did not conduct the Annual Performance Assessment for LGs in 2016/17</p>

24	The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A, during FY 2016/17 LG had not been established.
	Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that LG during previous FY has conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc..) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A, during FY 2016/17 LG had not been established.

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

25	The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles	<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	Not Applicable
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.	<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"> • The GFP has planned activities for the FY 2017/18 and these are integrated into the LG annual work plan. These includes; conducting a training on gender needs assessment and gender mainstreaming for sub county and district staff, and celebration of the International Women's day. • There's no activity for the FY2016/17 since the LG wasn't in existence.
26	LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition	<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 	0	No environmental screening or EIA was done for all projects that are to be undertaken by the local government, even though the Environment Officer exists.
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1 	0	Reviewing of the contract bid documents and engagement of the environment officer indicates that there's no integration of environmental and social management plans in the bid documents that were prepared

		<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	No proof of ownership on all land where the LG is planning or implementing its projects
		<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	Not Applicable



LGPA 2017/18

Educational Performance Measures

Namisindwa District

(Vote Code: 617)

Score 27/100 (27%)

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 Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4 	4	<p>A performance contract with 4,588,105,500/= for 1070 teachers in 95 schools for FY 2017/18 was in place. Giving an average of 11 teachers per school.</p> <p>According to OBT and list of schools, 88 schools have 7 classes. The school with lowest staff has 9 teachers and the highest with 16 teachers. 7 schools with classes P.4 to P.6 have one extra teacher on top of the highest class.</p>
2	<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision o If 100% score 6 o If 80 - 99% score 3 o If below 80% score 0 	3	<p>Out of the staff ceiling of 1281teachers, 1070 (81.2%) are in post giving a gap of 151teachers unfilled.</p>
3	<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6 	0	<p>The structure allows 2 inspectors, but there is one in place in acting capacity.</p>

4	<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of Primary Teachers: score 2</p>	0	<p>The recruitment plan has no provision for recruiting teachers this FY.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of School Inspectors: score 2</p>	0	<p>The recruitment plan has no provision for recruiting inspectors this FY.</p>
5	<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY • 100% school inspectors: score 3</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having been part of Manafwa DLG, Namisindwa was not yet established as an independent DLG during FY 2016/2017 to have its own department of Education to discharge the responsibility of appraising school inspectors.
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised head teachers during the previous FY. • 90% - 100%: score 3 • 70% - 89%: score 2 • Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having been part of Manafwa DLG, Namisindwa was not yet established as an independent DLG during FY 2016/2017 to have its own department of Education to discharge the responsibility of appraising head teachers.
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 	0	There was no trace of any circular from MoES to district neither one from district to schools.
		<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	Minutes of 2 meetings and attendance lists of 08/11/2017; 10/10/2017;26/09/2017; 11/07/2017; 01/08/2017; 28/08/2017; 04/10/2017; and 19/10/2017 meetings were in place.
7	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all private and public primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all private and public primary schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: o 100% - score 12 o 90 to 99% - score 10 o 80 to 89% - score 8 o 70 to 79% - score 6 o 60 to 69% - score 3 o 50 to 59% score 1 o Below 50% score 0. 	0	110 [95 government and 15 private] schools exist. Quarter 1 - 35 [31.8%] and quarter 2 - 50 [45.5%] schools were inspected bringing an average of 38.7% in the two quarters. Individual school's inspection reports were in place.
8	<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 	0	No evidence of departmental meetings was in place.
		<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	Consolidated inspection reports were not in place and no evidence of submission to DES was seen.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4 	0	No evidence of follow-up reports or monitoring reports by DEO as a follow-up of issues emanating from inspection reports.

9	The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5 	5	The OBT and list of schools in place had names and number tallying with EMIS data obtained from MoES.
	Maximum 10 for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5 	5	The enrolment figures in OBT and statistical forms at district and schools had same data with EMIS data, 2016. Schools: Buwandyambi [6152] - 332 boys & 280 girls; Tsengwa [6155] - 344 boys & 312 girls; Nabutoro [6201] - 438 boys & 457 girls; Musiye [6082] - 480 boys & 546 girls; Bumurwa [680051] - 208 boys & 195 girls and Bukhayaki [6197] - 375 boys & 379 girls had same data with EMIS enrolment data.
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				
10	The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A, during FY 2016/17 LG had not been established
	Maximum 4 for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2 	0	There are no approved minutes in place to prove this. All minutes are in draft/soft form.
11	Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% schools: score 5 80 to 99% schools: score 3 Below 80% schools: score 0 	0	All SMCs' term of office expired in December 2017 and the DEO's office is in the process of renewing them.
	Maximum 5 for this performance measure			

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 	0	<p>There was no evidence of pinned up information on UPE funds on notice boards for public viewing.</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 	4	<p>Procurement requests dated, 02/10/2017; 26/10/2017; and 05/07/2017 for projects at Tserono, Bunambobi, and Bukikayi Primary Schools respectively were in place.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG had not attained a district status by then. Not Applicable.
----	---	---	---	--

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A, during FY 2016/17 LG had not been established
16	<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year o If sector has no audit query score 4 o If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points o If all queries are not responded to score 0 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG had not attained a district status by then. Not Applicable.

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

17	<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc....: Score 2 	0	<p>There was no evidence of consultations with gender officer or training of senior women/men teachers.</p>
	<p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2 	0	<p>No evidence of collaboration with gender officer neither any write up to this effect.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1 	0	<p>With the expiry of SMCs' term of office, it was difficult to establish gender composition on the committees.</p>

18	<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc.): score 3:	0	<p>There was no evidence of guidelines issued neither collaboration with the environment department to schools on environment management.</p>
----	--	---	---	---



LGPA 2017/18

Health Performance Measures

Namisindwa District

(Vote Code: 617)

Score 20/100 (20%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human resource planning and management				
1	<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY • More than 80% filled: score 6 points, • 60 – 80% - score 3 • Less than 60% filled: score 0</p>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The performance contract 2017/18 indicates that there are 217 established positions of health workers with a wage bill however current deployment lists indicate 132 positions of health workers filled. • Budget analysis by the district indicated that there was a wage provision for an additional 66 established position for health workers for the year 2017/18 • There is a letter from the Ministry of Public Service (Ref: ARC 6/293/05) advising the district to prepare and forward the additional positions to the district service commission

2	<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 4</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a staff recruitment plan in the performance contract however it was not comprehensive as not all vacant positions of health workers had been included. • Only the 6 vacant posts at the district health department and town council were included. And these were the same posts proposed for filling FY 2017/18. • None of the vacant positions at the HFs were included.
3	<p>The LG Health department has ensured that performance appraisal for health facility in charge is conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the health facility in-charge have been appraised during the previous FY: o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having been part of Manafwa DLG, Namisindwa was not yet established as an independent DLG during FY 2016/2017 with its own department of Health to discharge the responsibility of appraising its health facility In-charges.

4	<p>The Local Government Health department has equitably deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers equitably, in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY: score 4 	0	<p>With regards to Bumwoni HC III there are 8 positions of Enrolled Nurses on the list submitted with the budget for the FY 2017/18, however there are only 3 positions of Enrolled Nurses on the health worker deployment list at the time of the assessment</p>
---	--	--	---	---

Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision

5	<p>The DHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3 	0	<p>This indicator is not applicable as 2017/18 is the maiden year for Namisindwa district</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the DHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 	0	<p>This indicator is not applicable as 2017/18 is the maiden year for Namisindwa district</p>
6	<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3</p>	0	<p>This indicator is not applicable as 2017/18 is the maiden year for Namisindwa district</p>
		<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY: • If 100% supervised: score 3 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	0	<p>This indicator is not applicable as 2017/18 is the maiden year for Namisindwa district</p>

7	<p>The Health Sub-district(s) have effectively provided support supervision to lower level health units</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities have been supervised by HSD and reports produced: • If 100% supervised score 6 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 4 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 2 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</p>	0	<p>This indicator is not applicable as 2017/18 is the maiden year for Namisindwa district</p>
8	<p>The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4 • Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 	0	<p>This indicator is not applicable as 2017/18 is the maiden year for Namisindwa district</p> <p>This indicator is not applicable as 2017/18 is the maiden year for Namisindwa district</p>
9	<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for health facility lists as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: o List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All 10 health facilities on the OBT that are also on the HIMS list from MoH.

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A, during FY 2016/17 LG had not been established There are no approved minutes in place to prove this. All minutes are in draft/soft form.
11	<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 5 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5 • If 80-99% : score 3 • If 70-79%: : score 1 • If less than 70%: score 0 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator is not applicable as 2017/18 is the maiden year for Namisindwa district
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"> • This indicator is not applicable as 2017/18 is the maiden year for Namisindwa district hence no PHC grant received during 2016/17

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

13	<p>The LG Health department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2 <p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no submission letters to DPU that covered all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget
14	<p>The LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% - score 8 70-99% – score 4 Below 70% - score 0 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This indicator is not applicable as 2017/18 is the maiden year for Namisindwa district Submission of health supplies procurement plan to NMS was done by Manafwa district – the mother district
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 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG had not attained a district status by then. Not Applicable

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A, during FY 2016/17 LG had not been established
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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If sector has no audit query score 4 If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points If all queries are not responded to score 0 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG had not attained a district status by then. Not Applicable.

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

18	<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health Unit Management Committees (HUMCs) at Bupoto HC III and Bukhabusi HC III had more than two females members
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating toilet facilities for men and women were found Bupoto HC III and Bukhabusi HC III

19	<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that the LGs has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal : score 2 points.	0	<p>No medical waste management guidelines, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal were found at Bupoto HC III and Bukhabusi HC III</p>
----	---	---	---	--



LGPA 2017/18

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Namisindwa District

(Vote Code: 617)

Score 0/100 (0%)

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>From the District annual work plan for Financial year 17/18 dated 21st June 2017, safe water coverage of the District was at 64% and according to the District second quarter Progress report dated 16th January 2018 the District safe water coverage was at 64%.</p> <p>The district has targeted to implement in the following sub counties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Magale with safe water coverage at 61%, Bubutu at 66%, Bumwoni s/c at 95%, Bwabwala 95%, Tsekululu at 61%, Bukhabusi s/c at 95%, Mukoto at 60%, Bukokho at 68%, Bupoto at 95%, Bukhaweka at 95%, <p>There were sub counties with safewater coverage below the district's that have not been targeted in the current Financial year and these include: Subcounties of Bukhiabi at safewater coverage of 51%, Bumbo at 51%, Namboko at 49%.</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>In financial year 2016/17 the district was not yet established. Therefore this performance measure is not applicable.</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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	0	<p>In financial year 2016/17 the district was not yet established. Therefore this performance measure is not applicable.</p>
---	--	--	---	--

4	<p>The LG Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10 	0	<p>No works have been implemented this current financial year as yet. At the time of the assessment contracts had just been signed so no data had been submitted to the MoWE.</p>
---	--	---	---	---

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

<p>5</p>	<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>	<p>0</p>	<p>The District Water Office submitted the requests that cover some of the items in the approved Sector annual work plan on time. These requisitions included for :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Supply of Borehole Spare parts ii. Rehabilitation of Buwabwala and Soono GFS iii. Extension of Lirima GFS to Magale, Bubutu and parts of Bumwoni and Bumbo <p>All the above requisitions were received in Procurement Unit on 16/10/2017.</p> <p>The district also planned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv) for Spring Protection - 6nos –and v) Construction of Sanitation facility. <p>However, the procurement requisitions for this work were not available at the district. They had been sent to Mbale Contracts Committee for support in Procurement since Namisindwa District has not yet constituted a Contracts Committee.</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 	0	<p>Implementation of works for the current financial year had not commenced at the time of the assessment. Contracts for the works had not been signed. One of the awards for Extension of Lirima GFS to Magale, Bubutu and parts of Bumwoni and Bumbo is under Administrative review.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2 	0	<p>Implementation of works for the current financial year had not commenced at the time of the assessment</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2 	0	<p>Implementation of works for the current financial year had not commenced at the time of the assessment</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2 	0	<p>Implementation of works for the current financial year had not commenced at the time of the assessment.</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LG had not attained a district status by then. Therefore Not Applicable..
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A, during FY 2016/17 LG had not been established
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 If sector has no audit query score 5 If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3 If queries are not responded to score 0 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG had not attained a district status by then. Therefore Not Applicable.
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				
10	<p>The LG committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A, during FY 2016/17 LG had not been established There are no approved minutes in place to prove this. All minutes are in draft/soft form.

11	The LG Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency	<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	The Notice Board did not have any display of information on releases for water and sanitation grant and the Annual Work plan and expenditures..
	Maximum 6 points for this performance measure	<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 	0	No project works undertaken as yet.
		<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	There was no information displayed on the notice board on contract awards.
12	Participation of communities in WSS programmes Maximum 3 points for this performance measure	<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	At the time of the assessment mobilisation of communities had not been carried out. The District had just sensitised the Extension workers who do the mobilisation.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O&M funds and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, for the current FY: score 2 	0	At the time of the assessment, the water facilities had not been constructed as yet.
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				
13	The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management Maximum 4 points for this performance measure	<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	No environment screening done for the planned Projects. Reports were not in place at the time of the Assessment. The Environment Officer does not seem to know her roles.
		<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	The district was established in the current financial year 2017/2018. This item is not applicable since it requires contracts for the previous financial year 2016/2017.18.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1 	0	The district was established during current financial year 2017/18. This item is not applicable since it requires contracts for the previous financial year 2016/2017.
14	<p>The LG Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If at least 50% WSCs are women as per the sector critical requirements: score 3 	0	At the time of the assessment, the mobilisation of communities had not been done yet.
15	<p>Gender- and special-needs sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/RGCs.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3 	0	Construction works for the planned sanitation facility have not yet started. Procurement process not yet complete.